

IN THE COURT OF THE ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE,
BHUBANESWAR.

Present:-

Shri M. K. Mishra, LL. B,
Addl. Sessions Judge, Bhubaneswar.

CRIMINAL TRIAL NO.54/254 OF 2013

(Arising out of Bhubaneswar Mahila P.S. Case
No.82/2013, corresponding to C.T. case
No.1577/ 2013,committed by the
SDJM,Bhubaneswar)

Date of argument- 12.08. 2014

Date of Judgment- 16.08. 2014

- S t a t e -

- V e r s u s -

Raja @ Dolagobinda Dash, aged about 27 years,
S/o: Laxmi Narayan Dash of village: Kusupur,
PO/PS: Gop, Dist: Puri, At present: Saranapalli,
Mayfarae road, Salia Sahi Basti, P.S. Nayapalli,
UPD, Bhubaneswar, Dist: Khurda.

.....Accused.

Counsel for the prosecution : Sri R.R. Brahma, Addl. P. P

Counsels for the defence : Sri Dukhishyam Das and his
assts.

Offence U/ss.: 376(1)/377/506 of IPC.

J U D G M E N T

The accused of this case namely: Raja @ Dolagobinda Dash is facing his trial being charged U/s. 376(1) of the Indian Penal Code (The Criminal Law Amendment Act, 2013) and U/s.506 of Indian Penal Code and U/s.377 of Indian Penal Code (hereinafter referred as IPC).

2. The case of the prosecution in short is that the mother of the victim lady had lodged a written report before the IIC, Mahila P.S, Bhubaneswar on dtd. 26.4.2013 to the effect that on 20.4.2013 before early morning at about 4 AM her eldest daughter who is the victim lady of this case had come outside of the house in order to urinate. The accused who happens to be the immediate neighbour of the victim lady had called the victim lady and brought her to

nearby latrine and committed rape and indecent act on her. He also threatened her not to disclose the matter to anybody, or else she would be killed. Since the victim lady was indisposed of for which the FIR could not be lodged promptly. Basing on the FIR Bhubaneswar Mahila P. S. Case No-82 dtd.26.4.2013 was registered U/s.376/506 I.P.C and investigation of the case was taken up. During course of investigation, the IO had visited the spot, examined the witnesses, seized the wearing apparels of the victim lady and sent the victim to medical for her medical examination on requisition, received the medical examination report, arrested the accused and sent him to Medical for his medical examination, seized the wearing apparels of the accused, seized the handicapped certificate of the victim lady, prepared the seizure list and left the same in zima on execution of zimanama, forwarded the accused to the court, seized the pubic hair and sample semen of the accused and sent the same to the laboratory for chemical examination. He also seized the medical documents and the prescription in respect of the ossification test of the victim girl and the diagnostic report and

prepared the seizure list. The spot was visited by the police forensic staff and the spot verification report was prepared. On completion of investigation and after observing the formalities, she had submitted the Charge sheet against the accused U/s.376 and Section 506 of I.P.C. However, on hearing in the matter of charge, the accused was further charged in the court U/s.376(1) I.P.C.(Criminal Law Amendment Act, 2013) and U/s.506 of I.P.C vide order dtd. Passed on 5.11.2013. Later on the charge was altered, and accordingly the accused was further charged U/s.377 of I.P.C on dtd. 22.7.2014. Hence, this case.

3. Plea of the accused is that of complete denial of prosecution story.

4) Considering the rival contention of the parties the points for determination in this case are:

i) Whether on dtd.20.4.2013 at about 4 AM at Saranapalli area, at a little distance from the house of the complainant, the accused had committed rape of the victim lady inside a nearby toilet without her consent?

ii) Whether on the same date, time and place the accused had threatened the victim lady to commit her murder in case of her disclosure to anybody causing alarm to her ?

iii) Whether on the same date, time and place the the present accused had committed carnal intercourse against the order of nature in respect of the victim lady?

