

PBASA10012652023



Presented on : 23.03.2021

Registered on : 23.03.2021

Decided on : 06.11.2025

Duration : 4 years 7 months 14 days.

IN THE COURT OF
Judicial Magistrate First Class
AT Ajnala, Amritsar
(Presided Over by Pallvi Rana)

CHI/125/2021

State

Versus

1. Dalbir Singh @ Kalla son of Natha Singh
2. Bir Singh son of Joginder Singh
3. Charanjit Kaur wife of Dalbir Singh
4. Nitta Singh @ Neeti son of Bir Singh

All resident of Machiwala Channa P.S. Ramdass Tehsil Ajnala,
Distt. Amritsar.

.....**Accused**

FIR No. 97 dated 29.08.2018

Under Section: 323, 326, 341 and 34 of IPC

Police Station: Ramdass

Present: Sh.Anjum Arora, Ld. APP for the State.

Accused Dalbir Singh @ Kala, Charanjit kaur, Beer Singh and Neeta Singh @ Neeti on bail with Counsel Sh.Sukhcharanjit Singh Adv.

JUDGMENT

1. The above named accused persons were sent by SHO P.S.Ramdas, to face trial for the offence punishable under Sections 323, 326, 341, 34 of IPC.

FACTS:

2. Briefly stated facts shorn of unnecessary details as culled out on bare perusal of report under section 173 of Cr.P.C. are that on 20.08.2020, ASI Sukhwinder Singh was present at Police Station Ramdass when the complainant Charanjit Singh alongwith his father Karam Singh and brother Major Singh came present and handed over to ASI their MLRs and X-Ray reports and also recorded his statement as per which he is a farmer and some people belonging to other villagers who reside near Dhusi-band are indulged in the business of distilling and selling illicit liquor and they prepared lahan in the agricultural fields of complainant without his consent due to which there always remained dispute between them. Further, on 22.08.2020 at about 4:00 pm the complainant alongwith his father Karam Singh were on their way on

motorcycle from their house to fields and when they reached near shanties in the slum area, the accused persons namely Dalbir Singh @ Kalla armed with datar, Charanjit Singh empty handed and Neeti Singh and Bir Singh both armed with daang were already standing there and upon seeing the complainant and his father, accused Charanjit Singh @ Bholi raised lalkara to catch and hold of the complainant and his father and teaching them a lesson for stopping them from distilling and selling illicit liquor. Further, the said accused persons wrongfully restrained the complainant and his father who were on their motorcycle and accused Dalbir Singh gave datar blow on the complainant which hit on his right leg due to which the complainant and his father fell from their motorcycle. Further, the accused Bir Singh then gave daang blow on the complainant which hit him on his left bicep whereas the accused persons starting beating his father who was already on the ground with daang and kicks. Furthermore, both the complainant and his father raised hue and cry hearing which the people working in nearby fields came to their rescue and thereafter, the accused persons ran away from the spot alongwith their respective weapons. Investigation was initiated into the matter, statements of witnesses were recorded and after the completion of the investigation the challan was presented in the Court against the accused.

3 On presentation of the challan, in compliance with section 207 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, the copies of challan and all the documents appended with the challan were supplied free of cost to the

accused and the statements of accused persons to this effect were separately recorded.

4. Finding a prima facie case, charge under section 326, 323 read with Section 34 of IPC was framed by the Court against the accused to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

EVIDENCE:

5. Thereafter, the case was fixed for prosecution evidence. In order to prove its case, the prosecution examined PW1 Charanjit Singh, PW2 Karam Singh, PW3 HC Gurjant Singh, PW4 ASI Jugal Kishore, PW5 Dr. Vishavpal Singh, PW6 Dr. Navjot Randhawa, PW7 ASI Nirmal Singh, PW8 Jatinder Singh, PW9 CT. Sharanbir Singh, PW10 HC Rajbir Kaur, PW11 ASI Sukhwinder Singh, PW12 Dr. Dawinder Singh, PW13 Manjit Singh Radiographer respectively.

6. After the prosecution evidence, the statement of accused persons under section 313 of Cr.P.C. was recorded separately and without oath in which every incriminating material produced in prosecution evidence was put to him. The accused refuted all the allegations leveled against him and submitted that he is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. The accused did not opt for leading evidence in his defence. As such, the case was fixed for arguments.

