

**IN THE COURT OF THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,  
LAKHIMPUR, NORTH LAKHIMPUR, ASSAM**

Present: Shri Narayan Kuri, AJS,  
Chief Judicial Magistrate,  
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur, Assam

**G.R. 1420/2014**  
U/s 336/427/323 IPC

**State of Assam**

**-Vs-**

**Smti. Meena Dutta**  
W/O: Late Lila Dutta  
R/O: Gandhali  
P.S: North Lakhimpur  
District: Lakhimpur, Assam

.....Accused person

Date of offence explanation : 05.01.2015  
Dates of recording evidence of PWs : 13.03.2015, 13.05.2015,  
06.01.2016, 20.04.2016,  
14.12.2016, 27.12.2018,  
30.04.2019  
Date of recording statement u/s 313, Cr.P.C : 10.05.2019  
Date of argument : 23.05.2019  
Date of judgment : **06.06.2019**

**Advocates appeared in the case:-**

Mr. Prasanta Dutta, Addl. P.P., for the State

Mrs. Minakhi Dutta Gohain Baruah, Advocate, for the accused person

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

1. The prosecution case, in brief, is that on 22.07.2014 informant Sri Tejen Borah has lodged an FIR with the In-charge of Nowboicha Police Outpost under North Lakhimpur Police Station alleging that on 22.07.2014 while the laborers were working on the development of village path, accused Smti. Meena Dutta attacked them with stones in which a labourer Md. Mofijul Islam sustained injury. Some land on which

2

the village path was situated was previously illegally encroached by the family members of accused Smti. Meena Dutta and they used to torture the pedestrian in various manner. During the year 2003-2004, the Hon'ble Court rejected the claim of the family members of the accused in connection with the said path. That apart, on the day of the occurrence, while the informant was proceeding to his office by his vehicle, the accused gave a 'kooor' (spade) blow to his vehicle thereby breaking its glass and thereafter, she threw sand in his eyes and tortured him but the labourers present there saved him from the accused person. As the accused is a lady, so the informant bearing all the tortures left that place. Hence, the case.

2. After receiving the ejahar, the In-charge of Nowboicha Police Outpost effected a G.D. Entry vide Nowboicha O.P. G.D. Entry no. 327 dated 22.07.2014 and forwarded the ejahar to the Officer-in-charge of North Lakhimpur Police Station to register a case under proper section of law. Accordingly, on receipt of the FIR, the Officer-in-charge of North Lakhimpur Police Station, registered a case vide North Lakhimpur Police Station Case No. 767/2014 u/s 325/336/427/323, IPC and got the investigation into the case commenced. The investigating officer, after completing the investigation, submitted charge-sheet u/s 336/427/323, IPC against accused person Smti. Meena Dutta to stand trial in the Court.

3. On receipt of the charge-sheet, cognizance of the offence u/s 336/427/323, IPC was taken as per section 190(1)(b), Cr.P.C. The accused person entered her appearance before this Court after receiving the summon. Copies were furnished to the accused person as per provision contained in section 207, Cr.P.C. The particulars of the offence u/s 336/427/323, IPC were explained to the accused person to which she pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

**POINTS FOR DETERMINATION:**

4. The points which are required to be determined for a just decision of this case are as follows:

3

(a) Whether the accused person, on 22.07.2014, at village Gendhali under North Lakhimpur Police Station, did an act of pelting stones to the labourers who were working on the village path, as to endanger human life or the safety of others, and thereby committed an offence punishable u/s 336 IPC?

(b) Whether the accused person, on 22.07.2014, at village Gendhali under North Lakhimpur Police Station, committed mischief by breaking the glass of the vehicle of informant Sri Tejen Borah, and thereby committed an offence punishable u/s 427 IPC?

(c) Whether the accused person, on 22.07.2014, at village Gendhali under North Lakhimpur Police Station, voluntarily caused hurt to Md. Mofijul Islam, and thereby committed an offence punishable u/s 323 IPC?

5. During the trial the Prosecution side examined 8(eight) witnesses, namely, Sri Gobin Borah (PW-1), Sri Tejen Borah (PW-2), Md. Habibur Rahman (PW-3), Md. Sahidul Islam (PW-4), Dr. Kiron Ch. Chetia (PW-5), Md. Kasem Ali (PW-6), Md. Mohammad Ali (PW-7) and SI Indreswar Gogoi (PW-8) and exhibited 8 (eight) documents (Shown in the Annexure appended below). After the closure of the prosecution evidence the accused person was examined under section 313, Cr.P.C. wherein she denied the incriminating materials put to her from the evidence of the witnesses and declined to adduce evidence in defence.