5. In order to prove it's case, prosecution has examined as many as 17 nos. of witnesses. Out of whom, the P.W.1 is the victim lady, the P.W.2 is the son-in-law of the informant, the P.W.3 is the younger-sister of the victim lady and the wife of the P.W.2, the P.W.4 is the father of the victim lady, the P.W.5, P.W.6, P.W.7 and P.W.8 are the nearby persons. The P.W.9 is the informant herself, the P.W.10 is the another person having his house in the case locality, the P.W.11 is the tenant of the informant, the P.W.12 and the P.W.13 are the lady police constables who are the witnesses to the seizure, the P.W.14 is a lady doctor who had examined the victim lady on police requisition, P.W.15 is the Laboratory Assistant - cum Scientific Officer, DFSL, Bhubaneswar who made the spot visit

along with the IO, the P.W.17 is the IO of this case. But no oral or documentary evidence is adduced by the accused. Ext.1 to Ext.22/1 are marked on behalf of the prosecution. No MO has been marked on behalf of the prosecution or on behalf of the defence.

6. The evidence of the informant indicates that at the relevant time of occurrence at about 04 AM while she had gone out of her house to ease herself, on seeing her the accused had dragged her on a pretext of showing a material and he brought her inside a latrine room located at 10 minutes distance from her house. After her arrival in the latrine, the accused directed her to remove her wearing apparels which she refused. Thereafter, the accused had forcibly removed her wearing chadi and molested her breast using both of his hand and inserted his penis into her anus. Then the accused fled away from the latrine after performing the aforesaid act. Her sister(P.W.3) and P.W.2 her husband and her parents came in search of her. It was early morning. She had informed the matter to her mother and the matter was informed to her sister by her mother and also to her father. Thereafter, they

departed from the spot. She was examined by the police after the matter was informed to police. Some leading questions were put to P.W.1 U/s.154 of Indian Evidence Act. She has admitted regarding the indecent act committed by the accused. She has categorically stated that the accused had sodomized her and that while she protested the act of the accused, he directed her to keep quiet. On her further protest, the accused threatened her to assault if she would move aside or raise hullah. Out of fear, she kept quiet and that the accused had committed the alleged crime for which, she wept. She stated to inform the matter in her house. But the accused then threatened her to kill, if the matter was informed to any other person. The victim lady was voluntarily cross-examined on behalf of the accused. She has categorically deposed that the accused had caught hold of her and dragged to the spot. At that time she was near the entrance of her house. Although, she raised hullah, the accused managed to take her away by dragging her hand. She has categorically deposed during her cross-examination that both of them were present in the spot latrine for about 5- 10 minutes. She

has further deposed that the accused had departed from the spot and thereafter she herself departed, and on her way she found her parents and sister who were in search of her. In Paragraph-11 of her cross-examination she has categorically deposed to have informed the matter to them.

7) The P.W.2, P.W.3, P.W.4 have all reiterated the same fact, and given corroboration to the evidence of P.W.1, by stating that on the occurrence date and time, the victim lady had gone outside for the purpose of easing herself, and did not return. The matter was informed to P.W.2 over phone by P.W.4, and on whose request the P.W.2 and the P.W.3 came to the house of the informant. There she was informed regarding the manner of missing of the victim lady. They have all stated that they went in search of the victim lady, and they went to bari side. But they did not locate her. Thereafter, they proceeded of 200 meter from the house of the informant and found that the accused was running from a narrow lane. After the departure of the accused they found the victim lady was coming through that lane. They ascertained from the victim lady about her

missing, who informed them regarding the alleged act of the accused. All these witnesses were also subjected to volley of questions during their cross-examination by the Ld. Defence counsel. But they have all consistently stated and corroborated the version of the P.W.1.