ARGUMENTS:

7. Learned APP for the State argued that accused persons who are indulged in distilling and selling illicit liquor used to keep the lahan remains in the fields of the complainant due to which the complainant always objected which became reason of enmity between the

complainant and the accused persons. As such, on 22.08.2020, when the complainant and his father were on their way to their fields, the accused persons attacked them and caused serious injuries on their person. It is further argued that the allegations against the accused persons are specific and in order to substantiate the allegations, the prosecution has examined all the material witnesses including the medical experts i.e. Doctors who have duly proved the medico legal reports of the complainant and his father. Further, all the witnesses were subjected to detailed cross-examination but their veracity could not be breached by the defence. As such, the allegations against the accused persons have been duly proved by prosecution beyond reasonable doubt. Thus, it is prayed that the accused persons may kindly be convicted and punished as per law.

8. While refuting the allegations against the accused persons, learned defence argued that the accused persons are innocent and they have been falsely implicated in the present case. Further, learned counsel argued that the injuries alleged by the complainant and his father are fabricated and even the medical experts examined by the prosecution have declared the said injuries as doubtful. Further, it is argued that the accused persons never inflicted any injuries on the complainant and his father as alleged even the prosecution witness have not duly supported the prosecution version. Thus, it is prayed that the accused persons may kindly be acquitted in the interest of justice.

POINTS FOR DETERMINATION:

9. After carefully perusing the documents on record and hearing the rival contentions, following point for determination emerged:

i) Whether on 22.08.2018 at about 4:00 pm, the accused persons namely Dalbir Singh, Charanjit Kaur, Bir Singh and Nita Singh in furtherance of common intention voluntarily caused grievous hurt on the person of complainant Charanjit Singh by means of sharp-edged weapons and thus committed an offence punishable under Section 326 of IPC.

ii) Whether on the same, date time and place, the above-mentioned accused persons in furtherance of common intention voluntarily caused hurt on the person of complainant Charanjit Singh and his father Karam Singh and thus committed an offence punishable under Section 323 of IPC.

iii) Whether on the same, date, time and place the above-mentioned accused persons in furtherance of common intention wrongfully restraint the complainant and his father Karam Singh and thus committed an offence punishable under Section 341 read with Section 34 of IPC.

FINDINGS:

10. The onus to prove the above-mentioned points for determination was on the prosecution and in order to discharge the same, the prosecution examined total thirteen witnesses.

11. Firstly, the prosecution has examined the complainant Charanjit Singh as PW1 who reiterated the prosecution version and proved his statement to police station which is Ex-P1 and identified his

signatures at Point-A on Ex-P1. The complainant further identified the accused persons present in Court.

12. Further, prosecution examined the father of the complainant namely Karam Singh who is also the alleged victim as PW2 who duly supported and corroborated the prosecution case by deposing exactly on the lines of testimony of PW1. Therefore, the examination-in-chief of PW2 is not reproduced herein for the sake of brevity.

13. Prosecution further examined PW3 Gurjant Singh who tendered into evidence his duly sworn affidavit which is Ex.PW-3/A wherein he deposed on 18.04.2020, he was posted as MHC when ASI Jugal Kishore deposited with him Bamboo stick without any blood stain, for keeping it in Police Malkhana which he carefully kept after making entry in Register No. 19 at serial No. 614. Further, PW3 deposed that he handed over the abovesaid bamboo stick on 18.12.2020 to PHG Diljeet Singh vide No. 177/21/2020. PW3 also stated that as long as the above-said bamboo sticks were in his possession he did not tamper with the same.

14. Prosecution further examined ASI Jugal Kishore as PW4 who stated during his chief-examination that on 08.04.2020, the investigation of the present case was handed over to him. Further, the accused Bir Singh and Neeti Singh joined investigation vide memo Ex.PW-4/B. PW4 further stated that the accused Bir Singh and Neeti Singh purchased the daangs which were used in the commission of offence and the same were taken in possession vide memo Ex.PW-4/C

and Ex.PW-4/D respectively. PW4 further stated that on 15.06.2020, accused Charanjit Kaur was joined in the investigation vide memo Ex.PW-4/E. PW4 further stated that the abovesaid memos were witnessed by Constable Sharanbir Singh and lady Constable Rajbir Kaur. The PW4 identified the accused property i.e. two dangs as Ex-MO1 and Ex-MO2. PW4 also identified the accused persons present in the Court.

