

IN THE COURT OF THE 1ST ADDL. DISTRICT &
SESSIONS JUDGE-CUM-SPECIAL JUDGE(VIGILANCE),
BHUBANESWAR.

P R E S E N T : Shri N.Sahu, LL.B.,
1st Addl. District & Sessions Judge-cum-
Special
Judge(Vigilance),Bhubaneswar.

S.T.No.19/138 of 2003

(Arising out of G.R.Case No.504 of 2001
corresponding to Nayapalli P.S.Case No.
35(17), dt.13.2.2001).

S T A T E
Prosecution.

-Versus-

1. Kabuli @ Pratap Sahu, aged 20 years,
S/o.Jogendra Sahu, Vill-Balipahad,
PO-Balabhadrapur, PS-Baideswar,
Dist.-Cuttack, A/P- Nilachadranagar,
Salia Sahi, PS-Nayapalli, Bhubaneswar,
Dist.Khurda.
2. Sankar Rajabhar, aged 21 years,
S/o.Ramapyari Rajabhar,Vill-Bharolia,
PO-Nagarbazar, Dist.-Basti (U.P.),
A/P- Nilachadranagar, Salia Sahi,
PS-Nayapalli, Bhubaneswar, Dist.Khurda.

..... Accused
persons.

For the Prosecution : Sri S.K.Barik,
Addl.P.P.

For accused Kabuli @ : Sri P.K.Mohanty &
Pratap Sahu Associates,Advocates.

For accused Shankar Rajbhar : Sri
R.N.Mishra,Advocate.

Date of argument : 24.1.2014.

Date of judgment : 3.2.2014.

Offence u/s.302/34 I.P.C.

J U D G M E N T

1. The aforesaid accused persons stood charge for committing the offence punishable u/s.302/34 I.P.C.

2. Briefly stated the prosecution case is that the deceased son of the informant cutting relationship with his parents, had kept one Sumitra(abandoned by earlier her husband) and they were staying in Sumitra's parents' house at May Fair Basti. On 7.2.2001 accused- Kabuli and Chagali pelted brick bats to their house, so they came and stayed at Mahaveer Nagar. On 8.2.2001 and 9.2.2001 there were some quarrel between the deceased and Kabuli and Chagali. On 13.2.2001 when the deceased was in his parental house, accused-Kabuli, Chagali with their 3 to 4 friends came there and dragged him towards the beetle shop of one Karuna Naik. Accused-Chagali brought out one Bhujali and gave a blow on the left side waist of the deceased and others pinned him on the ground and pounced upon him and Chagali gave repeated blows on the head and body of the deceased causing profuse bleeding and he got senseless and the accused persons left him saying that he was dead. The middle son of the informant namely, Chandrakanta

with one Amar brought one auto and took the deceased to Capital Hospital where he was declared dead. Basing on the report of the informant a case u/s.302/34 IPC was registered and after completion of investigation, chargesheet was submitted against these two accused persons and one Bapi @ Srinibas, Chagali @ Tapan Parida and Tikila @ Rajan. But the case against 3 other accused persons was splitted up and the present accused persons were committed to the Court of Sessions and the present judgment is meant for them only.

3. Defence plea is one of complete denial and false implications.

4. Prosecution has examined 19 witnesses whereas 2 witnesses have been examined on behalf of accused-Kabuli.

5. The point for determination is whether on 13.2.2001 at about 7.30 P.M. at Salia Sahi the accused persons in furtherance of their common intention committed murder of the deceased ?

6. PW-15 the doctor who conducted P.M. Examination of the deadbody of the deceased stated that he found several cut injuries on occiput back of the scalp, posterior lateral right side aspect of the neck, left wrist and both knees and thigh. The doctor opined that all the cut injuries are anti mortem in nature and caused by cutting weapon and the cause of death was due to haemorrhage and shock resulting from the above injuries. He further opined that the cut injuries on the posterior lateral right side aspect of the neck are sufficient to cause death in ordinary course. He proved his P.M.Examination Report, vide, Ext.7. Nothing substantial was

elicited in his cross-examination to discard his testimony. From the evidence of the doctor, it is crystal clear that the death of the deceased was homicidal in nature. Then arises the question as to who is the author of the crime.