**DISCUSSION, DECISION AND REASONS THEREOF:**

6. The evidentiary facts that need to be appreciated in all the three points are intertwined as such let me take up all these points together for discussion for the sake of convenience.

7. PW-1 Sri Govind Borah, is the brother of informant Tejen Bora, who has deposed that on the day of occurrence some labourers were doing the road construction work at Gendhali road and at that time Meena Dutta rebuked those laborers alleging that they had been constructing the road on their land. Then Tejen Borah came there

4

driving an Indica car but accused Meena Dutta restrained the vehicle of Tejen Borah from proceeding further and as such Tejen Borah stopped the vehicle and came down from it, when accused threw sand to the eyes of Tejen Borah. Thereafter, accused Meena Dutta hit the glass of the vehicle of Tejen Borah with a small 'koo' (spade) as a result the glass of the vehicle got damaged. Then accused Meena Dutta also hit her head on the said vehicle. Thereafter, Tejen Borah lodged an FIR at the Nowboicha Police Outpost.

8. In his cross-examination, PW-1 Govinda Bora has admitted that the accused had lodged a case against him and informant Tejen Bora in which they had been appearing in that case. He has stated to have no knowledge if the general public is afraid of informant Tejen Bora but he added that since informant Tejen Bora always side with the reason as such people are afraid of him.

9. PW-2 Sri Tejen Borah, informant, has stated that the occurrence took place on 22.07.2014 in between 11:00 AM to 12:00 noon. At that time, labourers had been doing the public road construction work on the road which ran from NH 52 towards Gendhali. At about 11:30 AM on the day of occurrence he was going to the Panchayat Office by driving his vehicle through Gendhali road and saw accused Meena Dutta had been quarreling with the labourers who had been doing the construction work of the said road. Then he asked the accused the reason for which she was not allowing the labourers to do the road construction work, whereupon, she with a 'koo' (spade) hit the front glass of his vehicle as a result it was broken down and he had to sustain a loss of Rs. 4,500/- Then he intended to get down from his vehicle when the accused threw sandy soil to his eyes. He took away his vehicle with the help of the labourers from that place. Prior to his arrival at the place of the occurrence, the accused had pelted stone to a labourer namely Mafijul Islam causing injury to him. In connection with the occurrence he went to Nowboicha Police Outpost and lodged an FIR (Ext-1). Police seized his vehicle along with its documents vide seizure list Ext-2 wherein Ext-2(1) is his signature.

10. In his cross-examination, PW-2 has stated that he is the member of the Gaon Panchayat and the under construction Gandhali village road was included in the Gaon Panchayat scheme. According to him, permission is not required to be taken if road is constructed over the Miyadi Patta land of a person and at the time of the construction of road the owner of the said land is only asked. He admitted that the accused lodged a case against him and his brother Govind Borah and that case was going on. The labourers was working there and they had 'kooor' (spade) and 'pachi' (bamboo bucket) with them. They told that the road in which the construction was taking place was public land but the accused claimed it to be her 'Miyadi Patta' land and in that connection she lodged a false case against them. According to him brining of 'Mandal' (surveyor for demarcation of land) is not his responsibility. He claimed to have not constructed road on 'Miyadi Patta' land if people objected to it. He clarified that he himself was driving his vehicle at the time of the occurrence but he clarified to have taken the said vehicle on rent from one Paban Kr. Baishya. The driving license which he handed over in the police station is of Parth Pratim Borah and not of him. He also admitted to have not taken any medical treatment by any doctor.

11. PW-3 Md. Habibur Rahman has stated that at the time of the occurrence he had gone to Gendhali where he along with other labourers were doing earth digging work on the road but the accused did not allow them to do the said work and scolded them instead. At that time, informant Tejen Borah (PW-2) came there in a vehicle but the accused went in front of the vehicle of Tejen Borah and stopped the said vehicle. Thereafter, the accused took sand in her hand and threw the said sand to the body of Tejen Borah through the window of the vehicle. They pushed the vehicle and brought it to the road. Thereafter, the accused broke the front side glass of the vehicle of Tejen Borah with a 'kooor' (spade) in her hand. Accused left the said 'kooor' (spade) at the place of occurrence and fled away from there to her house. Thereafter, Tejen Borah along with all the labourers, including him went to the police where Tejen Borah lodged an FIR.

