

IN THE COURT OF THE SPECIAL JUDGE, C.B.I. COURT NO.I,  
BHUBANESWAR.

PRESENT:

**Sri M.K.Panda,  
Special Judge, C.B.I.,  
Court No.I, Bhubaneswar.**

**T.R. Case No. 10 of 2003.  
Arising out of R.C.No.8(A)/2003.**

Date of argument :11.3.2014 & 12.3.2014.

Date of Judgment :18.3.2014.

**REPUBLIC OF INDIA.**

Versus.

1. Birakishore Mohapatra, aged about 53 years,  
s/o. Late Krishna Chandra Mohapatra,  
Vill. Chasapada, P.S. Chaudwar, Dist. Cuttack.  
At/Present- Charigharia, P.S. Chaudwar, Dist. Cuttack.

... Accused.

For the Prosecution : Sri I.K.Chandra, P.P.

For the Accused : Sri S.K.Sahu, Advocate.

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

The accused stands charged U/Ss.409 and 477-A of the Indian Penal Code and U/S. 13(2) read with Sec. 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

2. Facts material for the prosecution hold as follows: The accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra was working as Cashier in Allahabad Bank, Cantonment Road Branch, Cuttack from 9.4.2001 to 6.2.2002. He being the Cashier used to receive cash from the customers of the Bank and account for the same in the

cash book maintained by him. He also used to enter the vouchers of each day's transactions in Day Book, Long Book and General Ledger. It is the specific case of the prosecution that Manoranjan Das was operating a Cash Credit Account bearing No.84 in the aforesaid branch of Allahabad Bank. On 28.9.2001 Manoranjan Das handed over cash of Rs.50,000/- to the accused for depositing the same in his account, as he sustained fracture in his right hand and on his request the accused filled up the credit voucher of Sri Manoranjan Das and received cash from him. Thereafter the accused issued the counterfoil of pay-in-slip to Manoranjan Das after putting his initial and bank receipt seal. Similarly on 18.10.2001 and 20.11.2001 one account holder Sadasiv Das having Cash Credit A/C No.80 handed over the cash and voucher to the accused –cashier who received the same from him on both occasions and issued the counterfoils of the vouchers to Sadasiv Das after putting his initial & bank receipt seal. It is further case of the prosecution that on those three occasions the accused did not enter the fact of receipt of cash from the above account holders in Cash Receipt Book, Day Book, Long Book and General Ledger of the respective dates, rather subsequently he managed to remove the vouchers entered in the ledger by Sri K.K.Rout from the voucher bundle and consequently being an employee of the Bank abusing his official position dishonestly misappropriated the total amount of Rs.1,45,000/- by falsifying the records and thus caused wrongful loss to the bank and obtained for himself pecuniary advantage of the aforesaid amount. On completion of usual investigation, C.B.I submitted charge sheet against the accused resulting in the present case.

3. Defence plea is one of complete denial of complicity of the accused in the alleged crimes.

4. Points for determination are :
- i. Whether the accused during the period from 9.4.2001 to 5.2.2002 while working as Cashier in Allahabad Bank, Cantonment Road Branch, Cuttack and in such capacity of a public servant entrusted with a sum of Rs.195000/- deposited by the account holders which was the property of Allahabad Bank or having dominion over the said property committed criminal breach of trust in respect of the said property.
  - ii. Whether the accused during the aforesaid period being the Cashier of Allahabad Bank, Cantonment Road Branch, Cuttack wilfully and with intent to defraud forged the Bank documents and misappropriated a sum of Rs.195000/- which was the property of Allahabad Bank.
  - iii. Whether the accused during the aforesaid period being a public servant working as Cashier in Allahabad Bank, Cantonment Road Branch, Cuttack by corrupt and illegal means or otherwise abusing his position as such public servant obtained for him pecuniary advantage to the tune of Rs.1,95,000/- which was deposited by the account holders of Allahabad Bank, Cantonment Road Branch, Cuttack.
5. Prosecution in support of its charges against the accused has examined as many as twelve witnesses whereas the defence has adduced the evidence of one witness only.
6. Undeniably, one of the important witnesses for the prosecution is Siba Narayan Ghosh, the then Assistant Manager of Allahabad Bank, Cantonment Road Branch, Cuttack. He has