7. PW-4-Ramesh Pratap stated that he does not know the accused persons, but in one night at about 8 PM when he returned from work, police called him and took to Nayapalli Police Station and on the next day morning being asked by police he collected blood stained earth from the road in front of his house in a polythene bag and signed on a paper vide Ext.2. In the cross-examination he stated that the house of Karuna Naik is in front of his house on the other side of the road and there are many houses all round their houses.

PW-5 Madan Mohan Patra and PW-10 Basanti Biswal stated that they do not know anything about this case. PW-13 Shanti Nayak stated that she heard that the deceased is dead, but she cannot say how he died and PW-14 Kedar Nath Mishra stated that he does not know anything about this case. PW-16 Jitendra Jena only stated that he knows the accused persons and besides this, he does not know anything. All these witnesses-PWs-5, 10, 13, 14 and 16 were declared hostile by the prosecution, but nothing substantial was elicited from their evidence to implicate the accused persons with the alleged offence.

8. PW-7 Padmavati Sahoo stated that the deceased Chakara had married her daughter about 3 months before his death, but she does not know the cause of death of her son-in-law nor she had seen his deadbody, but she heard from her

daughter that he died. PW-9 Satyaban Paikaray stated that he does not know anything about this case. He further stated that nothing was seized in his presence though he had put his signature in the seizure list vide Ext.4 being asked by police. PW-11 Manoranjan Das, the Scientific Officer stated that on 14.2.2001 being identified by the I.O., he collected blood stained earth and sample earth from the spot and handed over the same to the I.O. and prepared a report vide Ext.5. PW-17- Dillip Kumar Mohanty- an Inspector of Police stated that on 13.7.2001 he took charge of the investigation from PW-19 and on 20.7.2001 he sent the wearing apparels of the accused Kabuli and blood stained earth and sample earth to SFSL, Rasulgarh and submitted chargesheet against the accused persons. He proved the C.E. Report, vide Ext.8. PW-18- Surendra Nath Sethi- a Constable of Nayapalli P.S. stated that on 13.2.2001 he had guarded the spot in that night and from the spot he heard about murder of the deceased, but he cannot say about the cause of death.

9 PW-3-Pravakar Baral, a cousin of the deceased stated that in one night at about 10 PM, he with his brother- Dhaneswar and father came to Bhubaneswar and first went to Capital Hospital and then to the house of the deceased, but could not find anybody there. In the morning they reached at Nayapalli Police Station and found the parents of the deceased and others there. Along with the police he came to Capital Hospital and police prepared inquest report vide Ext.1 in his presence. During cross-examination he stated that he had met PW-2 in the morning at about 5 A.M. in Nayapalli P.S. before

he proceeded to hospital with police but no document was being prepared. He further stated that he was not examined by police regarding the death of the deceased.

10. PW-6 Abadhuta Swain stated that he is the Secretary of Nilachakra Nagar, Salia Sahi. In one evening at around 7 to 8 P.M. he heard commotion about 600 cubits from his house and ran there and found the deceased-Chakara was being assaulted by 5 persons at about 200 cubits from his parental house with weapons like Lathi and Khanda. When they rushed there, the assailants fled away, but he could not identify any of the assailants. He found there was profuse bleeding from the head, back and other parts of the body of the accused. As the Secretary of the Sahi, he made arrangements for shifting of the deceased to hospital. On the next day at about 10 A.M. being called by police, he went to Nayapalli P.S. where police examined him and asked him to put his signature on a blank white paper on which they would write subsequently. He proved his signature vide Ext.3.

During cross-examination he specifically stated that these two accused persons to whom he knew since long, were not among the assailants. PW-6 also stated that the mother of the deceased had not gone to the spot till Chakara (deceased) was shifted to hospital. Moreover, he stated that the mother of the deceased is a daily wage earner and maid servant and maid servants like mother of the deceased leave home early in morning and return at noon and then again leave home at about 3 P.M. and return late in the evening around 8 or 9 P.M.

PW-8-Raj Kishore Samantaray stated that in one evening at 6.30 PM, hearing the commotion he rushed to the spot and found some persons were running away and he ascertained from nearby persons that some body was murdered, but he did not go near them. In cross-examination, he stated that he could not identify anybody from among the persons who were running away. He categorically stated that accused Kabuli was not among them. Moreover, he stated that he found a middle aged woman aged about 40 to 50 years was shouting that her son was killed and he saw that woman crying about 15 to 20 feet away from the spot where there was a gathering and that the woman was running to the place of gathering from the opposite direction of the persons fleeing away. PW-12-Sarat Chandra Sahu (Havildar of Nayapalli P.S.) stated about the inquest and post mortem of the deadbody and also stated that after post mortem he brought the pant, shirt, one finger ring and one silver chain of the deceased and produced the same at the police station and the same were seized under Ext.6. In cross-examination he stated that none was with him when he signed on the seizure list.

