

ITEM NO.116

COURT NO.7

SECTION II

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO(s). 1268 OF 2004

STATE OF RAJASTHAN

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

RAMESHWAR DAYAL & ANR.

Respondent(s)

(With office report)

Date: 06/10/2010

This Appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARJIT SINGH BEDI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRAMAULI KR. PRASAD

For Appellant(s)

Dr. Manish Singhvi, AAG.
Mr. D.K. Devesh, Adv.
Mr. Sahil S. Chauhan, Adv.
Mr. Milind Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Pradyot Kumar Chakravarty, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Sushil Kumar Jain, Adv.
Ms. Pratibha Jain, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

The appeal is dismissed in terms of the
signed order.

(KALYANI GUPTA)
SR. P.A.

(VINOD KULVI)
COURT MASTER

Cr1.A. No. 1268 of 2004

2

[SIGNED ORDER IS PLACED ON THE FILE.]

Cr1.A. No. 1268 of 2004

3

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 1268

OF 2004

STATE OF RAJASTHAN

.. APPELLANT(S)

vs.

RAMESHWAR DAYAL & ANR.

.. RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

1. We have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. We find that the judgment of acquittal recorded by the High Court is based on an appreciation of the evidence and the positive finding is that the two eye witnesses P.Ws.

1 and 3 were not present. For arriving at this conclusion,

the Court has minutely gone through the evidence of these

two eye witnesses and observed that the statement of P.W. 2

- Sandeep Kumar in fact belied the statements of P.Ws. 1 and

3.

3. We are of the opinion that as the High Court has

taken a view which was possible on the evidence, no

interference is called for in this appeal against acquittal.

Crl.A. No. 1268 of 2004

4

4. Dr. Manish Singhvi, the learned Additional Advocate

General for the State has, however, argued that the discrepancies pointed out by the High Court were very

insignificant and could not lead to the conclusion that the

two eye witnesses were not telling the truth.

We, however,

feel that the discrepancies pointed out by the High Court

are not insignificant and go to the very root of the prosecution story.

5. We, accordingly, find that no interference is called

for in this appeal under Article 136 of the Constitution of

India.

Dismissed.

.....J.
(HARJIT SINGH BEDI)

.....J.
(CHANDRAMAULI KR. PRASAD)

New Delhi,
October 06, 2010.