The other important witness is the P.W.9 who is the mother of the victim lady and the informant of this case. According to her she has also reiterated the aforesaid act of the accused and regarding the missing of the victim lady and regarding the search undertaken by them to trace her out, and regarding finding the accused coming through a narrow lane and thereafter they found the victim lady. Being the mother, she ascertained from the victim lady regarding her presence in that place. The victim lady had categorically informed in details regarding the aforesaid act of the accused, and how the accused brought her to a nearby latrine. She has further stated that on their return, they found the mother of the accused who was plucking flowers . They had informed the matter to her. Thereafter, they went to the house of the accused where the

accused was confronted and challenged by her to have committed the aforesaid act. Initially the accused had refused to have committed such act. But later on he admitted his guilt. Then as per the request of other gentries, who promised to take appropriate action against the accused and requested the family members of the victim not to inform the matter to police, the informant waited for some days. A meeting was held where the accused had admitted his guilt in writing. But as no action was taken, for that the informant had lodged a written report before the IIC, Mahila P.S., Bhubaneswar on dtd. 26.4.2013, basing on which the case was registered. It is also coming from the mouth of the informant that police had seized the wearing chaddi of the victim lady. Her cross-examination indicates that the aforesaid chadi of the victim was washed. However, the evidence of the P.W.1 indicates that the accused had inserted his penis into her anus, and sodomized her. In the other hand, the family members of the victim lady including the informant have not stated if the accused had inserted his penis into the anus of the victim lady. However, the tenant of the informant

namely: Kishore Ku. Satpathy has deposed that on the relevant date and time, while he got up from his bed, he heard some commotion outside of his house, and thereafter, he came to know about the occurrence from his wife. In Paragraph-2 of his examination-in-chief, he has categorically stated that the victim girl was continuously stating that the accused Raja had committed indecent act on her, and she was sodomized by the accused. He has also stated that a meeting was held in the village relating to the occurrence but he had not gone to that meeting.

8) The P.W.5, the P.W.6, the P.W.7, the P.W.8, the P.W.10 who are the independent witnesses and who belong to the case locality, and most of them were the local gentries who were present at the meeting place to solve the matter have not supported the case of the prosecution. They have corroborated the evidence of the informant and her family members who had deposed in this case.

9) The P.W.12 is the Police constable who stated regarding the seizure of the sample semen, the pubic hair and the wearing apparels of the accused. Similarly, P.W.13 has stated to have

accompanied the the victim lady to Capital Hospital for her medical examination where her pathological test was conducted, and regarding the seizure of the wearing apparels of the victim lady and the accused.

10) The P.W.14 is the Medical Officer, who has medically examined the victim lady, and opined that the general mental condition of the patient was subnormal, and there was history of epilepsy, and the aforesaid patient was responding the question very slowly. She has obtained the sample vaginal swab. She has further deposed that there was no bodily injury suggesting forcible intercourse, nor she found any such proof in respect of clothing suggesting sexual intercourse, for which she issued her report under Ext.4. The cross-examination of the P.W.14 indicates that the victim lady was not lunatic. But her I.Q was subnormal.

11) The P.W.15 is the Laboratory Assistant-cum-Scientific Officer who had visited the spot alongwith Scientific Team acting on police requisition has opined that the spot was used as a latrine and located at a at a distance of 250 meters apart from the house of the

victim. The aforesaid latrine was of size 6.3 inch X 4 ft.

12) The P.W.16 who is the Medical Officer who medically examined the accused on police requisition has found no external injury on his person. He has not found any injury on the penis at the scotrom. He has deposed that the accused had taken his bath, and used toilet in between 24.4.2013 till the date of medical examination. He did not find any sign of re cent sexual intercourse.

13) The P.W.17 is the Investigating Officer, who had deposed to have investigated the case after registration of the FIR. According to her, she had visited the spot, examined the witnesses, made seizure of the wearing articles including the wearing apparels of the accused and that of the victim, and issued injury requisition for medical examination of the accused and the victim lady, and received the medical examination report, issued requisition for the visit of the spot by the police scientific team, and sent the incriminating articles for chemical examination through the process of the court, and received the opinion of the Medical Officer in respect of the victim lady and the accused, arrested the accused

and forwarded to the court and recorded the statement of the victim and other witnesses U/s.161 Cr.P.C, and after gathering the evidence and after observing legal formalities submitted Charge-sheet in the case against the accused.