11. PW-1-Jayram Baral(father of the deceased) stated that the deceased had kept one husband-abandoned lady namely, Sumitra and prior to 10-12 days of his death, there were living at May Fair Basti and one day his wife told him that the accused persons with Chagali had thrown brick bats to their house. PW-1 stated that 13th instant was Tuesday and he returned home from his village at about 9 PM and took rest in a Matha. One Magi Patra(not examined) informed him that at

about 7 PM that his son was murdered in front of his rented house belonging to Tunia Naik and he found a police van and presence of some police personnel in front of house of Tunia Naik. As he was informed that his deceased son was taken to hospital, he went there and got intimation that his son was dead. In his cross-examination, he stated that at about 9.30 PM he reached at Capital Hospital, but did not find his wife or the younger son Chittaranjan. At about 10 PM he came to Nayapalli Police Station and found his wife and Chittaranjan there and they told him in the police station that they had not been examined by police nor they told anything to police. He also stated that after coming to his house from the Matha, he did not go near the house of Tunia nor did he see the place where the deceased was murdered which is quite abnormal. He stated that he was suffering T.B. and Asthma and was unable to do any physical labour and his wife(PW-2) was working as maid servant in different houses and leaves his house daily from early in the morning and returns at 9 AM and again leaves the house at 3 PM and returns at 9 to 10 PM and on the date of occurrence she had attended her work as usual.

12. PW-2-Tuni Baral-informant(mother of the deceased) stated that her son was staying separately at Nirankar Sahi along with his kept-Sumitra and once he came to her house and told that the accused Kabuli, Chagali and 4 to 5 others pelted brick bats to his house and the deceased took the house of Tunia Naik on rent and was staying there. On 9th instant one Guna Swain, friend of the deceased came to her and told that accused Kabuli and his associates were

assaulting the deceased and she sent her eldest son Amar and Guna to bring him back. Both Guna Swain and Amar have not been examined.

On 13th instant i.e. the date of occurrence while the deceased was standing in front of her house, accused Kabuli and Chagali came and each caught hold the hands of the deceased, dragged him near a Chaura, but she tried to pull her deceased son backwards holding his hand and requesting the accused persons not to assault the deceased. From the Chaura 5 other persons joined with them and dragged the deceased to a stoney place near the betel shop of Karuna Naik but due to darkness she could not identify the associates of accused Kabuli and Chagali. She further stated that the deceased was pinned down to the ground and accused persons assaulted him. Chagali brought out a Bhujali from his waist and gave a blow on the left hand of the deceased almost severing his left wrist and then he gave two blows with Bhujali on the neck of the deceased and there was profuse bleeding from the wounds. Her son Amar and Chandrakanta took the deceased in an auto-rickshaw to the hospital believing his life might be saved. She went running to Nayapalli P.S. and told the inspector that accused Kabuli, Chagali and 4 to 5 others had killed her son near the shop of Karuna and his deadbody was lying there. Immediately police proceeded to the spot in a jeep and she remained in the police station. At about 9 PM police returned to the police station and told her to give a written report. She cried and requested a person near the police station to write a report and on her narration of events he

scribed the report and after he read it over to her, she put her LTI.

In the cross-examination, she stated that regarding the previous incident involving the deceased and the accused persons she reported in the police station, but police did not come for investigation or enquiry. But no such report of the informant regarding the previous incident has been proved. PW-2 further stated that Sumitra (kept of the deceased) had immoral relationship with many persons and the suitors of Sumitra became enemy of the deceased. She also stated that at about 8 PM deceased was taken to hospital in an auto and at about 9 PM her sons returned from the hospital and informed her when she was in the police station that the deceased died. It may be mentioned here that neither the auto driver nor the son of PW-2 namely, Amar and Chandrakanta have been examined. It is difficult to believe that a mother in such a situation would rush to the police station instead of accompanying her son to the hospital particularly when she believed that his life might be saved. That apart, if she had directly rushed to the police station and informed the police that her son was killed, then her version could have been recorded as FIR. But she stated that police proceeded in a jeep to the spot and she remained in the police station and at about 9 PM police returned to the police station and told her to give a written report. Here also, her conduct is against normal course of human conduct. In the given circumstances she must have accompanied with the police to the spot.

