

**CAUSE TITLE****SESSIONS CASE NO.45(NL)2019.**

Informant : Sri Victor Orang.

Accused : Sri Binod Orang.  
S/o Lt. Andrias Orang.  
Line No.10, Koilamari T.E.  
P.S. North Lakhimpur.  
Dist. Lakhimpur.

**ADVOCATES :**

For the State: Mr. Madhab Gogoi, the learned Special Public Prosecutor.

For the Defence: Mr. Nupur Kumar Gogoi, Advocate.

**IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL JUDGE : LAKHIMPUR :  
AT NORTH LAKHIMPUR.**

**P R E S E N T** - S.P. Khaund, (MA Economics, LLB),  
Sessions Judge,  
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur.

**SESSIONS CASE NO.45(NL)2019.**

GR Case No.66/2019.

State of Assam.

-versus-

Sri Binod Orang.

Charge : Under Section 302 IPC.

Date of evidence. : 20.06.2019, 16.07.2019, 14.08.2019, 09.09.2019,  
05.11.2019, 04.12.2019.

Date of argument. : 12.02.2020.

Date of Judgment. : 11.03.2020.

**J U D G M E N T**

1) The prosecution case in a narrow compass is that on 06.01.2019 at about 9 pm, Sri Binod Orang ( here-in-after, accused person ) dealt a blow on his father's head with an axe and committed murder of his father. An ejahar regarding this incident was lodged by Binod's elder brother, Sri Victor Orang ( here-in-after, informant ). The F.I.R. was registered as North Lakhimpur P.S. Case No.23/2019 under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code ( IPC for short ).

2) The Investigating Officer ( I.O. in short ) embarked upon the investigation. He went to the place of occurrence, prepared a sketch map and recorded the statements of the witnesses. He made

Contd...

preparations for inquest and thereafter, forwarded the body for autopsy. On finding prima facie materials against the accused, the I.O. submitted charge-sheet against the accused under Section 302 IPC.

3) On appearance of the accused, copies were furnished and as this case is triable by the Sessions Judge, the case was committed to this court vide order dtd. 16.03.2019 passed by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Lakhimpur, in GR Case No.66/2019. After hearing both the sides, a formal charge under Section 302 IPC was framed, read over and explained to the accused person. The accused person abjured his guilt and claimed innocence.

4) To substantiate the stance, the prosecution adduced the evidence of 8 (eight) witnesses including one Court Witness and the I.O., and exhibited various documents, while the defence cross-examined the witnesses to refute the charge on the inculpatory circumstances arising against him. The tone and tenor of the answers of the accused to the questions u/s 313 (1)(b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure ( CrPC for short ) depicts the plea of total denial.

5) I have heard arguments submitted by the learned counsel of both the sides.

**Points for determination :**

6) To decide this case in its proper perspective, the following point is apposite to be taken up for discussion :

i) Whether on 06.01.2019 at about 9 pm, the accused committed murder of his father, Andrias Orang (here-in-after referred to as the deceased) by intentionally causing fatal injuries with an axe which was sufficient to cause death of Andrias Orang.

**Decision thereon and the reasons for the decision :**

7) To decide this case in its proper perspective, it is necessary to delve into the evidence. The informant, Sri Victor Orang is the accused

Contd...

person's elder brother and he testified as PW.1 that the incident occurred on 06.01.2019 at about 10 pm. At the time of incident, he was staying separately with his wife and children in a separate house, while the accused used to stay with his parents, Andrias Orang and Smti Rohil Orang and sister, Smti Santi Orang. His (PW.1's) house is situated about 30 metres away from his father's house. At the time of incident, his mother Smti Rohil Orang was inside the house. On the night of the incident at around 10 pm, Binod Orang came to his house calling for his mother. Binod Orang also stated that he killed his father and so saying Binod Orang went away from his (PW.1's) house. Then, he (PW.1) along with his mother, Smti Rohil Orang went out of their house and ran towards Andrias Orang's house. As soon as, he reached their father's house, he found Andrias Orang lying dead in the courtyard of their house. He noticed blood oozing out from his father's mouth. He also saw the dead body of his father in the courtyard, and at that time, there was no one in the house. His sister, Smti Santi Orang was in the 'Namghar'. He raised alarm and the neighbours assembled. Thereafter, the Gaonburah, Sri Philip Orang came to the place of occurrence. Sri Philip Orang informed the police and at about 12.30 am, the police arrived. Thereafter, the police took his father's body to the Police Station. He noticed injuries on his father's head, chest and backside. He also noticed blood oozing out from his father's face. On the following morning, the police apprehended Binod Orang and took him to the Police Station. On the next day, after Post Mortem examination, his father's body was handed over back to them for funeral rites. He lodged an ejahar with the police and he affixed his thumb impression on the ejahar. The police recorded his statement.