14) This being the subject matter of the case, keeping the aforesaid evidence in mind, the Ld. Defence counsel has submitted that the accused is innocent as because there is no probable circumstance suggestive of the commission of rape by the accused in respect of the victim lady. He has also submitted that the house of the victim lady consisted of three rooms out of which one is a kitchen and one is a bed room where all the family members used to sleep and the other room is occupied by the tenant of the informant. He has submitted that at the odd hour of the night while the victim lady came out of the house, at that time presence of the accused at that place is highly improbable. Moreover, he has drawn the attention of the court to the evidence of the informant that there is a boundary located in between the bari of the accused and the bari of the informant. There is no passage in between both the bari.

Though it is improbable that during odd hour of the night the accused remained present, and committing the alleged crime by taking the victim lady from that place to the nearby toilet. He has further stated that there was enemical rivalry in between the accused family and informant's family for which the informant has fabricated this case against the accused to teach him a lesson by using his own daughter, as an instrument. He has further submitted that there was inordinate delay in lodging of the FIR, and the delay has not been properly explained, for which the accused is entitle to benefit of doubt. He has drawn the attention to the medical examination report of the accused and the victim lady, which indicate that the concerned medical Officer has not found any evidence of rape and that basing on the medical opinion report, the accused needs to be ended in acquittal. Moreover, he has relied on the evidence of independent witnesses, who belong to case locality, have not supported the case of the prosecution in any manner.

15) Admittedly, the I.Q. Of the victim lady is subnormal, and she was responding very slowly which is revealed from the evidence of

p.W.14 who had medically examined her. The victim lady has categorically stated that at the alleged date and time on the pretext of showing an object, the accused brought her to a nearby latrine and inserted his penis to her anus. It is also admitted fact that at the time of occurrence there was no eye witness. In other words no body has witnessed the occurrence. However, the consistent evidence of P.W.2, the P.W.3, the P.W.4 and the P.W.9 clearly indicate that while they were searching for the victim lady, they found the accused coming from a narrow lane. Immediately, he departed and they found the victim lady coming through that lane, and they then ascertained the entire matter from the victim lady, and she had informed them about the occurrence. So, the evidence of the victim lady has been properly corroborated by the other witnesses.

It is true that there is delay of about six days in lodging the FIR. However, the informant had deposed that at the instance of the local gentries a meeting was held and they had promised to take appropriate action against the accused but as no action was taken

against the accused for that she lodged the FIR. So the delay has been properly explained by the informant in her evidence. But this fact has not been mentioned in the FIR. In the FIR, it is mentioned that as the victim lady was indisposed of for that the FIR could not be lodged in time. Admittedly there is some variance regarding the cause of delay in lodging FIR in between the contents of FIR and in the evidence of the informant. However, the delay in itself is not sufficient to discard the contents of the FIR altogether, and to throw out the oral evidence of the witnesses. Rather, the evidence of the P.W.1, the P.W.2, the P.W.3, the P.W.4 and the P.W.9 appear to be genuine and natural. Similarly the evidence of P.W.11 who is a tenant of the informant has stated that on the occurrence date, in the early morning hearing commotion, he got up from his sleep, and his wife had informed about the occurrence. He also deposed that the victim lady was saying that the accused had sodomized her.

16) So, the alleged act of the accused has not only been stated by the informant, but also by her family members who had deposed in this case, and including the P.W.11. Admittedly the

independent witnesses have not supported the case of the prosecution . But the fact of seizure of the incriminating articles are well proved in the mouth of P.W.12 and the P.W.13 and also by the IO. The evidence of the IO clearly indicates that she had conducted the investigation, and has taken care to collect the evidence against the accused. She was thoroughly cross-examined. But no serious latches could be obtained from her mouth regarding the investigation of this case.

17) During course of hearing of the case, the charge was altered and U/s.377 I.P.C was added. Further it is revealed from the case record that the occurrence took place on dtd. 20.4.2013 at about 4 AM. In the meantime prior to the occurrence as per the Criminal Law Amendment Act, the offence U/s.375 I.P.C was amended, which is as follows: "Definition - A man is said to commit "rape" if he

(a) penetrates his penis, to any extent, into the vagina, mouth, urethra or anus of a woman or makes her to do so with him or any other person; or,

(b) Inserts, to any extent, any object or a part of the body not

being the penis, into the vagina, the urethra or anus of a woman or makes her to do so with him or any other person; or

(c) manipulates any part of the body of a woman so as to cause penetration into the vagina, urethra, anus or any part of such woman or makes her to do so with him or any other person, or

d) applies his mouth to the vagina, urethra, anus or any part of body of such woman or makes her to do so with him or any other persons,

Under the circumstances falling under any of the following seven descriptions;-

First -Against her will,

Secondly -Without her consent,

Thirdly -With her consent, when her consent has been obtained by putting her or any person in whom she is interested, in fear of death or of hurt,

Fourthly -With her consent, when the man knows that he is not her husband and that her consent is given because she believes that he is another man to whom she is or believes herself to be

lawfully married.