Moreover, PW-19 (I.O.) stated that at about 9 PM the then IIC of Nayapalli P.S. reduced the oral complaint of the informant into writing and registered the case and directed him to take up investigation, but the informant herself stated that she requested a person near the Police Station to scribe a report for her and he scribed the report on her narration and read over that report to her and she put her LTI. No scribe has been examined in this case. The then IIC of Nayapalli P.S. has not been examined. The FIR has not been proved in this case. It may be reiterated here that as stated by PW-1, he came to Nayapalli P.S. at about 10 PM and there he found his wife and son Chittaranjan and they told him that till then they had not told anything to police nor police had asked them. So, the version of PWs-1, 2 and 19 read together coupled with the fact of non-examination of the then IIC and the scribe of the FIR creates doubt about the origin, scribing and time of lodging the FIR. PW-2 also stated that while she was crying near the body of her son, wife of Tunia (PW-13), one Ramesh and one person called "Master" came there but she did not talk with them. PWs-4 and 13 have not stated that they had come to the spot while PW-2 was crying near the body of her son. That other person "Master" has not been examined. Above all, the conduct of PW-2 that she did not talk with those persons is also abnormal. In usual course, she must have told them as to what had happened there. On a combined reading of such evidence, the testimony of PW-2 does not inspire confidence.

13. PW-19- Kishore Chandra Patsani (I.O.) stated that being directed by the IIC, he took up investigation, examined the informant and witnesses, visited the spot, prepared the spot map vide Ext.10, held inquest over the deadbody vide Ext.1, seized the blood stained earth and sample earth collected by the S.O. and one white colour printed saree, one Khaki colour full pant, one red colour full shirt on production by the informant. He also stated that he seized blood stained ash colour full pant, one blood stained green check full shirt, one silver chain and one silver ring on production by Havildar and prepared seizure list vide Ext.6 and left the seized chain and ring in zima vide Ext.12 and received P.M.Examination Report vide Ext.7.

PW-19 also stated that while in police custody, accused Kabuli @ Pratap confessed to have caused the death of the deceased by means of iron pipe along with other co-accused persons who were holding swords and other weapons and so saying he led the police party along with the witnesses to Nilakanthanagar, Salia Sahi where from a black colour iron pipe was seized which was kept concealed inside the thatches of the roof. He proved the statement of the accused vide Ext.13 and the seizure list in respect of iron pipe vide Ext.4.

In the cross-examination, he stated that he apprehended accused Kabuli on 25.3.2001 at about 7 AM. More specifically at para-7 of his cross-examination, the I.O. stated that first the accused made confession during interrogation and thereafter he called the witnesses namely, Satyabadi Paikaray and Abadhuta Swain. PW-19 also stated

that though accused Kabuli told to have taken the iron pipe with him, but he had not used that iron pipe in the commission of the crime.

14. Prosecution has mainly relied on the evidence of PW-1, PW-2, PW-15, PW-19 and the statement of accused Kabuli vide Ext.13, so also the recovery under Ext.4. The learned counsel for accused Kabuli during course of argument submitted that evidence of PW-2 to whom prosecution has projected as the only eye witness, is not trustworthy and should be discarded, so also, there has been no blood grouping of the accused Kabuli and the M.Os. have not been produced before the Court and above all, the so called recovery in pursuance to the alleged statement vide Ext.13 cannot be accepted. He placed reliance on a decision reported in **1981 CLR 80 Ramanath Dash-Vrs.-State of Orissa** and submitted that when the defence case finds support from the evidence of some of the prosecution witnesses, the plea of the accused is acceptable. Here, in the instant case, PW-6 in his cross-examination stated that the present accused persons-Kabuli and Shankar were not among the assailants. So also, he stated that the mother of the deceased (PW-2) had not gone to the spot till the deceased was shifted to the hospital. Likewise, PW-8 in his cross-examination stated that the middle age woman aged about 40 to 50 years was shouting that her son was killed and also stated that in his estimation that woman might not have seen the assailants as she was running to the place of gathering from the opposite direction of the persons feeling away. PW-8 has also categorically stated that Kabuli

was not among them. These two witnesses were not even declared hostile by the prosecution. They have denied the presence of the accused Kabuli near the spot during the time of occurrence, so also, they denied the presence of the informant at the spot by the time of occurrence.