claimed in his evidence that he had been working as Assistant Manager in Allahabad Bank, Cantonment Road Branch, Cuttack since 1999 till the year 2002. According to P.W.1, during that period the accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra was working as Cashier of the Bank in that branch for which he is acquainted with his hand writing and signature. P.W.1 has explained in his evidence that in case of any deposit of cash in the bank, the customers used to tender the cash to the accused- cashier. His evidence further reveals that after receipt of the cash the cashier should give the counterfoil of the deposit receipt to the customer and make posting in the cash receipt book and the original voucher is then sent to the concerned clerk of the Bank for posting. According to P.W.1, Ext.1 is the counterfoil of the receipt in respect of deposit of Rs.50,000/- by the customer M.R.Das which bears the seal of their branch and signature of the accused. The cash receipt book maintained by the accused has been marked Ext.2. His specific evidence is that there is no entry in Ext.2 in respect of any deposit in the Bank on 28.9.2001. It is pertinent to note that Ext.2 is the Cash Receipt book maintained by the accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra. The counterfoil of the receipt showing deposit of Rs.35000/- by Subash Sales & Supplies on 18.10.2001 bearing the seal of the branch and signature of the accused-cashier has been marked Ext.3. P.W.1 has specifically alleged in his evidence that this transaction has not been reflected in the cash receipt book as contained in Ext.2. His further allegation in the evidence is that another counterfoil of pay-in-slip shows deposit of Rs.60,000/- by Subash Sales & Supplies in the C.C. A/c No.80 dated 20.11.2001. The above counterfoil deposit receipt has been marked Ext.4. His further allegation in the evidence is that this deposit has also not been reflected in the cash receipt book as contained in Ext.2 on 20.11.2001. He has

also alleged in his testimony that although the entry shows deposit of Rs.60,000/- in cash receipt book as contained in Ext.2 on 20.11.01, but it does not relate to Ext.4. According to P.W.1, on 29.10.2001 there is no entry regarding deposit of Rs.50,000/- against cash credit A/c No.64 at page-92 -93. P.W.1 has categorically explained and alleged in his evidence about existence of counterfoil of deposit form and non-posting of the same in Ext.2. This is a circumstance of real consequence which shows in no uncertain terms the commission of misappropriation of the said amount by the accused. His further evidence is that the vouchers of the counterfoils marked Ext.1, Ext.3 and Ext.4 and voucher of posting in C.C A/c No.64 dated 29.10.01 were searched by him and the Investigating officer of this case, but the same were not available. His explanation in cross- examination is that in these cases no scroll number has been given as the amount has been received by cashier from the customer. Nothing substantial has been brought out in the cross- examination of P.W.1 to discredit his evidence on material aspects of the case. His evidence appear to be quite clear, consisting, convincing, credible and above reproach. I, therefore, find no cogent reason or ground to doubt his veracity.

7. P.W.2 Prabir Kumar Jena, the then Manager and Senior Manager of Allahabad Bank, Cantonment Road Branch, Cuttack has clearly deposed about the procedure of deposit of cash by customer with the cashier. Prasanta Kumar Biswal, Proprietor of M/S. Sagar Construction Pvt. Ltd. and the customer Cash Credit Account No. 64 has identified the accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra who was then working as Cashier in Allahabad Bank, Cantonment Road Branch, Cuttack. His specific evidence is that on 29.10.01 he had deposited Rs.50,000/- by handing over

the cash to accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra and in token of deposit the accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra had issued counterfoil of deposit slip under his signature and seal of the Bank. Those counterfoils have been marked Ext.3 and Ext.4. P.W.7 Brajabandhu Sahu who is a witness to the specimen signature of the accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra has deposed that the specimen signatures and hand writing of Bira Kishore Mohapatra had been taken in his presence. Ext.6 series are the specimen signatures and hand writing of accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra and Ext.6/1 is the signature of witness Braja Kishore Sahu. P.W.8 Sri ManoRanjan Das who is the customer of C.C A/c No.84 has deposed that he knows the accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra who was working as Cashier in Allahabad Bank, Cantonment Road Branch, Cuttack. He has also testified that on 28.9.2001 he had been to the said Bank and due to injury in his right hand he has requested the accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra to fill up the deposit slip. According to P.W.8 the accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra had filled up the deposit slip and received Rs.50,000/- on 28.9.2001 from the depositor M.R.Das. The accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra had issued counterfoil in token of deposit of Rs.50,000/- and Ext.1 is the counterfoil in respect of deposit of Rs.50,000/-.

