

IN THE COURT OF THE SESSIONS JUDGE SONITPUR:: TEZPUR

**PRESENT : Smt. I. Barman,
Sessions Judge,
Sonitpur, Tezpur.**

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 17(S-2)2019

Sri Kumar Kuzur **Appellant.**

- Versus -

1. State of Assam and

2. Sri Naro Horo & Zors

..... **Respondents**

A P P E A R A N C E

For the Appellant : A.K. Mahanta & K. Sharmah,
Advocate.

For the Respondents : Sri M.C. Baruah , P.P.

Date of Argument : 02-02-2021

Date of Judgment : 12-02-2021.

JUDGMENT

1. The instant appeal is directed u/s 374(3)(a) of Cr.P.C. against the Judgment and Order, dated 23-05-2019, passed by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sonitpur, Tezpur, in G.R. Case No. 1123/09. By the impugned Judgment and order, the learned trial court convicted the accused/appellant u/s 326 IPC and sentenced to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for 5 (five) years and to pay a fine of Rs. 2000/- (Rupees two thousand) along with default clause for the offence punishable u/s 326 of the IPC.

2. The prosecution case as discerned from record is briefly stated as follows:

3. Since three months prior to filing the FIR, the informant's brother Siba Horo was staying in the house of Samir Kujur, the brother of accused Kumar Kujur. During that period on 22-06-2009 at around 11.00 PM, accused Kumar Kujur severed the right wrist of Sibo Horo with a khukuri and when Rashmi Kujur, the sister of the accused intervened, the accused attacked her also and chopped her left ear. It is mentioned in the FIR that the khukuri which was used in the offence was handed over to police.

4. Based on the FIR lodged by Naro Horo on 23-06-2009, Rangapara PS Case No. 116/09 u/s 326 of IPC was registered and on completion of the investigation, laid charge sheet against the accused Kumar Kujur u/s 326 of IPC.

5. On appearance of the accused, necessary copies as required u/s 207 of Cr.P.C. were furnished to the accused and to the charge framed under Section 326 of IPC, the accused pleaded not guilty and claimed for trial

6. In course of trial, 11 (eleven) witnesses were examined by the prosecution side. Accused/Appellant was examined u/s 313 Cr.P.C, to which, he pleaded innocence and adduced no evidence in his defence.

7. After hearing argument for the parties, the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sonitpur at Tezpur on discreet analysis and evaluation of the testimony of the prosecution witnesses found the appellant guilty u/s 326 IPC and accordingly convicted the accused/Appellant, Kumar Kujur for the offence u/s 326 of the IPC and awarded sentence as indicated above.

8. Mr. Mahanta, learned counsel for the appellant in support of the appeal so preferred by the appellant has submitted that the evidence of the prosecution witnesses is not at all corroborative and the same are full of discrepancies. He further submitted that even the testimony of the injured person cannot be accepted. Reason for his such submission is that one injured Rashmi Kujur (PW 5) herself did not support the prosecution version according to whom both the injured inflicted injury on each other and the accused, the brother of Rashmi Kujur to save her took the blame upon himself and surrendered at the police station. Mr. Mahanta also submitted

that the evidence of PW 1, seizure witnesses PW 6 and PW 7 and the I.O. with regard to recovery of weapon makes the prosecution version doubtful and as such the evidence on record do not warrant conviction and is liable to be set aside.

9. Per contra, Mr. M. Baruah, the learned Public Prosecutor has forcefully submitted that the learned court was justified and correct in handing down the impugned conviction and sentence upon the appellant. He submitted that the prosecution by cogent and reliable evidence have been able to prove the allegation of voluntarily causing grievous hurt to the injured Siba Horo and Rashmi Kujur with a khukri, a sharp cutting weapon against the accused/appellant and there is no convincing or compelling circumstances to dislodge the prosecution case and no interference is called for with the impugned conviction and sentence.

10. I have given my anxious and thoughtful consideration as regards to the rival contentions raised by the learned counsel for both sides. I have also perused the impugned judgment and order and the materials available in the record. For appreciating the rival contention, it would be apt and appropriate to discuss the evidence on record.