Adding to this, DW-1- Pradip Kumar Mishra stated that the informant was working as part time maid servant in his house and in one evening a boy came and told that somebody has killed her son and immediately she left his house and he(DW-1) followed her. They went to the spot and found there was a gathering and deceased was loaded in a trolley and PW-6 with others were taking the deceased to hospital. Likewise, DW-2-Gadadhar Sahu stated that one day at about 7 to 7.30 PM hearing shouts from the side of the house of the informant, he rushed to the spot and found a gathering near the house of the informant and also found that the deceased was lying with cut injuries on his body and PW-6 called a trolley and took the deceased to hospital. By that time PW-2 came running to the spot shouting "MO PILAKU KIA MARILA". Nothing substantial was elicited from the cross-examination of these two witnesses to discard their testimony. It may be reiterated here that PW-1 the husband of the informant testified that PW-2 was working as maid servant and leaving their house daily in between early morning to 9 AM and 3 PM to 9 to 10 PM and on the date of occurrence she had attended her work as usual. A combined reading of such evidence of PWs.1, 6, 8 and DWs-1 and 2 creates doubt about presence of PW-2 during the time of occurrence and witnessing the assault on

her deceased son. Besides this, the unusual conduct of the informant and the contradictory version of PWs-1, 2 and 19 as discussed above, are additional factors which renders the testimony of PW-2 doubtful and the same does not inspire confidence.

15. The learned defence counsel further placing reliance on a decision reported in **(1992) 5 OCR 295, Sesadev Mallick, Bhagaban Das and others-Vrs.-State of Orissa** submitted that Exts.4 and 13 should be discarded and even if the same is accepted for the sake of argument, that would not be sufficient to warrant a conviction in absence of other substantive evidence. The I.O.(PW-19) stated that first the accused made confession during interrogation and thereafter he called the witnesses. The signatures of Pws-6 and 9 find place on reverse page of the statement of accused recorded u/s.27 Evidence Act, vide Ext.13. But, both of them have not stated anything regarding any statement made by Kabuli while in police custody or regarding seizure of any pipe and T.Shirt (Ext.4). It is more surprising that in Ext.4 itself, there is mention that the witnesses to the seizure brought out the articles and then the same were seized. But PWs-6 and 9 have not stated so. Another significant factor is that the so called statement u/s.27 of the Evidence Act was recorded on 23.3.2001, but the I.O. in his cross-examination stated that he apprehended the accused Kabuli on 25.3.2001 at 7 AM. Such version of the I.O. creates a doubt if accused Kabuli in fact had given any statement before him on 23.3.2001 while in police custody. More so over, the I.O. in his evidence stated that the accused

Kabuli had not used that iron pipe in commission of the crime. None of the witnesses including the informant has stated that accused Kabuli was holding an iron pipe or was putting on a T.Shirt by the time of alleged occurrence. These factors taken together create a doubt regarding the seizure in pursuance to the statement of the accused Kabuli u/s.27 of Evidence Act.

16. The learned A.P.P. during course of argument placing reliance on a decision reported in **90(2000) CLT 62, Dinabandhu Sahu and another-Vrs.-State of Orissa** submitted that when blood found on the seized T.shirt tallied with the blood group of the deceased, non-examination of blood group of the accused is not fatal to the prosecution case. The learned A.P.P. Further placed reliance on a decision reported in **2004(1) Crimes 165 (SC), State of Rajasthan-Vrs.-Dhool Singh** and submitted that non-production of the seized articles are not helpful to the accused. With profound respect to the above authorities I found that the facts of the aforesaid cases are quite distinguishable from the facts of the present case. Here, the evidence of PWs-6 and 9 vis-a-vis the evidence of the I.O. as discussed above makes the recovery suspicious. More so over, when PWs-6 and 9 have not been declared hostile by the prosecution, the seizure itself is not free from doubt and coupled with the same, none of the witnesses has stated that this accused was wearing that T.Shirt or holding that iron pipe by the time of occurrence. So, the cited decisions are no way helpful to the prosecution.