15. Furthermore, the prosecution examined Vishavpal Singh Medical Officer as PW5 who proved the MLRs dated 22.08.2018 pertaining to Karam Singh and Charanjit Singh. PW4 stated that on medical examination of Karam Singh following injuries were found on is person.

i. Lacerated wound of 1 cm in length is present on the forehead 0.5 cm above left eyebrow, no fresh bleeding, no swelling is seen.

ii. Patient c/o pain in the right upper quadrant of abdomen 14 cm below the right nipple, no swelling, mild tenderness is present.

iii. Patient c/o pain in epigastric region of abdomen 7 cm below xiphoid process, no swelling mild tenderness is present.

iv. Patient c/o pain on the back just medial to lower part of scapular bone 6 cm right to the midline, no swelling, mild tenderness is present.

PW5 further stated that probable duration of injuries on the present Karam Singh was within 6 hours and the nature of weapon used for inflicting the abovesaid injuries was blunt in nature and all the injuries were declared simple in nature. PW5 further stated that he has produced

the original record of the said MLR whereas its computerized copy is on the judicial file as Ex.PW-5/A on which he identified his signature at Point A. PW5 further stated that the pictorial diagram of the patient is Ex.PW-5/B. Furthermore, PW5 stated that on medical examination of Charanjit Singh following injuries were wound on his person.

i. An incised wound of 6*1.5 cm horizontally placed over the anterior aspect of the right leg. 18.5 cm away from knee joint fresh bleeding present no swelling in adjacent area, injury kept under x-ray

ii. An abrasion of 3*1 cm is present on lateral surface of left arm 8 cm from the elbow joint no swelling, no tenderness is present.

PW5 stated that the probable duration of the injuries on the person of Charanjit Singh was within six hours and the nature of the weapon used for inflicting injury No. 1 declared sharp in nature whereas for injury No. 2 it was declared blunt in nature. PW5 stated that the injury No. 1 was subject to x-ray examination whereas injury No. 2 was declared simple in nature. PW5 further stated that the copy of MLR of Charanjit Singh is Ex.PW-5/C whereas his pictorial diagram is Ex.PW-5/D (original seen, compared and returned). PW5 further stated that he filled the x-ray requisition form and after receiving the x-ray film Mark A and other medical record, he alongwith Dr. Navjot Randhawa and Dr. Davinder Singh Gill declared the injury No. 4 as grievous in nature. PW5 stated that the final opinion given is Ex.PW-5/E and he identified his signature at Point A on Ex.PW-5/E.

16. Moving further, the prosecution examined Dr. Navjot Randhawa Medical Officer as PW6 who stated during chief-examination that a board consisting of members Dr. Vishavpal Singh Dhillon, Dr. Davinder Singh Gill including her was constituted for the declaration of injury No. 1 of MLR No. 8/VS/RD/2018 of Charanjit Singh son of Karam Singh resident of Machiwala and after going through all the x-ray films which is Mark A and other medical record, the injury No. 1 was declared as grievous in nature. PW6 further stated that the final opinion given by them is Ex.PW-5/A on which PW6 identified his signatures at Point A2.

17. Further, the prosecution examined ASI Nirmal Singh as PW7 who tendered into evidence his duly sworn affidavit which is Ex.PW-7/A wherein he deposed that on 29.08.2018 he was posted as MHC at P.S. Ramdass when ASI Sukhwinder Singh deposed with him one datar for keeping it in police Malkhana which he carefully kept after making entry in Register No. 19.

18. Moving further, the prosecution examined Jatinder Singh as PW8 who stated that on 02.12.2018, he was posted at P.S. Ramdass and he was the part of the police party headed by ASI Sukhwinder Singh and on that day the accused Dalbir Singh was arrested from the area of Shehzada on the basis of a secret information. PW8 further stated that the arrest cum intimation memo of accused Dalbir Singh is Ex.PW-8/A and his personal search memo is Ex.PW-8/B. PW8 further stated that before arresting the accused he was inquired about the

facts of the case and during inquiry, he suffered the disclosure statement that the weapon of offence which was used in the commission of crime was concealed in his house and the same could be recovered with his help. Further, on the basis of the said disclosure statement the recovery of datar was effected. PW8 stated that the disclosure stated is Ex.PW-8/C and recovery memo is Ex.PW-8/D which was witnessed by him. PW8 identified the accused present in the Court.