11. PW 1, the informant Naro Horo, the brother of one injured Siba Horo, in his evidence stated that on the day of incident he went for a social visit and at night he was informed by his neighbour that accused Kumar Kujur had severed the hand of his brother Siba Horo. Receiving the aforesaid information, he immediately returned home and saw that the right wrist of his brother Siba Horo had been completely severed and he was in a very serious condition. He also had seen cut injury on right leg, left shoulder and back of his brother. His brother was taken to the tea garden hospital first and from there he was shifted to Rangapara PHC and thereafter, his brother was taken to KCH, Tezpur. Regarding the incident, on the next day he lodged the ejahar. He also noticed the left ear of Rashmi Kujur, the sister of the accused being cut off by the accused and she was taken to the hospital for treatment where she took treatment for about one month. He stated that police seized the khukri from the house of the accused Kumar Kujur in his

presence which was used in the offence. He proved the seizure list Ext. 2 wherein Ext. 2(1) is his signature. He identified the Khukri as M.Ext.1. During cross he stated that Rashmi, the sister of the accused resided with her elder brother Samir Kujur and the accused resided in the other side of the road. When he returned home at 12:00 mid night, his parents reported him about the incident. On that night, he did not go to the house of Samir Kujur. He admitted that as his brother Sibor Horo leaving his house used to reside in the house of Rashmi, hence his relation with Sibor Horo was not good. He admitted that Rashmi gave birth to a child through his injured brother Sibor Horo. He stated that Joseph wrote the FIR in his (PW1) house as instructed by him. He further stated that except Sibor and Rashmi, none witnessed how they sustained injuries.

12. Though one Mangal Tirky was examined as PW 2 but he could not be cross-examined as in the mean time he died. Hence, his evidence was not considered by the trial court.

13. The most vital witness i.e. injured Sibor Horo was examined as PW3. He stated that on the day of incident, at around 11:00 PM when he was taking dinner in his house, accused Kumar Kujur came there and severed his left hand(wrist) with a khukri and inflicted cut injury on his right leg and right cheek near the ear. He stated that at the time of incident Rashmi, the sister of the accused was also present with him. As a result of the attack, he lost his senses and on regaining his senses, he found himself lying in the dining room and in the morning, his brother Naro Horo and his parents came and took him to Rangapara P.H.C. for treatment wherefrom he was taken to Tezpur Civil Hospital and was admitted there for 15 days. Regarding the incident, his brother Naro Horo lodged the FIR. During cross he stated that he was staying at Samir Kujur's house, the brother of the accused and on the other side of the road, accused resided. He admitted that he maintained physical relation with Rashmi Kujur, the sister of accused promising to marry her, as a result of which she carried pregnancy. He further stated that since 2-3 months prior to the incident, he used to reside with Rashmi in her house and hence he said that the incident occurred in his

house, actually the incident occurred in the house of Samir Kujur, the brother of the accused Kumar Kujur. He stated that on previous day of the incident, accused Kumar Kujur raised objection of his staying with Rashmi together and asked him to leave the company of his sister. PW 3 admitted that even after Rashmi became pregnant, he did not marry her. He denied the suggestion of defence that when he refused to marry Rashmi, on the night of occurrence he and Rashmi taking dao, knife etc. had quarreled and both inflicted cut injuries on each other. PW 3 stated that Rashmi had tied a cloth on his wound after the incident.

14. PW 4 Dr Hiranjan Saikia, the Medical Officer of KCH, Tezpur stated that on 23-06-2009 he examined Sibor Horo who gave history of assault and found the following injuries:

- i) Leads to amputation of right forearm at wrist joint level,
- ii) Right knee incised injury, 3 cm x 2cm x 1cm and fracture of tibia,
- iii) Incised injury 3cm x 2cm x 1cm in right side of cheek in maxillary region.

He opined that the injuries were caused by sharp weapon, less than 24 hours old and grievous in nature.

He proved the Medical report as Ext.3.

In cross examination, he stated that he cannot say on which date the forearm of Sibor Horo got amputated. He found the patient with amputated forearm which was within 24 hours. He did not know who performed the amputation.

15. PW 5 Smti Rashmi Kujur, another injured as well as the sister of the accused turned hostile. She stated that she had love affair with Sibor Horo and on the day of incident at 11:00 PM she had quarreled with Sibor Horo for not marrying her and in course of quarrel both of them had beaten each other, as a result, her left ear was cut off and right hand of Sibor Horo got severed in the process. During cross by defence she stated that the house of Sibor Haso is adjacent to her house. She admitted that she gave birth to a

child through Sibor Horo. She also admitted that for maintaining relation with PW 3 Sibor Horo, her brother Samir disliked her. On the night, they informed none about the incident.