6

12. PW-3 during his cross-examination, has explained that the accused asked them not to dig the land claiming that the said land belongs to her and in spite of the protest and threatening from the accused they had dug the said land. He admitted to have worked without knowing who the owner of the land was. He along with three other labourers were working with 'kooor' (spade) in their hands. Only the accused objected to their performing their work for which they had to stop their work. Tejen Borah stopped his vehicle on the road. Tejen Borah is the Councillor of Gaon Panchayat.

13. PW-4 Md. Sahidul Islam has stated that on the day of occurrence Tejen Borah had engaged him and other labourers to do the earth filling work on the Gendhali road. While he along with other labourers were doing their work the accused came there and told them not to fill earth near her 'jeura' (fencing) and as such they stopped filling up that land. Accused pelted stones at them. Meanwhile informant Tejen Borah came there when the accused threw dust in the person of Tejen Bora. They pushed the vehicle of Tejen Bora but accused followed the vehicle and coming on to the front of the vehicle, the accused broke the front glass of the said vehicle by hitting with a 'kooor' (spade). They snatched away the 'kooor' (spade) from her hand and went to the police station to lodge an ejahar.

14. PW-5 Dr. Kiron Ch. Chetia has stated that on 27.07.2014 at 12:50 PM he was at Nowboicha PHC as SDM & HO. On that day, he examined Md. Mofijul Islam (aged 15 years), son of Md. Habibur Islam of No. 1 Borchalla, P.S: North Lakhimpur, escorted and identified by H/G Mumu Bhuyan with history of assault at about 11:30 AM on that day. He further stated that he found swelling with abrasion over left lower part (in front). Size 2" x 1" and ½" x ½" respectively and the injury was fresh and caused by blunt object and simple in nature. Ext-3 is the injury report, Ext-3(1) is his signature. In his cross-examination, he has stated that the abrasion was on the area of swelling. Such injury may be caused by falling or dashing against hard substance.

15. PW-6 Md. Kasem Ali has stated that the occurrence took place during the rainy season and on that day he was working on the road at Gendhali whose repairing work was taken in contract by informant Tejen Borah and Tejen Borah came out from his house on his vehicle at about 12/1 in the noon. Accused hit the vehicle of Tejen Borah with a 'kooor' (spade) and as such Tejen Borah came out of his vehicle when the accused threw sand in the eyes of Tejen Borah. The accused also chased him and another labourer namely Habibur to assault them. Thereafter, Tejen Borah lodged an ejarah at the police station. He also accompanied Tejen Borah to the police Station. He took the 'kooor' (spade) used by the accused in committing the offence and police seized the same vide Ext-4 seizure list wherein Ext-4(1) is his signature.

16. PW-6 in his cross-examination, has stated that on that day he along with one Habibur had been doing the construction work and while going to the police station he took the 'kooor' (spade) there and the police seized the said 'kooor' from the hand of Habibur. He heard that the accused filed a case against Tejen Borah. They filed the case at the police station on the day of the occurrence. He used to work as a mason but on the day of the occurrence he was engaged as day labour. He is not the resident of that village and also was not a job-card holder.

17. PW-7 Md. Mohammad Ali has stated that he knows informant Tejen Borah who is a contractor of PWD road and used to work under him. He also knows the accused whose house is three houses after the house of Tejen Borah. On the day of occurrence he was doing labour work under Tejen Borah in the road of Gendhali village. A tractor was dumping soil on the road near the house of the accused but the accused objected to the unloading of soil there. Then he made a phone call to Tejen Borah and informed him that the accused was not allowing the tractor to unload the soil there. Thereafter, Tejen Borah came there by his car but when Tejen Borah got down of his vehicle, the accused threw sandy soil on his face. Thereafter, the accused got hold of a hoe lying there and hit on the front glass of the vehicle of Tejen Borah with

the said hoe. As a result, the glass of the vehicle broke. Tejen Borah went to Nowboicha Police Outpost and he also accompanied him to Nowboicha Police Outpost along with the hoe. Tejen Borah lodged a case before the police. In his cross-examination, he has stated that he was not a contractor, but he had taken the work of repairing of the road. There were 10/12 persons working as labourers. He admitted that the accused also filed a case against Tejen Borah and Gobin Borah. He acknowledged to be not a resident of that village and also had not the holder of any Job Card of that village. He also admitted that the dispute was on a Panchayat road. He admitted that a Job Card holder should do the work of the Panchayat road but all the labourers working on the road were not having any Job Card of that village.