8. P.W.9 Santosh Kumar Rath who was working as Special Assistant in Allahabad Bank, Cantonment Road Branch, Cuttack has claimed in his evidence that he is acquainted with the signature and hand writing of the accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra on the counterfoils which have been marked Ext.1, Ext.3 and Ext.4. He has also proved Ext.12 which is the seizure memo, Ext.13 is the long book, Ext.14 which is the cash credit ledger, Ext.15 is the another cash credit ledger, Ext.3/1 is the initial of

the accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra, Ext.3/2 is the receipt seal of the Bank, Ext.4/1 is the initial of accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra, Ext.4/2 is the receipt seal of the Bank and Ext.15/3 is the entry made by the accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra dated 29.10.2001 on C.C A/c No.64. P.W.10 Sankar Prasad Mishra, the then Sr. Manager of Allahabad Bank, Cantonment Road Branch, Cuttack has specifically alleged in his evidence that the amount of Rs.50,000/- dated 29.10.2001 on C.C. A/c No. 84 vide Ext.1 has not been reflected in Cashier's cash receipt book Ext.2 and long book Ext.13 and subsequently also the amount has not been credited to the account of the Bank. His further allegation in the evidence is that the amount of Rs.35000/- dated 18.10.2001 and Rs.60,000/- dated 20.11.2001 though have been mentioned in counterfoil Ext.3 and Ext.4, have not been reflected in Cashier's cash receipt book Ext.2 and long book Ext.13. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that in view of the above, amount of Rs.145000/- has been misappropriated by accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra. P.W.10 has also pointed out in his evidence that the entry dated 30.10.01 in respect of C.C A/c No.84 in cash credit ledger Ext.14 is a fictitious entry as the amount has not been reflected in Cashier's cash receipt book Ext.2 and long book Ext.13. His further evidence is that entry dated 17.10.01 in respect of C.C A/c No.80 in cash credit ledger Ext.15 is also fictitious as the amount has not been shown in the Cashier's cash receipt book Ext.2 and long book Ext.13. According to P.W.10 the amount of Rs.50000/- dated 29.10.01 in respect of C.C A/c No.64 though mentioned in cash credit ledger Ext.15, the said amount has not been reflected in Cashier's cash receipt book Ext.2 and long book Ext.13. P.W.10 has therefore, clearly alleged in his evidence that the above amount having not been credited to account of the Bank has been misappropriated by accused Bira

Kishore Mohapatra. His evidence further reveals that he had submitted a letter to S.P. C.B.I., Bhubaneswar regarding non-availability of the vouchers dated 28.9.2001, 18.10.01, 20.11.01, 3.11.2001, 17.10.2001 and 29.10.2001 in respect of C.C. A/c No.84, C.C. A/c No.80 and C.C. A/c No.64. The relevant letter addressed by P.W.10 to the S.P. C.B.I. Bhubaneswar has been marked Ext.16. The evidence of P.W.10 has received ample corroboration in this regard from the evidence of P.W.12, Rabindra Kumar Panda who is the Investigating officer. Nothing substantial has been brought out in the cross- examination of P.W.1 to discredit his evidence on material aspects. He has successfully stood the test of cross- examination. Much less elicited nothing has been suggested to P.W.1 that he is in any way inimically disposed towards the accused so as to depose falsely against him. His evidence appears to be quite clear, consistent, convincing, credible and above reproach. His evidence does not suffer from inherent infirmity or improbability.

9. The learned defence counsel submits that the prosecution evidence deserves no credence in view of serious infirmities. He has drawn the attention of this court to the cross-examination of P.W.10 and 11 who have deposed: "In case of deposit of cash the depositor/ account holder has to present the deposit slip/pay-in-slip before the passing officer, duly filled up, for scrolling of the same in the scrolling register and the passing officer shall enter the scrolling number in the scroll register as well as the pay-in-slip and the counterfoil. Therefore the depositor has to place the scrolled pay-in-slip along with the amount before the cashier wherein the cashier on receipt of the money enters the scroll number in his cash receipt register (Ext.2) and after signing in the counterfoil, give the same to the party."