8) In his cross-examination, he (PW.1) testified that he did not witness the incident. On the night of occurrence at about 7 pm, he went to his father's house, but, he could not find anybody in the house. He also did not find his brother, Binod Orang in the house. His father may have been killed in some other place and his body may have been placed in the courtyard. He has admitted his omission to state u/s 161 CrPC that,

Contd...

when he raised alarm, neighbours assembled. He also did not mention before the police about the injuries he noticed on his father's body.

9) It is amply clear from the evidence of PW.1 that Binod Orang informed him that he killed his father, and so saying he again went away. This evidence remains uncontradicted and uncontroverted. Whether this evidence is sufficient to fasten the guilt of the accused person?

10) Smti Santi Orang is the accused person's younger sister. She testified as PW.2 that she resides with her parents and the accused person in the same house at Line No.10, Koilamari Tea Estate, while her brother, Victor Orang resides in a separate house with his own family. The incident occurred about 3 / 4 months back. On that day at about 5 pm, she went to 'Namghar', while her parents were in the house. Prayer ended at about 10 pm, and she along with her companions could not return as that area is frequented by wild animals at night. Then, she along with her companions stayed in the 'Namghar'. But, at night, her elder brother, Victor Orang, her uncle, Ararush Tete went to the 'Namghar' and informed her that her father passed away and they brought her back to the house along with them. She found her father lying dead on the ground, in the verandah of their house. She noticed bleeding injuries on her father's head. Then, her mother, Rohil Orang informed her that her brother, Binod Orang committed murder of her father. At that time, she did not find her brother, Binod Orang in the house. Thereafter, police came and took her father's body. On the following evening, her father's body was handed back for funeral. However, her brother, Binod Orang did not mention anything regarding her father's death.

11) After scrutinising the evidence of PW.1 and PW.2, it can be safely held that extra judicial confession was made to PW.1 by the accused. The cross-examination of PW.2 also reveals her omission to state u/s 161 CrPC that she noticed bleeding injuries on her father's head. Her evidence stood firm regarding her testimony that her mother, Rohil

Contd...

Orang informed her that Binod Orang killed her father. Whether the aforestated testimony is sufficient to fasten the guilt on the accused person?

12) PW.2's mother, Smti Rohil Orang was examined as CW.1. Smti Rohil Orang testified as CW.1 that Binod Orang is her younger son and Andrias Orang was her husband. The incident occurred in the month of January, 2019 at about 10 pm in their homestead. Her elder son, Victor Orang resides in a separate house at some distance, and no commotion can be heard from Victor's house. At the time of the incident, she was staying with her husband, Andrias Orang, her son Binod Orang and Smti Santi Orang as joint family in the same house. On the date of the incident at about 6 pm, she went to Victor's house while Andrias, Binod and Santi were at home. That night at about 11 pm, her daughter Santi Orang went to Victor's house and informed them that her (CW.1's) husband Andrias Orang was lying dead in their courtyard. Instantly, she along with her elder son, Victor Orang and her daughter, Santi Orang returned home and found her husband lying dead on the courtyard of their house. She noticed injuries on his head, forehead and blood was oozing out from the injuries. Her daughter did not inform her (CW.1) who killed her husband. When she returned home from Victor's house at about 11 pm, Binod Orang was not in the house. Thereafter, police came and took away her husband's body. On the next day, her husband's body was handed over to them for funeral. She did not know who killed her husband. She also did not know why Binod Orang is still under custody. She did not know who lodged the ejahar.

13) After scrutinising the evidence, it is held that PW.2's evidence is not substantiated by her mother's evidence. PW.2 testified that her mother informed her that the accused killed her father while on the contrary, her mother testified as CW.1 that she received information of her husband's death from PW.2. CW.1's evidence depicts that she did not know who held her son liable for her husband's death.