16. PW 6 Sri Prem Bhengra, the then VDP President stated that one morning at about 9-10 AM, when he went to the police station, he saw the accused in the police lockup. At that time one ASI and one constable were present there. In his presence the ASI asked the accused as to where he had kept the 'khukuri', to which the accused replied that the 'khukuri' was kept under his bed. Then police disclosing about non availability of police personnel in the police station at that time, asked him to bring the same. Accordingly, as directed by police, he along with other villagers went to the house of the accused and finding a khukri without cover beneath the bed of the accused wrapped it with Gamocha and handed over the same to police. He identified the said 'khukuri' as M.Ext.1. During cross he stated that other witnesses of the seizure list did not put their signatures in his presence. He stated that he did not know the contents of the seizure list. He clearly denied the suggestion that the Material Ext.1, the khukuri was not the seized khukuri which he saw at the police station.

17. PW 7 Sri Josheph Tirkey deposed that in the next day morning he heard from the villagers about a quarrel that took place in the house of the informant between Rashmi Kujur and Sibor Horo. He stated that on being called by the informant, he went there. At that time an ambulance also arrived by which he took the injured Sibor Horo and Rashmi to Borjuli tea garden hospital and thereafter to Rangapara Hospital. He further deposed that in the afternoon police came to the house of the informant and he was also called there where police took his signature in the seizure list Ext. 2 but no any seized article was shown to him. In cross examination he stated that other witnesses did not sign in the seizure list in his presence and the seizure list was written in Assamese language. He stated that Siba Horo resided in the house of Rashmi but the accused resided in another house at a distance of about 10' situated on the other side of the road.

18. PW 8 Sri Bimal Dhanuwar who turned hostile deposed that he came to know that somebody had cut off the hand of the informant's brother. He further stated that when he went to the house of the informant, he noticed bandage on the hand of the injured but, the injured did not tell him the name of the person who cut off his hand. This witness during cross by prosecution admitted that in statement before the Investigating Officer he stated that the accused himself admitted that prior to one week of the incident Sibor Horo slapped Rashmi, the sister of the accused, hence out of grudge the accused committed the offence. He also admitted that before police, he stated that on the night at around 11:00 PM when Sibor Horo and Rashmi Kujur were in kitchen, accused came there with a khukri and severed the right wrist of Sibor Horo and on being prevented by Rashmi, he chopped off her left ear. During cross by defence he stated that he heard about the incident from Ramesh (since deceased) whose house is about 1 mile away from the place of occurrence. He further stated that in the morning, at 6:00 AM when he went to the house of Rashmi, he found Sibor and Rashmi there.

19. PW 9 Sri Joseph Tanti deposed that he heard that on the previous night an incident of cut took place in the house of the informant. When police reached the place of occurrence, he also went there and saw cut injury on the hand of Sibor but, he had no knowledge who caused the injury.

20. PW 10 Mahendra Nath Bora the Investigating Officer deposed that that on the day of incident, one Kumar Kujur of Rupajuli line No.6, Borjuli TE informed at Rangapara Police Station that he had a fight with Sibor Horo and had stabbed him with a 'khukri'. The information was entered as GD Entry No.600 dated 23-06-2009 (Ext.4) and he was entrusted with the preliminary investigation of the case. He visited the place of occurrence and came to know that two persons sustained injuries and they were taken to hospital. He prepared the sketch map of the place of occurrence (Ext. 5). Regarding the incident on 23-06-09 Naro Horo lodged the FIR. Accordingly, Rangapara PS Case No. 116/09 u/s 326 IPC was registered and on being entrusted him to investigate the case, he recorded the statement of the witnesses along with the injured/victims Sibor Horo and Rashmi Kujur, seized the 'khukri' vide

seizure list Ext.3, collected the medical reports and on completion of investigation, submitted the charge sheet under Section 326 of IPC against the accused Kumar Kujur (Ext. 6). During cross he stated that on 23-06-09 Kumar Kujur appeared before Rangapara Police station and informed that he stabbed one person. He further stated that during investigation he came to know that Sibor Horo and Rashmi, the sister of the accused were in a living relationship, as a result Rashmi became pregnant. He also came to know that one brother of Rashmi Kujur was mentally retarded and that brother resided with Rashmi. He stated that Naro Horo produced the khukri at the police station.