It has also been pointed out that the prosecution attempted to establish their charges by introducing three number of counterfoils showing deposit of Rs.50,000/- on 28.9.2001 under Ext.1, deposit of Rs.35,000/- on 18.10.01 under Ext.3 and deposit of Rs.60,000/- on 20.11.01 under Ext.4 showing some initials alleged to have been made by the accused which is completely denied by him. True, it is that Ext.1, Ext.3 and Ext.4 bear no scroll number which would have been marked by passing officer after entering the same in the scroll register provided by the Bank. This procedure is conspicuously absent in the whole transaction. The learned defence counsel has alleged in course of his submission that the prosecution has intentionally suppressed the facts in respect of scrolling of Ext.1, Ext.3 and Ext.4 in the scrolling register. It is striking to note that the pay-in-slip or counterfoils of pay-in-slip without having the scroll number of the Bank cannot be treated as the document of the Bank and cannot be entered in the cash receipt book of the cashier. The contention of the learned defence counsel that the accused has no knowledge about Ext.1, Ext.3, Ext.4, Ext.14/1, Ext.15/1 and Ext.15/2 is not at all acceptable on the face of overwhelming articulation in Ext.1, Ext.3 and Ext.4. What cannot be lost sight of in this connection is the plea of the case of the defence that the accused has neither scribed Ext.1, Ext.3 and Ext.4 and Ext.2 and that he has not given initials in each of the counterfoils has not been confronted to any of the prosecution witnesses. The accused has also not taken this plea in his statement u/s. 313 Cr.P.C. The very fact that such a purportedly serious fact has neither been confronted to P.W.10 nor to P.W.11 is pointer to the only conclusion that the defence has not come out with a clean hand. Much has been sought to be made of the admissions of P.W.1,

P.W.2, P.W.9, P.W.10 and P.W.11. But these admissions are too trivial in nature to affect the essential credibility of the prosecution case.

10. It is as much disquieting as perplexing that the accused with the transparent motive of misappropriation has deliberately omitted to mention the scrolling number in counterfoils of pay-in-slips contained in Ext.1, Ext.3 and Ext.4. Similarly he has also not been mentioned in Ext.2 cash receipt book. Importantly, the accused in his own wisdom found it as a convenient ruse to strain the credibility of Ext.1, Ext.3 and Ext.4. But quite understandably, the very fact that the accused chose not to mention the scrolling number in Ext.1, Ext.3 and Ext.4, far from being a discrediting factor lends sufficient assurance to the prosecution case. Santosh Kumar Rath, the then Special Assistant in Allahabad Bank, Cantonment Raod Branch, Cuttack appearing as P.W.9 has claimed that he is acquainted with hand writing and signature of Bira Kishore Mohapatra. It therefore, follows a natural corollary that P.W.9 Santosh Kumar Rath is well acquainted with the hand writing and initial of Bira Kishore Mohapatra in usual course of official business. The prosecution has proved the signature of the accused through P.W.9 marked Ext.1/1, the initial of the accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra has been marked Ext.3/1 and the initial of the accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra which has been marked Ext.4/1. It is common knowledge that a Bank officer who wants to misappropriate money from the Bank this way, will never make the mistake of mentioning the scrolling number in counter foils of pay-in-slips, little knowing that it is all at his own peril.

P.W.3 who happens to be the Government Examiner of Questioned Documents has identified and proved the initials of

the accused in Ext.1, Ext.3 and Ext.4 after which the initials of the accused have been proved as Ext.1/1, Ext.3/1 and Ext.4/1 and Bank seals have been identified and proved as Ext.1/2, Ext.3/2 and Ext.4/2. Ext.1, Ext.3 and Ext.4 counterfoils of pay-in-slips of Rs. 50,000/-, Rs.35,000/- and Res.60,000/- respectively bear the seal of the bank and signature of the accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra. Brajabandhu Sahu who was then working in the Head Post Office, Angul has categorically deposed that on 29.9.09 C.B.I took the specimen signature and hand writing of the accused marked Ext.6 series. Thus the signature of the accused stands wholly proved by P.W.7 in whose presence the accused put his signature. To say the least there could be no better evidence to prove the signature of the accused. On the face of this unimpeachable oral as well as documentary evidence the defence contention that the accused has not put his initials in Ext.1, Ext.3 and Ext.4 is not only legally untenable but also factually misconceived.