Contd...

14) Sri Joydev Sobor testified as PW.3 that the accused is his neighbour. He (PW.3) is the chowkidar of Koilamari Tea Estate. The incident occurred about 5/6 months back. That night at about 11 pm, he retired to bed. At that time, Victor Orang came to his house and informed that his father, Andrias Orang was killed in his house. Victor Orang did not mention who killed his father. Then, he along with Victor Orang went to Andrias Orang's house and saw his dead body lying in the courtyard and blood was oozing out from the nose of Andrias. He noticed people assembled in the house. The Gaonburah, Sri Philip Orang was also present along with the Ward Member, Sri Sanjay Sarma. No one informed him who killed Andrias Orang. Thereafter, police arrived and recovered one axe from Andrias Orang's house. Police seized the axe vide Ext.1 in his presence. Ext.1(1) is his signature. At the time of incident, Binod Orang and his brother, Victor Orang were staying in the same house. Thereafter, the police took away Andrias Orang's body. Binod Orang was not present in the house.

15) In his cross-examination, he testified that he affixed his signature on Ext.1(1) at the Police Station. He did not properly see the axe while it was recovered. Thus, his evidence does not affirm the seizure of the axe. His signature ought to have been taken at the place of occurrence, but his signature was taken at the Police Station. He also could not properly identify the axe, which was not produced by the prosecution as material exhibit. His evidence does not at all implicate that the accused is complicit. His evidence does not affirm if the axe was inside the house at the time of seizure.

16) Sri Liknath Sobor testified as PW.4 that the accused is his neighbour and they reside in the same Line No.10 at Koilamari T.E. The incident occurred 5 / 6 months ago. On the night of the incident at about 6 pm, he went out to attend his duty as chowkidar at the Water Pump machine. At about 8 pm, while he was returning back home, he met the accused person's mother in front of her house, who informed him that Binod Orang committed murder of his father. He did not see the dead body. Thereafter, he returned to his house.

Contd...

17) Although PW.2 and PW.4 testified that CW.1 informed them about the incident and they also informed them that Binod Orang killed his father, yet their evidence remains hearsay because CW.1 chose to remain mum. As the accused is her son, she chose not to disclose the name of her husband's assailant. Thus, the evidence of PW.2 and PW.4 remains unsubstantiated.

18) Sri Philip Orang testified as PW.5 that the accused person's house is less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  a kilometer away from his house. The incident occurred 6 / 7 months ago. At the time of incident at about 6 pm, he was at Johing Police Out Post and on that day, at about 7 pm, he returned to his house. Then, his wife informed him that Binod Orang came to his house to meet him. Thereafter, at about 8.30 pm, Binod Orang again came to his house and informed him that he had a quarrel with his father, Andrias Orang, and thereafter, he assaulted his father in his house. Then, he went to Andrias Orang's house leaving behind Binod Orang in his house. When he reached Andrias Orang's house, he noticed the dead body of Andrias Orang lying in the courtyard. He noticed injuries on the head of Andrias Orang. He did not look at the body to find out if there were other injuries on different parts of his body. Blood was oozing out from Andrias Orang's head. He saw the local people and the inmates of the house except Binod Orang. Then, he informed the police about the incident over phone. On that night, the police from Johing Out Post came and took away the body with them. On the same night, he took the police of Johing Out Post to his house, where he left Binod Orang, and he handed over Binod Orang to police. Binod Orang's mother, Smti Rohil Orang informed him that Binod Orang attacked his father, Andrias Orang with an axe. The police seized the axe from Andrias Orang's house, and he affixed his signature as Ext.1(2). In his cross-examination, he admitted his omission to state u/s 161 CrPC that he returned home at about 7 pm from Johing Out Post, his wife informed him that Binod Orang came to his house to meet him, and again Binod Orang came to his house and informed him that he had a quarrel with his father and he assaulted his father, Andrias Orang in his house, and then he left Binod Orang in his

Contd...

house, and he went to Andrias Orang's house and found Andrias Orang's body lying in the courtyard. The aforementioned omission is a major contradiction, which casts a shadow of doubt over the veracity of his evidence.