Fifthly -With her consent when, at the time of giving such consent, by reason of unsoundness of mind or intoxication or the administration by him personally or through another of any stupefying or unwholesome substance, she is unable to understand the nature and consequences of that to which she gives consent.

Prior to the aforesaid amendment, the case was ordinarily covered U/s.377 of I.P.C relating to the unnatural intercourse, against the order of nature. But, in view of the aforesaid amendment, and as the date of occurrence falls after the amendment had taken place, and as the amendment had come into force, for that the application of Section 377 of I.P.C does not arise.

The evidence of the victim lady discloses that the accused had inserted his penis into her anus, is also covered within the definition of rape in view of the aforesaid amendment. So, in my considered opinion although U/s.377 of I.P.C is added during alteration of charge, still then, I am inclined to accept that Section 377 I.P.C applies to the facts of this case. Hence, no case is made

out against the accused U/s.377 of I.P.C. However, taking into consideration the trustworthiness of the informant and the victim and further as the victim having subnormal I.Q. which is stated by the doctor who had medically examined her, and inspite of that she has revealed the incident in a detailed manner, I do not find any compelling reason to discard her evidence regarding the alleged act committed by the accused. Even though the medical examination report of the accused and the victim lady never indicate that there was any clue of rape, the court has not lost sight of the fact that the medical examination of the victim took place on 27.4.2013 i.e. on the 7th day of the incident. That apart, the evidence of the informant indicates that the wearing apparels of the victim lady including the chadi were already washed. The evidence of the Medical Officer who had medically examined the accused indicates that the accused had already taken his bath before the time of his medical examination. So, under the circumstance, it is not possible to collect any incriminating material and evidence against the accused.

18) The further argument of the Ld. Defence counsel is

that the spot is a small latrine and it is not possible on the part of a person to commit rape. But the evidence of the P.W.15 who is the police scientific Officer, indicates that the spot latrine room was of size 6.3 inch X 4 ft. The evidence of the informant indicates that the accused had committed the alleged act by standing in-front of the victim lady as well as from the backside. So in that posture the size of the room is not a bar to resist the accused to commit the alleged crime. For the same reason, I am not inclined to accept the submission of the Ld. Defence counsel.

19) In this case, as per the version of the doctor who has medically examined the victim lady, she was not a lunatic. But her I.Q. was subnormal and she was responding slowly. The prosecution has also filed documents which indicate that the victim lady was mentally retarded to some extent. The view of the Apex Court in the matter of Bhoginbhai Hirjibhai Vs. State of Gujrat, AIR1983 S.C.,753 indicate that i “On principle the evidence of a victim of sexual assault stands on par with the evidence of an injured witness. As she is the best witness and is not likely to

exculpate the real offender, so the evidence of victim of sexual offence is entitled to great weight, absence of corroboration notwithstanding”.

The dictum of the aforesaid citation applies to the present case.

Some contradictions are brought to the notice of the Court by the Ld. Defence counsel, which are cropped in the statement of the witnesses including the informant, but those contradictions are not strong enough to have an adverse impact on the merit of the prosecution case. In the instant case, the oral evidence of the victim lady, the informant, the P.W.2, the P.W.3, the P.W.4, the P.W.11, coupled with the evidence of the seizure witnesses i.e. P.W.12 and the P.W.13 clearly indicates that the evidence of the informant has been properly corroborated by these witnesses, So far the offence of rape is concerned. But there is lack of sufficient evidence regarding the criminal intimidation made by the accused in respect of the victim lady. The victim lady had also not deposed if she was afraid by or if she was alarmed due to intimidation, by the words of the