11. The learned defence counsel has also submitted that the initials and signatures appearing in Ext.1, Ext.3 and Ext.4 have not been made by the accused in as much as he has denied to have put his initial or signature on the above documents. It is as much inconceivable as unusual that an accused would ever admit his initials and signatures in Ext.1, Ext.3 and Ext.4 as those are incriminating in nature. Besides, any expectation that the accused would admit his signature and initials in the above documents will be an exercise in futility. The learned counsel appearing for the accused has also urged that Ext.1, Ext.3 and Ext.4 have no evidentiary or probative value for the simple reason that the examiner of questioned documents has failed to give any concrete opinion after comparison with the original initials and

signatures of the accused with the initials available in Ext.1, Ext.3 and Ext.4. Not only that, the admissions brought out by the defence in the cross-examination of the prosecution witnesses carry no legal conviction since those are too trivial to affect their veracity. On the face of overwhelming and unimpeachable evidence that the accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra had issued counterfoils of deposit slips under his signature and seal of the Bank, goes long way in reinforcing the prosecution evidence. It is common legal proposition that evidence of no witness is free from discrepancies or inconsistencies. On the contrary, contradictions, inconsistencies and discrepancies make the prosecution case all the more believable. The evidence of D.W.1 Saktibrata Tarai in examination –in-chief stands squarely discredited by his clean admission that he cannot say what procedure was followed prior to his joining and Ext.1, Ext.3 and Ext.4 bear the bank seal. According to D.W.1, Ext.1, Ext.3 and Ext.4 do not bear the scroll number. It is common knowledge that if scroll numbers do not appear in Ext.1, Ext.3 and Ext.4, it is for the simple reason that counterfoils of pay-in-slips' have not been made over to the officer in-charge of entering the scroll number. It is more than apparent from the evidence on record that non-mention of the scroll number in Ext.1, Ext.3 and Ext.4 is a well calculated overt act of the accused so as to escape from criminal liability in future. But the accused had all along remained blissfully oblivious of the pitiful inherent in the supposed safeguard resorted to by the accused, in his own perilous ways. It is important to note that the accused Bira Kishore Mohapatra maintains and thus, the custodian of Cash Receipt Book as contained in Ext.2. Therefore, quite obviously, he is solely responsible for proper maintains of Ext.2. It is evident from the Cash Receipt Book that the accused has deliberately not mentioned the account of Rs.145,000/- in

Ext.2 and has thus, misappropriated the entire amount. There could be no gainsaying the fact that the accused has abortively resorted to all contrivance and subterfuge to misappropriate the amount. I therefore, find no force in the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the defence. The evidence satisfies all the essential ingredients of the alleged offences. The unimpeachable oral as well as documentary evidence unerringly leads to the conclusion that the accused has misappropriated the amount of Rs.145,000/- (Rupees One Lakh and Forty five thousands).

12. In ultimate appraisal of the totality of the evidence on record I am driven to hold that prosecution has proved its case against the accused beyond all reasonable doubt. I, therefore, find the accused guilty for the offences under Sections 409 and 477-A IPC and Section 13(1)(d) read with Section 13(2) of the P.C.Act, 1988 and convict him thereunder.

Special Judge,C.B.I., Court No.I  
Bhubaneswar.

Dictated & corrected by me and pronounced in the open court today i.e. on 18<sup>th</sup> March, 2014.

Special Judge,C.B.I., Court No.I  
Bhubaneswar.