18. PW-8 S.I. Indreswar Gogoi, Investigating Officer, has stated that during investigation he examined informant Tejen Borah and one Gobin Borah and recorded their statements. Thereafter, he went to the place of occurrence and inspected the same and prepared a sketch map of the place of occurrence. Ext-6 is the sketch map of the place of occurrence wherein Ext-6(1) is his signature. He also seized a 'koor' (spade) from the place of occurrence vide Ext-4 seizure list wherein Ext-4(2) is his signature. He also seized a Tata Indica vehicle and its documents from the place of occurrence vide Ext-2 wherein Ext-2(2) is his signature. He gave the seized Tata Indica vehicle on zimma to its registered owner. He sent the victim Mofijul Islam for his medical treatment to Nowboicha PHC. He also examined the victim and the witnesses found at and around the place of occurrence and recorded their statements. He further stated that on 23.07.2014 accused was advised to come to the police station and as such on 27.08.2014 accused Smti. Mina Dutta appeared at the Nowboicha Police Outpost and examined her and thereafter released her on bail. Thereafter, he collected the medical report of the victim. He further stated that since his preliminary investigation was over by then as such he handed over the case diary to the then O/C of the North Lakhimpur Police Station. Thereafter, SI Narayan Tamuli investigated the case and upon finding sufficient material against accused Smti. Mina Dutta charge-sheet has

been filed against her u/s 336/427/323, IPC. Ext-7 is the charge-sheet wherein Ext-7(1) is the signature of SI Narayan Tamuli with which he is familiar. He also collected the MVI report vide Ext-8.

19. In his cross-examination, PW-8 has stated that Ext-4 seizure list was prepared by him in the place of occurrence on 27.07.2014 and on that day he asked accused Mina Dutta to appear before the police outpost. The place of occurrence and the house of accused Mina Dutta are adjacent. He did not take signature of accused Mina Dutta in Ext-4. The seized spade was given to him by one Kasam Ali. By Ext-2 he seized the Tata Indica vehicle on 27.07.2014 but there is no mention of any damage or broken glass of the vehicle in Ext-2. He also did not take signature of accused Mina Dutta in Ext-2. He did not mention from whom the Tata Indica vehicle was seized. He did not seize any driving license of Tejen Borah. The seized R/C is in the name of Paban Kr. Baishya and the driving license was in the name of Pratha Pratim Borah. In Ext-6 in mark 'E' is mentioned as 'jeura' (fencing) but in the note it has mentioned that the 'jeura' had been in a broken condition because of the dashing by a vehicle. Accused Mina Dutta also lodged a case against informant Tejen Borah and Gobin Borah on the very same day of the occurrence which was registered as a cross-case of this case. Ext-A is the bail bond of accused Mina Dutta in which Ext-A(1) is his signature and Ext-A(2) is the signature of accused Mina Dutta.

20. In cross-examination PW-8, I/O has stated that Witness Gobin Borah told him that he did not see the occurrence and as such he did not tell him that he has seen the accused breaking the glass of the vehicle and throwing sand in the eyes of Tejen Borah. He has further stated that witness Hobibur Rahman told him regarding breaking of 'jeura' of the accused; and Witness Shohidul Islam did not tell him that stone was pelted to his body.

21. He has further stated that witness Mohammad Ali did not tell him that as the tractor was dumping soil, the accused objected to the

10

same and then he called Tejen Borah over phone thereafter Tejen Borah came by his vehicle.

22. The road where construction was going on is a Panchayat road but he did not verify if the labourers engaged in the road construction had valid job-card. He could not say on which date the Tata Indica vehicle was given on zimma to its registered owner.

### **APPRECIATION OF EVIDENCE**

23. The testimony of the above witnesses have perspicuously established two facts. Firstly, the accused also lodged a case against informant Tejen Bora and his brother Govinda Bora (PW-1); and secondly, the cause of the dispute is construction of road by the side of the homestead land of accused Meena Dutta. It has also an admitted fact that informant Tejen Bora was the Councilor of Gaon Panchayat at the relevant time of the occurrence and accused is a teacher in a venture school. PW-1 Gonvinda Bora is the brother of informant PW-2 Tejen Bora and PW-3 Habibur Rahman, PW-4 Sahidur Islam, PW-6 Kasem Ali and PW-7 Md. Mohammed Ali are the labourers engaged by informant Tejen Bora for the road construction work of the Gendhali Road on the relevant day of the occurrence. These preliminary introductory facts are essential for the just appreciation of evidence given the fact that accused also lodged a case against PW-2(informant) and his brother(PW-2).