accused, for which the offence U/s.506 I.P.C has not been established. Hence, considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the evidence of the IO, the other witnesses, although the independent witnesses have not supported the case of the prosecution in any manner still then I find the aforesaid oral evidence of P.W.2, P.W.2, P.W.3, P.W.4 and P.W.9 to be trustworthy and believable. Under the circumstance, I am of the opinion that prosecution has well proved its case U/s.376(1) I.P.C(Criminal Law Amendment Act, 2013) and the accused is found guilty thereunder and is convicted accordingly U/s.235(1) of the Cr.P.C.

20) However, for the reasons discussed above, the accused is found not guilty U/s.506/ 377 of I.P.C and he is acquitted thereunder.

Addl. Sessions Judge,
Bhubaneswar.

21) **Hearing on the question of sentence:**

I have heard the convict and his representing lawyer, and the Ld. Prosecutor of the State regarding the imposition of sentence on the accused. The Ld. Counsel for the convict and convict himself, submitted that in the interest of justice, he may be extended with the beneficial provisions of Probation of Offenders Act, as he is the bread earner of his family. But considering the manner and gravity of the offence, and taking into consideration the condition of the victim lady, I do not feel it proper to extend the provision of the P.O. Act to the convict. The convict has further pleaded that a lenient sentence may be imposed against him since he has to take care of his family, and he has a small children. But considering the present facts and circumstances of the case, and taking into consideration that the victim lady is mentally retarded to some extent, and that he has not spared the victim lady who happens to be his immediate neighbour, for that I feel it proper to impose appropriate sentence against him as prescribed under the law. Accordingly, I direct the convict to

undergo R.I for 7 years and a fine of Rs.5000/- and in default to undergo a further RI of 3 months for the offence U/s.376(1) I.PC, Read with Criminal Law Amendment Act,2013.. The period already undergone by the convict in the jail custody as UTP be set off against the substantive period of sentence. The fine amount if realised be paid to the victim girl of this case, towards compensation.

The zimanama be cancelled after four months of the appeal period is over in case of no appeal in case of appeal the same may be dealt with as per the decision of the appellate court. The seized clothes of the convict and the victim be destroyed after four months of the appeal period is over in case of no appeal.

Addl. Sessions Judge,

Bhubaneswar.

Typed to my dictation, corrected by me and pronounced in the open Court today this the 16th day of August, 2014 given under my signature and seal of this Court.

Addl. Sessions Judge, Bhubaneswar.

List of witnesses examined for the prosecution

P.W.1	Sabita Behera
P.W.2	Shiba Charan Das
P.W.3	Smt. Banita Das
P.W.4	Prafulla Chandra Behera
P.W.5	Prakash Chandra Mohanty
P.W.6	Mafida Bibi
P.W.7	Smt.Sita Mohant
P.W.8	Smt. Kumudini Mohanty
P.W.9	Smt.Kamala Behera
P.W.10	Smt. Minati Sahu
P.W.11	Kishore Kumar Satapathy
P.W.12	Mamata Rath
P.W.13	Smt. Kavita Behera
P.W.14	Dr. Smt. Bijaya Panda
P.W.15	Prasanna Kumar Senapati

P.W.16 Dr.Niranjan Padhi

P.W.17. Smt. Anita Pradhan

List of witness examined for the defence

Nil

List of exhibits marked for the prosecution

Ext.1 FIR

Ext.1/1 Signature of P.W.2 on Ext.1

Ext.1/2 Signature of informant on Ext.1

Ext.2 Seizure list

Ext.2/1 Signature of P.W.3 on Ext.2

Ext.2/2 Signature of mother of P.W.3 on Ext.3

Ext.3 Seizure list

Ext.3/1 Signature of P.W.3 on Ext.3

Ext. 3/2 Signature of the P.W.3

Ext.4 : Medical opinion

Ext.4/1 : Signature of P.W.3

Ext.4/2 : Signature of victim lady

Ext.4/3 : Signature of the mother of P.W.3

Ext.5 : Zimanama

Ext.5/1 : Signature of P.W.9 on Ext.5

Ext.6 : Seizure list

Ext.6/1 : Signature of P.W.12 in Ext.6

Ext.6/2 : Signature of P.W.C/D.K.Behera in Ext.6

Ext.6/3 : Signature of P.W.13 in Ext.6

Ext.6/4 : Signature of Gitanjali Naik.