### **S E N T E N C E**

I heard the learned defence counsel as well as the learned Public Prosecutor on the point of sentence. The learned defence counsel submits that the convict should be dealt with leniently as there is no adverse antecedents and complaint against him during his service career. The learned Public Prosecutor, on the other

hand, urges that the convict deserves exemplary and condign punishment. Therefore, regard being had to the age of the convict and other mitigating factors and extenuating circumstances, I am disposed to hold that the convict should be dealt with leniently. Consequently, the convict Bira Kishore Mohapatra is sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year and to pay a fine of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten thousand) in default to suffer rigorous imprisonment for three months for the offence Under Section 409 IPC, to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year and to pay a fine of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten thousand) in default to suffer rigorous imprisonment for three months for the offence under Section 477-A IPC and to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year and to pay a fine of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten thousand) in default to suffer rigorous imprisonment for three months for the offence under Section 13(2) read with Section 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 with a direction that all the sentences shall run concurrently.

13. The seized documents be returned from whom seized and zimanama, if any, be cancelled four months after the appeal period is over, if no appeal is preferred and in the event of an appeal subject to the order of the Hon'ble Appellate court.

Special Judge, C.B.I. Court No.1,  
Bhubaneswar.

Dictated & corrected by me and pronounced in the open court today i.e. on 18<sup>th</sup> March, 2014.

Special Judge,C.B.I., Court No.I  
Bhubaneswar.

LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED FOR THE PROSECUTION.

- P.W.1. Siba Narayan Ghos.  
 PW.2. Prabir Kumar Jena.  
 P.W.3. Vinod Kumar.  
 P.W.4. B.N.Bastia.  
 P.W.5. Prasant Kumar Biswal.  
 P.W.6. Shadasiv Das.  
 P.W.7. Brajabandhu Sahu.  
 P.W.8. Manoranjan Das.  
 P.W.9. Santosh Kumar Ratha.  
 P.W.10. Sankar Prasad Mishra.  
 P.W.11. Karunakar Rout.  
 P.W.12. Rabindra kumar Panda.

LIST OF WITNESS EXAMINED FOR THE DEFENCE.

- D.W.1. Sakti Brata Tarai.

LIST OF DOCUMENTS ADMITTED FOR THE PROSECUTION.

- Ext.1. Signature of accused in counter-foil of receipt for Rs.50,000/-  
 Ext.2. Cash receipt book.  
 Ext.3. Signature of accused in counter foil of receipt of Rs.35,000/-  
 Ext.4. Counter foil of deposit receipt of Rs.60,000/- on 20.11.01.  
 Ext.5. Forwarding letter.  
 Ext.6. Signature and specimen writing of B.K.Mohapatra.  
 Ext.7. Opinion of Deputy GEQD.  
 Ext.7/1. Signature of P.W.3.  
 Ext.7/2. Signature of S.C.Gupta.  
 Ext.8. Forwarding letter.  
 Ext.9. Written opinion.  
 Ext.9/1. Signature of P.W.3.  
 Ext.10. Sanction order.  
 Ext.10/1. Signature of P.W.4 in Ext.10.  
 Ext.11. Seizure list.  
 Ext.11/1. Signature of P.W.6.

- Ext.6/1. Signature of P.W.7.
- Ext.12 Seizure list.
- Ext.12/1 Signature of P.K.Jena on Ext.12.
- Ext.13 Long book.
- Ext.14 Cash credit ledger.
- Ext.15 Another cash credit ledger.
- Ext.1/1 Initial of Birakishore Mohapatra on Ext.1.
- Ext.1/2 Receipt stamp of Bank.
- Ext.3/1 Initial of accused on Ext.3
- Ext.3/2. Receipt seal of the bank on Ext.3.
- Ext.4/1 Initial of the accused in token of receipt of cash.
- Ext.4/2. Receipt seal of the bank.
- Ext.14/1. Relevant entry on Ext.14.
- Ext.15/1 Relevant entry on Ext.15.
- Ext.15/2. Entry dated 20.11.01 made by Karunakar Rout on Ext.15.
- Ext.15/3. Relevant entry on Ext.15.
- Ext.16 Relevant letter
- Ext.16/1 Signature of P.W.10 on Ext.16.
- Ext.17 Seizure list.
- Ext.17/1. Signature of P.W.10 on Ext.17.
- Ext.18. Seizure memo.
- Ext.18/1. Signature of P.W.11.

LIST OF DOCUMENTS ADMITTED BY THE DEFENCE

NIL.

Special Judge, C.B.I.  
Court No.1, Bhubaneswar.