19) The crucial question in this case is whether the accused killed his father. When PW.5 omitted to mention before the I.O. that the accused informed him that he assaulted his father, his evidence is not sufficient and this contradiction can be considered as a major contradiction because there has to be uncontradicted evidence that immediately before the person was found dead, he was assaulted or attacked by the author of the crime. Moreover, PW.3 affixed his signature, Ext.1(1) at Johing Out Post. The defence has disputed the seizure of the axe. The testimony of PW.5 is contradicted by the testimony of PW.7. SI Bhadreswar Chamuah is the I.O. and he testified as PW.7 that on 07.01.2019 while he was going to the place of occurrence, he found the accused, Binod Orang roaming at Amguri Pathar. He arrested the accused, Binod Orang and took him to the place of occurrence. The accused produced the axe with the help of which, he committed murder of his father, Andrias Orang from the backside of Andrias Orang's house. Then, he seized the axe in presence of the witnesses vide Seizure List, Ext.1, wherein Ext.1(3) is his signature. After scrutinising the evidence of PW.5 and PW.7, it can be held that the evidence of PW.5 was not substantiated by the evidence of PW.7. It is not clear why PW.5 went out of his way to fasten the guilt on the accused person by stating that Binod Orang confessed before him that he killed his father, and then, he held the accused, Binod Orang and after the police arrived at Andrias Orang's house, he came along with police to his house and handed over the captive, Binod Orang to the police. The aforesaid extra judicial confession of the accused before PW.5 remains unsubstantiated and his testimony has been contradicted by the evidence of the I.O.

20) The evidence of the I.O. further proceeds that on 06.01.2019 while serving as In-charge of Johing Out Post at about 10.30 pm, PW.5,

Contd...

Sri Philip Orang, the Gaonburah of Line No.10 informed him that the accused Binod Orang committed murder of his father, Andrias Orang with the help of an axe. He recorded GD Entry No.82 dtd. 06.01.2019 and proceeded towards the homestead of Andrias Orang at Line No.10, Koilamari T.E. After reaching the homestead of the deceased, he found the dead body of Andrias Orang lying in the courtyard of his homestead. He noticed injuries on the head of the deceased and blood was oozing out from two injuries of Andrias Orang's head. Sri Victor Orang identified his father's body. He prepared sketch map, Ext.3, wherein, Ext.3(1) is his signature. He held inquest on the dead body. Ext.4 is the Inquest Report and Ext.4(1) is his signature. He recorded the statements of the witnesses u/s 161 CrPC. He could not arrest the accused, Binod Orang as he was not present at the place of occurrence. Thereafter, at about 11.40 pm, he returned back to the Police Station along with the dead body. He kept the dead body at North Lakhimpur P.S. for the night. On the following day, he forwarded the body for autopsy. After autopsy, the body was handed over to the family members. On 07.01.2019, Victor Orang lodged the ejahar which was registered as North Lakhimpur P.S. Case No.23/2019 u/s 302 IPC. He recorded the statements of the witnesses, who were present during the seizure of the axe. Thereafter, he along with Binod Orang came to Johing Out Post. He recorded the statement of Binod Orang, and on the following day, he forwarded Binod Orang to the court. He collected the Post Mortem Report and after closure of the evidence, he submitted the charge-sheet against the accused u/s 302 IPC. Ext.5 is the charge-sheet and Ext.5(1) is his signature.

21) The extract copy of GDE No.82 dtd. 06.01.2019 was certified by the In-charge of Johing Out Post. Ext.6 is the extract copy of the afore stated GD entry. Ext.6(1) is the signature of the In-charge of Johing Out Post, certified to be true copy. His cross-examination is not noteworthy.

22) The Medical Officer, Dr. Ram Prasad Pawe testified as PW.6 that on 07.01.2019 while serving as Medical & Health Officer -1 at North

Contd...

Lakhimpur Civil Hospital, he performed Post Mortem examination on the dead body of Andrias Orang at about 3 pm, and found the following:

EXTERNAL APPEARANCE :

1. Condition of subject stout emaciated, decomposed etc. :  
Built – An average built, adult, male, non-decomposed dead body with rigor mortis present in limbs.
2. Wounds position and character : Lacerated wound right parietal region, 6x5, 5x4, 3x3, 5x2 cm.
3. Bruise position, size & nature : Nil.
4. Mark of ligature on neck dissection etc. : Nil.