24. In the instant case as per Ext.1 FIR one Md. Mofizul Islam and informant Tejen Bora sustained injuries in the occurrence. Injured Mofizul could not be traced out in course of trial and injured Tejen Bora (PW-2) himself admitted to have not taken any medical treatment by any doctor. PW-5 Dr. Kiron Ch. Chetia has averred in evidence that at 12.50 PM on 27.7.2014 upon examination of Md. Mofijul Islam who had a history of assault around 11.30 AM on that day, found abrasion over left leg lower part. According to him the injury was fresh and caused by blunt object and simple in nature. Ext.3 Injury Report certifies this fact. The History of patient contained in Ext.3 Injury Report reflects that

11

Mofijul sustained injuries on 27.7.2014 at 11.30 AM but as per evidence and Ext.1 FIR the date of occurrence was 22.7.2014. Thus, I have no doubt at all to hold that Ext.3 Injury Report of Mofijul does not justify his assault on the day of occurrence. Moreover, it is strange enough that PW-1 Govinda Bora, PW-3 Habibur Rahman, PW-6 Kasem Ali and, PW-7 Mohammed Ali stated nothing regarding infliction of injury to Mofijur Rahman by pelting stone. The non-examination of informant Tejen Bora for the injury that he sustained due to alleged throwing of sand in his eyes by accused also leaves the prosecution case in mystery.

25. Now coming on to the version of victim-cum-informant PW-2 Sri Tejen Borah. According to him at about 11:30 AM on the day of occurrence he was going to the Panchayat Office by driving his vehicle through Gendhali road and saw accused Meena Dutta had been quarreling with the labourers who had been doing the construction work of the said road. But this point of him is controverted by PW-7 Md. Mohammed Ali as he asserted that it was he who telephoned informant Tejen Bora to come to that place as accused had been allegedly remonstrated with their act of unloading soil on the road by a tractor. Thus, the purpose of coming to the place of the occurrence by informant Tejen Bora, has become hazy.

26. According to PW-2 Tejen Bora, on his arrival, he asked the accused the reason for which she was not allowing the labourers to do the road construction work but at that accused hit the front glass of his vehicle with a "kooor" and thereby damaging the glass. Then he intended to get down from his vehicle when the accused allegedly threw sand to his eyes. He took away his vehicle with the help of the labourers from that place. This view of PW-2 get the support of PW-6 Kasem Ali and PW-4 Sahidul Islam. But PW-1 Govinda Bora, PW-3 Habibur Rahman and PW-7 Mahammed Ali asserted that at first accused threw sand in the face of informant Tejen Bora and thereupon hit the glass of his vehicle. PW-1 Govinda Bora has further stated that after hitting the vehicle of his brother, accused banged her own head

12

on the vehicle but no other witnesses have vouched this fact. PW-4 Sahidul Islam while narrating the incident has stated that when they had been pushing away the vehicle of Tejen Borah, the accused had followed the vehicle and coming on the front of the vehicle had hit the glass of the vehicle. Thus, different eye-witnesses have portrayed different version of the occurrence.

27. PW-6 Kasem Ali has stated that accused also attempted to assault him and PW-3 Habibur Rahman, but the latter has not stated anything of this sort in his evidence. The fact adduced by PW-7 Mohammed Ali that accused was not allowing unloading of soil from a tractor has not been supported by any other witnesses. PW-8 I/O has stated that PW-1 Gobin Bora told him that he did not see the occurrence. No other witness have stated anything about the presence of PW-1 at the place of the occurrence, as such the evidence of PW-1 Govinda Bora is also doubtful so far as his witnessing the occurrence is concerned.

28. PW-3 Habibur Rahman has admitted in his evidence that accused was asking them not to dig earth from the place as she was claiming it to be her land, but inspite of that they carried out the digging work. PW-2 Tejen Bora has also admitted that the land which he claimed to be the land of the road was being claimed by accused as her own and the accused lodged a case against him alleging that they had damaged her boundary fencing. He has also stated that it was not his responsibility to bring the Mandal for demarcation. He in fact stated that it is not necessary to take permission while constructing road on the Myadi land of other.