21. PW11 Dr Tilak Bhattacharjee deposed on 23-06-20109 he examined Rashmi Kujur in connection with Rangapara PS letter no nil dated 23-06-2009 and on examination found the following:

- i) Sharp cut injury on left side of neck of 20cm long x 1/2 cm depth including left pinna. Patient was discharged on 24-07-2009.

The injury was fresh, grievous and caused by sharp weapon.

He proved the injury report as Ext.7 and his signature as Ext.7(1).

During cross he stated that he found only one injury on the person.

22. In the backdrop of above evidence, it reveals that admittedly, the injured Sibor Horo, brother of the informant had relation with another injured Rashmi Kujur, the sister of the accused and she gave birth to a child through him. It is also in the evidence that since three months prior to the incident Sibor Horo (PW 3) used to reside with Rashmi who resided with her another brother Samir Kujur, the brother of the accused and Rashmi where the incident occurred and the accused resided in other side of the road. In the incident both Sibor Horo and Rashmi Kujur sustained injuries. One of the most vital witness Sibor Horo, the injured in evidence disclosed that on the day of incident, at around 11:00 PM when he was taking dinner in the house of Samir Kujur and Rashmi where he used to reside, accused Kumar Kujur came there and had cut his left hand with a khukri and also inflicted injury over his right leg and right cheek near the ear. At that time Rashmi Kujur,

the sister of the accused was present there and she applied bandage over his injury. The injury report Ext. 3 reveals that the right forearm of Sibor Horo at wrist joint level was amputated and also sustained right knee incised injury and fracture of tibia and incised injury in right side of cheek in maxillary region. The Medical officer (PW 4) found the injured Sibor Horo (PW 3) with amputated forearm on 23-06-2009 when he examined the patient at Kanaklata Civil Hospital, Tezpur and the amputation was done within 24 hours. He examined the patient on 23-06-2009 at 12:50 PM and the alleged incident occurred on 22-06-2009 at 11 PM. The evidence of the informant, PW 1 who is the brother of injured Sibor Horo reveals that at first the injured was taken to Tea garden hospital wherefrom he was taken to Kanaklata Civil Hospital, Tezpur. PW 3, the injured also stated that he was taken to Rangapara hospital in the morning and then to the Civil Hospital at Tezpur. The ocular evidence of the injured PW 3 is supported by the medical evidence. The evidence of PW 1, the informant, is that on the night, he was informed that accused Kumar Kujur had severed the hand of his brother Sibor Horo. He also saw cut injury over right leg, left shoulder and back of his brother. PW 1 further stated that he noticed the left ear of Rashmi Kujur, the sister of the accused being cut off by the accused with khukri and she was also taken to the hospital and was admitted in hospital. The injury report, Ext. 7 reveals that PW 5 Rashmi Kujur was examined by PW 11 on 23-06-09 at 2:00 PM at Kanaklata Civil Hospital, Tezpur and found sharp cut injury over left side of neck of 20 cm long X ½ cm depth including left pinna. Doctor opined that the injury was fresh, grievous and caused by sharp weapon. Rashmi Kujur, one of the injured, who is the sister of the accused turned hostile during deposition. She stated that on the day when she questioned PW 3 Sibor Horo as to why he did not marry her, quarrel took place between them and they inflicted injury to each other in which she sustained cut injury over left ear and in the process the right arm of Sibor Horo got severed. During cross by defence she stated that at the time of incident her elder brother Samir Kujur was present and when quarrel took place between herself and Sibor Horo, Samir Kujur went out but she did not state how she and Siba Horo sustained such severe injury to the extent of

amputation of wrist joint of PW 3 and severe cut injury upto pinna of ear of PW 5. She stated nothing as to who first sustained. It is quite natural that being sister, she would not say against her brother. Further though PW 8 Bimal Dhanowar was declared hostile by the prosecution but during cross examination by prosecution itself, he admitted that before police he stated that prior to one week of the incident Sibor Horo slapped Rashmi, hence the accused on the day of incident at 11:00 PM when Sibor and Rashmi were in kitchen, accused Kumar Kujur came there with a khukri and severed the right wrist of Sibor Horo and on being prevented by Rashmi, the accused chopped her left ear. Injured Sibor Horo also corroborated that when he was taking meal, the incident occurred. During cross by defence PW 8 stated that he heard about the incident from Ramesh (since deceased). Though PW 3 did not state about injury of PW 5, but his evidence clearly revealed that after he was attacked in which his wrist joint was severed from his hand, he lost senses and in such situation, it is not possible for him to know how Rashmi sustained injuries.