Ext.7 : Medical examination report

Ext.7/1 : Signature of P.W.12 on Ext.7

Ext.7/2 : Signature of D.K.Behera in Ext.7

Ext.7/3 : Signature of accused in Ext.7

Ext.8 : Command Certificate

Ext.8/1 : Signature of P.W.12 in Ext.8

Ext.8/2 : Signature of D.K.Behera in Ext.8

Ext.4/4 : Signature of P.W.13 in Ext.4

Ext.9 : Pathological report

Ext.9/1 : Signature of P.W.13 in Ext.9

Ext.9/2 : Signature of victim lady

Ext.10: Radiological examination report

Ext.10/1 : Signature of P.W.13 on Ext.10

Ext.10/2 : Signature of victim lady in Ext.10

Ext.2/3 : Signature of P.W.13 on Ext.2

Ext.4/5 : Signature of P.W.14 on Ext.4

Ext.4/6 : Signature of P.W.14 on final opinion

Ext.11: Ultra sound report

Ext.12: Requisition for ultrasound report

Ext.12/1 : Signature of P.W.14 on Ext.12

Ext.10/3 : Signature of P.W.14 on Ext.10

Ext.9/3 : Signature of P.W.14 on Ext.10

Ext.13: Spot visit report

Ext.13/1 : Signature of P.W.15 on Ext.13

Ext.13/2 : Signature of Bansidhar Bhoi on Ext.13

Ext.13/3 : Signature of Anita Pradhan

Ext.14: Opinion report of MO.

Ext.14/1 : Signature of P.W.16 on Ext.14

Ext.14/2 : Signature of accused Dolgovind on Ext.14

Ext.7/4 : Signature of P.W.16 on Ext.7

Ext.7/5 : Signature of P.W.16 and alongwith his final
opinion on Ext.7

Ext.1/3 : Signature and endorsement of IIC,Sarojini
Nayak

Ext.1/4 : Formal FIR

Ext.15: Spot map

Ext.15/1 : Signature of P.W.17 on Ext.15

Ext.13/3 : Signature of P.W.17 on Ext.13

Ext.3/3 : Signature of P.W.17 on Ext.3

Ext.5/2 : Signature of P.W.17 on Ext.5

Ext.2/4 : Signature of P.W.17 on Ext.2

Ext.6/5 : Signature of P.W.17 on Ext.6

Ext.16: Receipt of the exhibits vide Memo No-1160

dtd.13.8.13

Ext.17: Prayer made by P.W.17 to SDJM to send the
seized exhibits to DFSL.

Ext.17/1 : Signature of P.W.17 on Ext.17

Ext.18: Forwarding letter

Ext.18/1 : Signature of P.W.17 on Ext.18

Ext.19: Requisition for medical examination of victim.

Ext.19/1 : Signature of P.W.17 on Ext.19

Ext.20: Requisition for medical examination

Ext.20/1 : Signature of P.W.17 on Ext.21

Ext.21: Requisition for scientific team

Ext.21/1 : Signature of P.W.17 on Ext.21

Ext.14/2 : Injury requisition

Ext.14/3 : Signature of P.W.17 on Ext.14

Ext.4/7 : Issue query by P.W.17 relating too victim lady

Ext.4/8 : Signature of P.W.8

Ext.7/6 : Issue query in respect of accused

Ext.7/7 : Signature of P.W.7

Ext.8/3 : Signature of P.W.17 on Ext.8

Ext.22: Signature of IIC Sarojini Naik on charge sheet

Ext.22/1 : Signature of P.W.17 in charge sheet.

List of Exts. Marked on behalf of the defence

Nil.

List of M.Os marked on behalf of the prosecution

Nil

List of M.Os marked on behalf of the defence

Addl. Sessions Judge, Bhubaneswar.