29. The foregoing discussion reveals how the so called eye-witnesses i.e. the laborers of informant Tejen Bora had contradicted each other. It is an admitted fact that Tejen Bora is a member of Gaon Panchayat and his brother PW-1 Govinda Bora has narrated that people are afraid of Tejen because he always side with "Reason". Being a member of Gaon Panchayat it is no denying a fact that informant Tejen

Bora has the political clout. So far as his remaining in the side of "Reason", this myth is busted by no other person, but Tejen himself when he asserted that it is not required to take permission from the owner of the Myadi land on whose land road is constructed. It may be an ignorance of law or may be a political arrogance, because to construct a road the lands need to be acquisitioned by following due process of law. The above fact reveals that the labourers of informant had constructed the road by the side of homestead fencing of accused and she apprehended its destruction, but despite her remonstrations, the labourers did not stop themselves from digging the soil. The right of private defence of property thus comes into play in the instant scenario at the disposal of the accused. Accused is a widow and also poor, whereas informant Tejen Bora having political clout and surrounded by his employees, were causing performance of activities which was imminently dangerous for her properties, and in such scenario the state of mind of the hapless women cannot be fathomed by reason. The prosecution has failed to prove the fact of injuries to Mofizur and Tejen Bora, nor it has any proof that stone was pelted to the labourers.

30. Now let's focus on the point as to damaging of the vehicle driven by informant Tejen. The occurrence took place on 22.7.2014 but the vehicle was seized (Ext.2) on 27.7.2014, but the Driving Licence of some Partha Pratim Borah was seized and not of informant. Ext.8 MVI Report shows that the mechanical examination was done on 5.8.2014 i.e. after 14 days of the occurrence. A legitimate question now creeps up as to whether informant Tejen Bora had the skill of driving that vehicle as because police did not seize his driving licence. In Ext.8 the vehicle was found mechanically fit, but the witnesses reveal that after being allegedly hit by accused, the labourers of Tejen Bora pushed away the vehicle. So, if the vehicle was mechanically fit it did not require pushing. The Ext.2 does not show that the front glass of the vehicle was in damaged condition, but the MVI report which was done after 14 days of the occurrence shows it has a damaged windshield. The PW-8 I/O has stated that after seizing the vehicle he handed over the

14

zimma of the same to the informant on 27.7.2014 and since during this time gap between seizure and MVI examination, the vehicle was with the informant as such a grey area exist of the fact that the windshield was being damaged by accused, given the fact that the prosecution case is weak in respect knowledge of informant as to how to drive a motor-vehicle.

31. Considering the above contradictions, and lacuna in prosecution story, I am convinced of the fact that prosecution case lacks sufficient force and thus failed to build up a case beyond all reasonable doubt against accused Mina Dutta.

**ORDER**

32. In view of the discussion made above, the points for determination are decided in negative against the prosecution and as such accused Smti Meena Dutta is acquitted of the accusation under section 336/323/427 of the Indian Penal Code. She shall be set in liberty forthwith. Considering the nature of the case, the bail bond of Smti Meena Dutta shall remain in force for a further period of six months.

33. The Seized articles shall be disposed of in due course of time as per law.

34. The judgment is delivered and operative part of the same is pronounced in the open court on this 6<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2019.

**(Shri Narayan Kuri)**  
Chief Judicial Magistrate,  
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur

Dictated & corrected by me-

**(Shri Narayan Kuri)**  
Chief Judicial Magistrate,  
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur

Contd. .... Appendix

**A P P E N D I X**

**WITNESSES FROM THE PROSECUTION SIDE**

Sri Gobin Borah (PW-1)  
Sri Tejen Borah (PW-2)  
Md. Habibur Rahman (PW-3)  
Md. Sahidul Islam (PW-4)  
Dr. Kiron Ch. Chetia (PW-5)  
Md. Kasem Ali (PW-6)  
Md. Mohammad Ali (PW-7)  
SI Indreswar Gogoi (PW-8)

**PROSECUTION EXHIBITS**

Ejhar (Ext-1)  
Seizure list (Ext-2)  
Medical Report (PW-3)  
Seizure list (Ext-4)  
Extract Copy of G.D. Entry (Ext-5)  
Rough sketch map (Ext-6)  
Charge-sheet (Ext-7)  
MVI Report (Ext-8)

**WITNESSES FROM THE DEFENCE SIDE**

Nil

**DEFENCE EXHIBITS**

Bail Bond of accused (Ext-A)

**(Shri Narayan Kuri)**  
Chief Judicial Magistrate,  
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur

Transcribed & types by-  
Sri Narayan Chetri, Stenographer