23. In the case, the khukri (M. Ext.1) allegedly used in the offence was seized. PW 6 one of the seizure witness who was the VDP President testified that when he went to the police station, he saw the accused in the lock up and on being asked by police as to where he kept the khukri, the accused replied that he kept it under his bed. Then on being asked by police, he along with villagers brought the khukri which was kept under the bed of the accused. Though he stated that he did not know the contents of the seizure list, but his evidence that he along with villagers found the khukri under the bed of the accused remained undemolished. Evidence of another seizure witness PW 7 is only that police obtained his signature in the seizure list but no any seized article was shown to him. While PW1, the informant claimed that police seized the khukri from the house of the accused, the seizure witness PW 6 deposed that he along with other villagers collected the khukri from beneath the bed of the accused and handed over to police. On the other hand, according to the Investigating Officer, the informant produced the khukri at the police station which reflects in the seizure list and in the FIR. In my considered opinion only for the discrepancy as to from where the

weapon was seized the whole case cannot be brushed aside, when the prosecution case is otherwise established.

24. Regarding contradictions in the statement of the witnesses, it is settled legal position that the courts are not to get swayed by minor contradiction or insignificant discrepancies when otherwise testimony of a witness is cogent, credible and trustworthy on the material aspects of the case. In this case also minor discrepancies as pointed out by the learned counsel for the appellant are not so material which go to the root of the matter and materially affect the trial or core of the prosecution case and as such, same cannot be taken into consideration.

25. Further more, in the case the evidence of the Investigating Officer (PW 10) reveals that on 23-06-2009, accused Kumar Kujur himself informed at Rangapara PS that he had a fight with Sibor Horo and had stabbed him with a khukri on which GDE NO. 600 dated 23-06-2009 were entered. The said GDE was proved as Ext. 4 as per which on 23-06-09 at 7:00 AM accused Kumar Kujur informed police verbally that in a quarrel with Siba Horo, he inflicted him injury with a khukri. So, the verbal information was given by none other than the assailant himself. During cross of the Investigating Officer, it was asserted that on 23-06-09 accused Kumar Kujur appeared before the police station and told that he stabbed one person on the basis of which, the GDE was entered. According to the I.O., the informant produced the khukri.

26. The other witnesses stated about the incident as they had not seen the occurrence. They appeared in the place of occurrence after the incident on being informed by others. The other witnesses have found the victim in an injured condition at the house of Samir Kujur. The evidence of PW 3 (injured) coupled with medical evidence clearly leads to the findings that none other than appellant had caused the grievous injury to PW 3 and PW 5. The injured PW 3 narrated the incident in question. His evidence has been found trust worthy.

27. Regarding injured witness, normally, an injured witness would enjoy greater credibility because he is the sufferer himself and there will be no occasion for such a person to state an incorrect version of the occurrence or to accuse anybody falsely and in the bargain, protect the real culprit.

In the case of **Abdul Sayed – vs – State of Madhya Pradesh (2010) 10 SCC 259**, it was held by the Hon'ble SC that where a witness to the occurrence has himself been injured in the incident, the testimony of such a witness is generally considered to be very reliable, as he is a witness that comes with a built in guarantee of his presence at the scene of the crime and is unlikely to spare his actual assailant in order to falsely implicate someone. Convincing evidence is required to discredit an injured witness.

28. In the instant case, the testimony of PW 3 is also found consistent from his very first statement made before the police and proved on record while deposing before the court. Though PW 1 was not present at the time of the incident, but according to him, he came to know from a neighbour and later from his brother, i.e. victim that he was assaulted by the accused with a 'khukri'.

29. In the case of **State of UP – vs – Naresh & Ors. (2011) 4 SCC 324**, it was held that the evidence of an injured witness must be given due weightage being a stamped witness, thus his presence cannot be doubted. His statement is generally considered to be very reliable and is unlikely that he has spared the actual assailant in order to falsely implicated someone else. The testimony of an injured witness has its own relevancy and efficacy as he has sustained injuries at the time and place of occurrence and this lends support to his testimony that he was present during the occurrence. Thus, the testimony of an injured witness is accorded a special status in law.