19. Furthermore, the prosecution examined Constable Sharanbir Singh as PW9 who stated in his chief-examination that on 08.04.2020 he was part of police party led by ASI Jugal Kishore and on that day, the accused Bir Singh and Neeti Singh were joined in the investigation vide memo EX.PW-4/A and Ex.PW-4/B. Further, PW9 stated that accused Bir Singh and Neeti Singh purchased their daang i.e. weapon used in the commission of crime and the same were taken into police possession vide memos Ex.PW-4/C and Ex.PW-4/D which were witnessed by him. PW9 identified the accused persons present in the Court

20. Further, prosecution examined HC Rajbir Kaur as PW10 who stated that on 15.06.2020, she was present in the police party led by ASI Jugal Kishore and on that day accused Charanjit Kaur was joined in the investigation vide memo EX.PW-4/E which was witnessed by her. PW10 identified the accused present in the court.

21. Further, the prosecution examined ASI Sukhwinder Singh as PW11 who stated that on 29.08.2018, he was the investigating officer in the present case and on that day, he was present at police station when complainant Charanjit Singh appeared before him and got his statement recorded which is Ex-P1. Further, PW11 stated that the statement was read over to complainant and after admitting its contents to be correct he put his officials at Point A on the same. Further, police proceedings Ex.PW-11/A were initiated. PW11 further stated that he endorsed the statement at Point A1. PW11 further stated that the complainant also produced his medical record. The statement suffered by the complainant and the medical recorded produced disclosed the commission of an offence under Sections 326, 323, 341 IPC on the basis of which FIR Ex.PW-11/B was registered against the accused by SI Lakhbir Singh whose signature at Point A2 was identified by PW11. PW11 further stated that thereafter, he alongwith other police officials went to the place of occurrence and recorded the statement of witnesses. Further, site plan Ex.PW-11/C was also prepared and on 02.12.2018, the accused Dalbir Singh appeared before me and suffered disclosure statement Ex.PW-8/C on the basis of which datar was effected which was taken into police possession vide memo Ex.PW-8/D. Further, the arrest memo of the accused is Ex.PW-8/A whereas his personal search memo is Ex.PW-8/B which were witnessed by Constable Parminder Singh and Constable Jatinder Singh. PW11 identified the accused present in the Court as well as the case property which is Ex-MO1.

22. The prosecution further examined Dr. Dawinder Singh Gill as PW12 who stated that a that a board consisting of members Dr. Vishavpal Singh Dhillon, Dr. Navjot Randhawa including him constituted for the declaration of injury No. 1 of MLR No. 8/VS/RD/2018 of Charanjit Singh son of Karam Singh resident of Machiwala and after going through all the x-ray films which is Mark A and other medical record, the injury No. 1 was declared as grievous in nature. PW12 further stated that the final opinion given by them is Ex.PW-5/A on which PW12 identified his signatures at Point A3 of Ex.PW-5/E.

23. Lastly, prosecution examined PW13 Manjit Singh Radiographer who stated that he brought the original x-ray record in the MLR No. 08/VS/RD/2018 of Charanjit Singh which is placed on record as Ex.PW-13/A and entry regarding the same was also made in the register brought by him in Court on that day.

24. To begin with, it is alleged by the prosecution that the accused persons were indulged in the illegal business of distilling and selling illicit liquor and they used to keep lahan remains in the agricultural fields of complainant Charanjit Singh due to which there was enmity between the parties. As such, on 22.08.2018, at about 4:00 pm when the complainant and his farther Karam Singh were on their way to their fields, they were intercepted by the accused persons who wrongfully restrained them and attacked them with the datar which was being carried by accused Dalbir Singh @ Kalla and dang (sticks) which were being carried by accused Bir Singh and Neeti Singh and due to the said attack,

the complainant and his father allegedly suffered injuries on their person. At this moment, it is pertinent to mention that the alleged occurrence is said to have taken place on 22.08.2018 whereas the FIR in this regard was registered on 29.08.2018. A careful perusal of the FIR which is Ex.PW-11/B shows that the information was received on 29.08.2018. Therefore, it is evident that the FIR was registered after seven days of the alleged occurrence and not forthwith. Since, there is delay of seven days, it was incumbent upon the prosecution to explain the delay of each and every such day. However, no plausible explanation has been offered by the prosecution to explain the said delay. Pertinently, the FIR must be registered promptly without any delay in order to rule out the possibility of any improvement in the story and by deliberations and consultations. *At this juncture*, it would be significant to refer to the landmark judgment of the **Hon'ble Supreme Court in Thulia Kali vs. State of Tamil Nadu reported in (1972) 3 SCC 393** wherein it was held that *"First Information Report in a criminal case is an extremely vital and valuable piece of evidence for the purpose of corroborating the oral evidence adduced at the trial. The importance of the above report can hardly be overestimated from the standpoint of the accused. The object of insisting upon prompt lodging of the report to the police in respect of commission of an offence is to obtain early information regarding the circumstances in which the crime was committed, the names of the actual culprits and the part played by them as well as the names of eyewitnesses present at the scene of occurrence. Delay in lodging the first information report quite*