17. As discussed earlier, several discrepancies and shortcomings in the evidence of PW-2 renders her testimony

incredible particularly when PWs-6 and 8 and DWs-1 and 2 categorically negative her presence by the time of occurrence. Adding to this, the version of PWs-6 and 8 that the accused Kabuli was not present by the time of occurrence casts cloud on the prosecution case. None of the witnesses has whispered anything to implicate the accused Shankar Rajbhar. Material discrepancies in the version of the Pws as discussed above creates doubt about the FIR, so also, about the alleged recovery at the instance of accused Kabuli. Non-examination of material witnesses as discussed above is an additional factor affecting the bonafides of the prosecution case. Therefore, after analyzing the evidence on record and for the reasons discussed above, I am inclined to hold that the prosecution has not been able to prove its case u/s.302/34 IPC against the aforesaid two accused persons beyond all reasonable doubt and the benefit of such doubt should be extended in their favour.

In the result, the accused persons are found not guilty of the offence u/s.302/34 IPC and acquitted u/s.235(1) of Cr.P.C. The bail bond of accused Kabuli @ Pratap Sahu be cancelled and sureties discharged. Accused Shankar Rajbhar who is in custody be set at liberty forthwith, if not wanted in any other case.

1st Addl. District & Sessions Judge-cum-
Special
Judge(Vigilance),Bhubaneswar.

The judgment having been typed to my dictation and corrected by me and being sealed and signed by me is pronounced in the open court today this the 3rd day of February, 2014.

1st Addl. District & Sessions Judge-cum-
Special
Judge(Vigilance),Bhubaneswar.

List of witnesses examined for the prosecution :

P.W.1	Jayaram Baral.
P.W.2	Tuni Baral.
P.W.3	Pravakar Baral.
P.W.4	Ramesh Pratap.
P.W.5	Madan Mohan Patro.
P.W.6	Abadhuta Swain.
P.W.7	Padmavati Sahoo.
P.W.8	Rajkishore Samantaray.
P.W.9	Satyaban Paikaray.
P.W.10	Basanti Biswal.
P.W.11	Manoranjan Das.
P.W.12	Sarat Chandra Sahoo.
P.W.13	Smt.Santi Nayak.
P.W.14	Kedar Nath Mishra.
P.W.15	Dr. Benudhar Satpathy.
P.W.16	Jitendra Jena.
P.W.17	Dillip Kumar Mohanty.
P.W.18	Surendra Nath Sethy.
P.W.19	Kishore Chandra Patsani.

List of witnesses examined for the defence (accused Kabuli) :-

D.W.1	Pradipta Ku. Mishra.
D.W.2	Gadadhar Sahu.

List of exhibits marked for the prosecution :-

Ext.1	Inquest Report.
Ext.1/1	Signature of PW-3 in Ext.1.
Ext.2	Signature of PW-4 in seizure list.
Ext.3	Signature of PW-6 in seizure list.
Ext.4	Seizure list,dt.23.3.2001.

Ext.4/1	Signature of PW-9 in Ext.4.
Ext.5	Report of PW-11.
Ext.5/1	Signature of PW-11 in Ext.5.
Ext.6	Seizure list.
Ext.6/1	Signature of PW-12 in Ext.6.
Ext.7	Post-mortem report.
Ext.7/1	Signature of PW-15 in Ext.7.
Ext.7/2	Signature of CMO on Ext.7.
Ext.8	C.E.Report.
Ext.9	Command Certificate.
Ext.10	Spot Map.
Ext.10/1	Signature of PW-19 in Ext.10.
Ext.1/2	Signature of PW-19 on Ext.1.
Ext.11	Deadbody Challan.
Ext.11/1	Signature of PW-19 on Ext.11.
Ext.3/2	Signature of PW-19 on Ext.3.
Ext.2/2	Signature of PW-19 on Ext.2
Ext.6/2	Signature of PW-19 on Ext.6
Ext.12	Zimanama.
Ext.12/1	Signature of PW-19 on Ext.12.
Ext.13	Statement of the accused P.Sahu.
Ext.13/1	Signature of the accused P.Sahu on Ext.13.
Ext.13/2	Signature of PW-19 on Ext.13.
Ext.4/2	Signature of PW-19 on Ext.4.

List of exhibits marked for the defence :-

Nil.

List of M.Os. marked for the prosecution :-

Nil.

List of M.Os. marked for the defence :-

Nil.

1st Addl. District & Sessions Judge cum-
Special Judge(Vigilance),Bhubaneswar.