The law on the point can be summarized to the effect that the testimony of injured witness is accorded a special status in law and is given due importance and weightage.

30. Here, the sister of the accused undeniably tried to shift the liability of the accused by claiming that due to a joint fight happened between her

and her lover injured Sibbo Horo, both of them sustained injuries. The defence side also suggested that the accused had not inflicted any sort of injury upon the body of both the victims rather they sustained injuries on a mutual fight. In the aforesaid discussion, it has already been clarified that one of the victim PW 5 who is the sister of the accused tried to protect the principle accused by the dint of her relationship. The another victim's testimony, the PW-3 found to be trustworthy in nature and the entire act committed by the accused falls under the offence punishable under section 326 of IPC and settled proposition of law is that an act of criminal in nature must be followed by mens rea and there is a famous maxim called "**Actus Non Facit Reum Nisi Mens Sit Rea**" which means a crime cannot be committed without any guilty mind.

31. In **State Of Maharashtra -vs- M. H. George, AIR 1965 SC 722**, it was observed : It is a well settled principle of common law that mens rea is an essential ingredient of a criminal offence. However, a statute can exclude that element, but it is a sound Rule of construction adopted in England and also accepted in India, to construe a statutory provision by creating an offence in conformity with the common law rather than against it, unless the statute expressly or by necessary implication excluded mens rea. There is a presumption that mens rea is an essential ingredient of a statutory offence. It may be rebutted by the express words of a statute creating the offence or by necessary implication.

32. In **State of Gujrat -vs- D. Pandey, 1971 Cr.L.J. 760 (SC)**, **Hon'ble Supreme Court observed:** "Unless a statute either clearly or by necessary implication Rules out mens rea as constituent part of the crime, a person should not be found guilty of an offence against the criminal law unless he has got a guilty mind. But language of a provision either plainly or by necessary implication can Rule out the application of that presumption. The Court may decline to draw that presumption taking into consideration the purpose intended to be served by that provision." So generally "Mens Rea" i.e. guilty mind is necessary to be proved for conviction of accused in

respect of any offence unless such proof has been expressly and impliedly dispensed with by law.

33. In this case, the intention or guilty mind established from the plea of defence. The version of the victims PW-3 and PW-5 is that victim Sibor Horo had maintained an illicit relationship with PW 5 Rashmi Kujur due to which she became pregnant and gave birth to a child but Sibor Horo declined to marry her. Hence there is every possibility that being aggrieved by the act of Sibor Horo, the accused, brother of PW 5 had committed the alleged offence and as such intention or mens rea is also present in this case.

34. In the present case, injured PW 3 was in hospital for 15 days and PW 5 was under treatment for one month. After going through the evidence on record, it appears that the injury suffered by the victim does fall under the provisions, as referred to in Section 320 of IPC as grievous hurt caused by sharp weapon, punishable under section 326 of IPC.

35. Because of what has been discussed and pointed out above, I do not find that the findings of guilt, recorded by the learned trial court, against the accused appellant u/s 326 IPC suffers from any infirmity, legal or factual. The prosecution has proved its case beyond reasonable doubt that the accused appellant has committed the offence u/s 326 of the IPC by inflicting a blow on the PW 3 and PW 5 with a khukri. So far the sentence passed against the accused appellant is concerned, this court does not find that even the sentence needs any interference by this court.

36. The appeal is therefore dismissed being devoid of merit. The impugned Judgment and order of conviction and sentence passed by the learned trial court is hereby upheld and affirmed. The appellant Kumar Kujur is directed to surrender before the learned trial court on or before 12-03-2021 to serve the sentence. The bail bonds of the accused appellant is hereby cancelled and surety stands discharged.

37. Send back the case record of GR Case No.1123/09 along with a copy of this Judgment to the learned trial court forthwith.

38. Given under my hand and seal of this Court on this the 12th February, 2021 at Tezpur.

(I.Barman)
Sessions Judge,
Sonitpur: Tezpur.

Dictated and corrected by me.

(I.Barman)
Sessions Judge,
Sonitpur, Tezpur.