often results in embellishment which is a creature of afterthought. On account of delay, the report not only gets bereft of the advantage of spontaneity, danger creeps in of the introduction of coloured version, exaggerated account or concocted story as a result of deliberation and consultation. It is, therefore, essential that the delay in the lodging of the first information report should be satisfactorily explained.” Also, the **three Judge Bench of Hon’ble Supreme Court in case titled as Sekaran vs. the state of Tamil Nadu [2023 live law (SC) 1052]** wherein it was held that *“it is trite that merely because there is some delay in lodging of FIR, the same by itself and without anything more ought not to weigh in the mind of the courts in all cases as vital for the prosecution. A realistic and pragmatic approach has to be adopted, keeping in mind the peculiarities of each particular case, to assess whether the unexplained delay in lodging the FIR is an afterthought to give a colour version of the incident, which is sufficient to corrode the credibility of the prosecution version. In cases where delay occurs, it has to be tested on the anvil of other attendant circumstances. If on an overall consideration of all relevant circumstances it appears to the court that the delay in lodging the FIR have been explained, mere delay cannot be sufficient to display the prosecution case. However, if the delay is not satisfactorily explained and it appears to the court that cause for the delay had been necessitated to frame anyone as an accused, there is no reason as to why the delay should not be considered as fatal forming part of several factors to vitiate the conviction”*. Thus, it is evident from the above discussed judgment that

the FIR must be registered forthwith and delay in FIR must be duly explained by the prosecution, failing which, the delay may prove fatal to its case and as such, the delay in FIR tends to adversely affect the prosecution case if other circumstances also indicate the improvements in the prosecution story by consultations and deliberations.

25. Rebutting to the facts in hand, as already discussed above, there is a delay of seven days in registration of the FIR. However, the prosecution has failed to explain such delay which indicates towards the high possibility of indictment of the accused persons after manipulating the facts and circumstances in order to use the same against the accused persons in a manner to invoke criminal proceedings against them. Therefore, this Court is of the considered opinion that the delay in registration of FIR affects the roots of the prosecution case and creates reasonable doubt for the same.

26. Moving further, as far as the question of injuries on the person of complainant and his father is concerned it is worth mentioning that although the prosecution has examined three medical experts i.e. PW5, Vishavpal Singh, PW6 Navjot Randhawa and PW12 Dawinder Singh Gill. PW5 admitted during cross-examination that as per the final opinion injury No. 1 on the person of Charanjit Singh was non-vital and accessible part of the body so the possibility of the said injury being inflicted with friendly hand cannot be ruled out. He also admitted that all the injuries on the person of Karam Singh and Charanjit Singh are on non-vital part of the body and as such, the possibility of all injuries being self

-suffered or being caused by friendly hand cannot be ruled out. Likewise, PW6 and PW12 admitted that in their final opinion injury No. 1 was on the non-vital and accessible part of the body of the complainant and the possibility of it being inflicted with friendly hand cannot be ruled out. During cross-examination the investigating officer ASI Sukhwinder Singh examined as PW11 admitted that when he got the medical opinion from the doctor it was mentioned that the injury No. 1 on the body of Charanjit Singh was suspicious and therefore, he was directed to see the circumstantial evidence before lodging the FIR. PW11 also admitted that no blood was found on the datar allegedly recovered from Dalbir Singh and further admitted by the complainant party did not get any docket from the police station. The FIR was lodged after seven days of the alleged occurrence. Therefore, where in the opinion of medical experts the injury No. 1 on the person of complainant Charanjit Singh which is grievous injury as per his MLR, is declared as 'suspicious', the onus was on the prosecution to remove the suspicion and prove the injury as genuine. Therefore, when the medical opinion of the doctors is read in conjunction with the delay of seven days period, reasonable doubt already accrued in the prosecution story gets more strengthened. Moreover, during cross-examination complainant/ PW1 Charanjit Singh denied the suggestion that the accused already has taken land on lease for doing agriculture but admitted that they also do labour work for their livelihood. Further, PW1 admitted that an inquiry was conducted by DSP, Ajnala on reference by National Scheduled Castes Commission on the application given by