II. CRANIUM AND SPINAL CANAL :

1. Scalp, skull and vertebra : Lacerated wound right parietal region, 6x5, 5x4, 3x3, 5x2 cm. Fracture skull right parietal region.
2. Membrane : Ruptured.
3. Brain and spinal cord : Ruptured right cerebral hemisphere.

III. THORAX :

1. Walls ribs and cartilages : Fracture 2<sup>nd</sup> , 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> rib right side.
2. Plurae : Ruptured bilaterally.
3. Larynx and trachea : Healthy.
4. Right lung, Left lung : Ruptured.
5. Pericardium : Healthy.
6. Heart: Healthy.
7. Vessels : Healthy.

IV. ABDOMEN :

1. Walls : Healthy.
2. Peritonum : Healthy.
3. Mouth, pharynx, oesophagus : Healthy.
4. Stomach and its contents : Healthy and contains undigested food materials.

Contd...

5. Small intestine and its contents : Healthy and contains semi-digested food materials.
6. Large intestine and its contents : Healthy and contains digested food materials.
7. Liver : Healthy.
8. Spleen : Healthy.
9. Kidneys : Healthy.
10. Bladder : Healthy.
11. Organs of generation, external and internal : Healthy.

V. MUSCLES, BONES AND JOINTS :

1. Injury : Lacerated wound right parietal region, 6x5, 5x4, 3x3, 5x2 cm.
2. Disease or deformity : Nil.
3. Fracture : Fracture skull right parietal region. Fracture 2<sup>nd</sup> , 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> rib right side.
4. Dislocation : Nil.

MORE DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF INJURY OR DISEASE :

An average built, male, adult, non-decomposed dead body with rigor mortis present in limbs. On Post Mortem examination lacerated wound right parietal region, 6x5, 5x4, 3x3, 5x2 cm, fracture skull right parietal region, fracture 2<sup>nd</sup> , 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> rib right side, ruptured pleura bilaterally, ruptured bilateral lung, ruptured right cerebral hemisphere were found.

The M.O. opined that the cause of death is due to coma as a result of head injury.

EXTRA JUDICIAL CONFESSION

23) In view of my foregoing discussions, it can be safely held that the extra judicial confession before PW.5 remains unsubstantiated. The extra judicial confession before PW.2 cannot be relied upon. This is the

Contd...

sole circumstance against the accused. Although, the extra judicial confession was not made by the accused under any pressure or duress, yet this is not sufficient to fasten the guilt on the accused person. It is true that the extra judicial confession before PW.2 was voluntarily made without any pressure from any quarter. The accused retracted his extra judicial confession. In his statement u/s 313 CrPC, the accused denied that he is complicit. It has already been held in my foregoing discussions that the accused cannot be fastened with the guilt on sole confession before PW.2. This evidence does not inspire confidence. Several contradictions were elicited by the cross-examination of PW.2 and CW.1. Thus, the extra judicial confession before PW.2 and CW.1 requires corroboration to rope in the accused.

#### LAST SEEN

24) This case rests solely on the plank of circumstantial evidence. The evidence of PW.1, PW.2 and CW.1 clearly depicts that on the night of the incident, Smti Rohil Orang was with her son, Victor Orang, who resides in a separate house situated at a few distance from the original house. The evidence of PW.1 and PW.2 reveals that PW.2 went to the 'Namghar' to attend prayer meeting. She was in the 'Namghar' when her father died and she received the information from Victor Orang that his father died. It can be deciphered that Binod Orang was with his father at the time of incident. So, Binod Orang was last seen at the time of incident. The burden was cast upon the accused u/s 106 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 ( Evidence Act for short ) to explain why he is not responsible for his father's death, but the accused failed to explain why his father was found dead. He was last seen with his father. Moreover, the conduct of the accused after the incident is also suspicious. This is one another circumstance against the accused. Even then, the accused cannot be held guilty of offence u/s 302 IPC. The circumstances are stray circumstance. There is not an iota of evidence that Andrias Orang was hacked to death on the night of 06.01.2019 by the accused. Andrias Orang was alone at home with his son, Binod Orang while Rohil Orang was in her other son, Victor Orang's house,