accused Dalbir Singh who alleged that he and Karam Singh had stolen their maize crop. He also admitted that accused Dalbir Singh had also given one application to the Forest Department against him and his father Karam Singh for selling woods from the nearby land of the Forest Department. PW1 further admitted that the doctor has given opinion regarding his injury no. 1 that the possibility of the said injury being inflicted with friendly hand cannot be ruled out but he voluntarily stated that the accused persons had beaten him and his father. PW1 also admitted that at present there is no case of illicit liquor pending against the accused persons. Hence, having considered admission on the part of the complainant himself that the accused Dalbir Singh had already moved a few applications against him before departments concerned is suggestive of the fact that the relation between the parties were strained. Therefore, under these peculiar circumstances the possibility of implicating the accused persons in a false criminal case cannot be completely ruled out. On the other hand, on the same ground the possibility of accused persons attacking the complainant party can also not ruled out but there was heavy onus on the prosecution to prove the allegations beyond the shadow of reasonable doubt. However, the factors like delay of seven days in registration of FIR and the opinion of medical board that the injury No. 1 on the person of complainant was suspicious; create reasonable doubt in the prosecution story. Further, as far as the remaining injuries on the persons of complainant and his father are concerned again the medical opinion on record is that the same are on non-vital parts of the body and

possibility of them being inflicted with friendly hands or being self-suffered cannot be ruled out. Thus, under these peculiar circumstances, the prosecution cannot be said to have proved the guilt of the accused persons beyond the shadow of reasonable doubt. Hence, the accused persons namely Dalbir Singh, Charanjit Kaur Bir Singh Nitti Singh are hereby held not guilty under Sections 326, 323, 341 and 34 of IPC.

CONCLUSION:

27 Therefore, in view of the preceding discussion, this Court is of the considered opinion that the benefit of doubt ought to be granted to the accused. Accordingly, the accused persons namely Dalbir Singh, Bir Singh, Charanjit Kaur and Neeti Singh are hereby acquitted of the offence punishable under Section 323, 326, 341 and 34 IPC. Bail Bonds and surety bonds of the accused stand discharged. In compliance of Section 437-A of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, accused persons are directed to furnish their bail bonds and surety in the sum of Rs.50,000/- to appear before the Higher Court as or when such court issues notice in respect of any appeal or petition filed against this judgment. Case property, if any, be disposed of as per rules. File be consigned to the record room, Ajnala after due compliance, under proper receipt.

Pronounced in open Court
Dated:-06.11.2025
'Deepa Stenographer III'

Pallvi Rana, PCS,
Judicial Magistrate 1st class,
Ajnala/UID No.PB0648.

*Note :Certified that all the pages of this Judgment
are signed by me, which have been
dictated and typed directly on computer.*

CHI-125-2021.

State Vs. Dalbir Singh & Ors.

Present: Sh.Anjum Arora, Ld. APP for the State.**Accused Dalbir Singh @ Kala, Charanjit kaur, Beer Singh and Neeta Singh @ Neeti on bail with Counsel Sh.Sukhcharanjit Singh Adv.**

Today, the accused persons closed their evidence vide their statement.

Arguments heard and concluded. Vide my separate detailed judgment of even date, accused persons namely **Dalbir Singh @ Kala, Charanjit kaur, Beer Singh and Neeta Singh @ Neeti** are acquitted for the offences punishable under Section U/s 323, 326, 341 and 34 IPC, by giving benefit of doubt. They are also ordered to furnish bail bonds in the sum of Rs.50,000/- each with one surety in the like amount as required U/s 481 of BNS. Requisite bail bonds and surety bonds furnished which are accepted and attested. Case property, if any, be dealt with as per rules, after the expiry period of limitation, for filing an appeal/revision, if any. Surety bonds of accused also stands discharged. File be consigned to the judicial record room, Ajnala.

Pronounced in open Court
Dated:-06.11.2025
'Deepa Stenographer III'

Pallvi Rana, PCS,
Judicial Magistrate 1st class,
Ajnala/UID No.PB0648.