Contd...

and Santi Orang was in the 'Namghar'. There is every possibility that Andrias Orang was with his son, Binod Orang on that night, but this fact that Andrias Orang was alone with his son could not be proved beyond a reasonable doubt. It was apprehended that Andrias Orang was alone with his son on the fateful night. Although, there is every possibility, Andrias Orang was alone with his son, Binod Orang on the fateful night, yet it cannot be held conclusively that he was alone with his son, Binod Orang when the incident occurred. The victim's body was found in the courtyard. The circumstances does not form a complete chain because it was not conclusively proved that Andrias Orang was alone with his son, Binod Orang on the fateful night. Andrias Orang resides with Rohil Orang and Santi Orang in the same house, while his other son, Victor Orang resides in a separate house.

#### CONCLUSION

25) The circumstances which surfaced against the accused person is that Andrias Orang resides with his son, Binod Orang and his wife, Rohil Orang and his daughter, Santi Orang in same household. Andrias Orang was alone with his son, Binod Orang on the fateful night i.e., on 06.01.2019 as Rohil Orang went to her other son, Victor Orang's house and Santi Orang went to 'Namghar'. The other circumstance is the extra judicial confession of Binod Orang to his younger sister, which does not inspire confidence. The extra judicial confession of Binod Orang to PW.5 is not taken into consideration due to the contradictions writ at large. The circumstance is that Binod Orang was found missing at the place of occurrence after his father's death. One circumstance against the accused is that he had to explain why his father was found dead in the household when he and his father were present in the house on the fateful night. The circumstance is not conclusively proved, although the extra judicial confession does not require corroboration, yet in this case, the extra judicial confession of the accused had to be substantiated by corroboration.

Contd...

26) In view of my foregoing discussions, it is thereby, held that the prosecution has failed beyond reasonable doubt that the accused, Sri Binod Orang committed murder of his father, Andrias Orang by causing injuries on his head, which ruptured his father's brain and fractured the skull.

27) The accused, Sri Binod Orang is acquitted from the charge u/s 302 IPC on benefit of doubt and is set at liberty forthwith.

28) The aggrieved in this case as described u/s 2 (wa) IPC are the next of the kin of the victim, Andrias Orang leaving behind aside the accused. The accused is not an aggrieved in this case. This case is now recommended for compensation under the Assam Victim's Compensation scheme, 2012.

29) Send a copy of the Judgment & Order to the Secretary, District Legal Services Authority, Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur, for assessment of compensation to the aggrieved.

Judgment is signed, sealed and delivered in the open Court on the 11<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2020.

( S.P. Khaund )  
Sessions Judge,  
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur.

Certified that the Judgment is typed to my dictation and corrected by me and each page bears my signature.

( S.P. Khaund )  
Sessions Judge,  
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur.

Contd...

**APPENDIX****Sessions Case No.45(NL)2019.****LIST OF WITNESSES FOR PROSECUTION :**

1. PW.1 - Sri Victor Orang.
2. PW.2 - Smti Santi Orang.
3. PW.3 - Sri Joydev Sobor.
4. PW.4 - Sri Liknath Sobor.
5. PW.5 - Sri Philip Orang.
6. PW.6 - Dr. Ram Prasad Pawe, M.O. of the case.
7. PW.7 - SI Bhadreswar Chamuah, I.O. of the case.

**LIST OF COURT WITNESS :**

1. CW.1 - Smti Rohil Orang.

**LIST OF EXHIBITS FOR PROSECUTION :**

1. Ext.1 - Seizure List.
2. Ext.2 - Post Mortem Report.
3. Ext.3 - Sketch map.
4. Ext.4 - Inquest Report.
5. Ext.5 - Charge-sheet.
6. Ext.6 - Extract copy of GD Entry.

**LIST OF MATERIAL EXHIBITS FOR PROSECUTION :**

Nil.

**LIST OF WITNESSES FOR DEFENCE :**

Nil.

**LIST OF EXHIBITS FOR DEFENCE :**

Nil.

( S.P. Khaund )  
Sessions Judge,  
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur.

Transcribed and typed by :  
Sri Satyabrata Kshattri, Stenographer.