

**APPENDIX -12**

**IN THE COURT OF ASSISTANT SESSIONS JUDGE,  
SONITPUR, TEZPUR.**

Present: Dr. C. Khanikar, AJS  
Assistant Sessions Judge, Sonitpur, Tezpur

**(29<sup>th</sup> October, 2022)**

**(Sessions Case No 76 / 2019)**

(FIR NO.139/2012 DATED 23-03-2012 / ATTEMPT TO MURDER CASE /AND  
DHEKIAJULI POLICE STATION)

<b>COMPLAINANT :</b>	MD. ABDUL RASID KHAN
<b>REPRESENTED BY</b>	SMT. NIVA RAHMAN, ADVOCATE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR SRI P. SARMA ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
<b>ACCUSED</b>	<b>1.</b> MD. BAHEJUDDIN SEIKH S/O MD. LAL BATCH SEIKH <b>2.</b> MD BAREK ALI S/O MD. LAL BATCH SEIKH BOTH ARE RESIDENTS OF VILL- MOLAN PUKHURI P.S.- DHEKIAJULI DIST- SONITPUR, ASSAM <b>3.</b> MD. MUZAFAR ALI S/O MD. AINUL HAQUE RESIDENT OF VILL- BAKPURI P.S.- SAMPUR DIST-MANGALDOI, ASSAM
<b>REPRESENTED BY</b>	MD. S. K ALAM, ADVOCATE SRI A. SAIKIA, ADVOCATE

**APPENDIX -13**

Date of Offence	20-03-2012
Date of FIR.	23-03-2012
Date of Charge-sheet	30-06-2013
Date of Framing of Charges	17-06-2019, 07-11-2019
Date of commencement of evidence	26-07-2019
Date on which judgment is reserved	19-10-2022
Date of the Judgment	29-10-2022
Date of the Sentencing Order, if any	29-10-2022

**ACCUSED DETAILS:**

Rank of the Accused	Name of Accused	Date of Arrest	Date of Release on Bail	Offences charged with	Whether Acquitted or convicted	Sentence Imposed	Period of Detention undergone during Trial for purpose of Section 428, Cr.P.C.
1	Md. Berek Ali	15-05-2019	20-07-2019	364/387/343 IPC	Acquitted	None	N/A
2	Md. Bahejuddin	15-05-2019	20-07-2019	364/387/343 IPC	Convicted	For the offence u/s 364 of IPC rigorous imprisonment for five years with a fine of Rs. 500/-, each, in default S.I for 10 days. For the offence u/s 343 of IPC rigorous imprisonment for two years. Both the imprisonments will run concurrently.	66 days
3	Md. Muzafar Ali	15-05-2019	20-07-2019	364/387/343 IPC	Convicted	-do-	66 days

**IN THE COURT OF ASSISTANT SESSIONS JUDGE, SONITPUR,  
TEZPUR**

**SESSIONSCASE No. 76 of 2019**

**G.R. Case No.674 of 2012**

U/S.364/387/343 of IPC

State of Assam .....Prosecutor

- *Versus*-

- 1) Md. Barek Ali
- 2) Md. Bahejuddin
- 3) Md. Muzafar Ali

.....Accused

Present: Dr. Chetana Khanikar, AJS

For the prosecution : Smt. N. Rahman, Addl. P. P.

Sri. P. Sarma, Addl. P. P.

For the defence : Md. S. Alam, Advocate

Sri. A. Saikia, Advocate

Evidence recorded on: 26-07-2019, 07-11-2019,  
16-11-2019 & 02-09-2022

Argument heard on : 19-10-2022

Judgment delivered on : 29-10-2022

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

1. The prosecution case in brief as stated in the FIR is that on 20-03-2012 at about 5.30 P.M Md. Joinal Abedin, who is the son of the informant went to Sirajuli Center with Motorcycle bearing registration No. AS-12F-0157. He parked the motorcycle in front of the shop of Md. Tahidur Khan and kept his mobile phone in the computer shop of

the Md. Abdul Ali for charging the same. Thereafter, he went to a hotel along with some of his friends and after having tea in the hotel he took his mobile phone bearing No. 9613355012 and thereafter went off missing. On 22-03-2012 at about 5.04 p.m the informant received a call from the aforesaid mobile number demanding Rs. 50 lakhs to be paid within 1 week.

2. On the basis of aforesaid FIR, police registered a case as Dhekiajuli PS Case No. 139/2012. Police investigated the case and on completion of investigation submitted charge-sheet against the accused persons Md. Nasirul Haque, Md. Noor Ali @ Aslam, Md. Noor Bakta, Md. Riajul Haque, Md. Barek Ali, Md. Abdul Salam, Md. Bahejuddin and Md. Muzafar Ali U/S 364/387/343 of IPC.

3. On appearance of the accused persons Md. Barek Ali, Md. Abdul Salam, Md. Bahejuddin and Md. Muzafar Ali, copies of relevant documents were furnished to them as required U/S 207 of Cr. P. C. and the case was committed to the Court of Hon'ble Sessions Judge, Sonitpur as the case was exclusively triable by the Hon'ble court of Sessions. Thereafter, the case has been transferred to this court. Considering the relevant documents and hearing both the parties and having found sufficient material to presume that the accused had committed offences U/S 364/387/343 of IPC charge under those sections was framed against them. The accused pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried when the charge was read over and

explained to them. The case was abated against accused Abdul Salem vide order dated 16-09-2019 on his death.

4. During trial the prosecution side has examined nine witnesses and also adduced six documentary evidences.

5. On perusal of the C.R, it appears that one seizure list and the statement of the victim u/s 164 of Cr.P.C are exhibited as Ext.2. However, for convenience of discussion and identification, the statement of the victim u/s 164 of Cr.P.C is renumbered as Ext.7 and the same is signed accordingly.

6. At the close of the prosecution evidence, the accused were examined U/S. 313 of the Cr.P.C. in reference to the incriminating circumstances appearing against them in the prosecution evidences. Defence side has adduced no evidence and plea of the accused is of total denial.

7. After perusing the records, considering the materials produced, hearing the arguments of the learned counsels for both the sides and the accused the following points are taken as **POINTS FOR DETERMINATION:**

(i) Whether on 20-03-2012 at about 5.30 P.M the accused had kidnapped or abducted Md. Joinal Abedin from Sirajuli Center in order that Joinal Abedin may be murdered or might be disposed of as to be put in danger of being murdered ?

(ii) Whether on the same day, time and place the accused, in order to commit extortion, had put or took

attempt to put Joinal Abedin, the son of the informant, in fear of death or grievous hurt?

(iii) Whether from 20-03-2012 for a consecutive period of three days or more, the accused had wrongfully confined Joinal Abedin in an unknown place?

**DISCUSSION, DECISION AND REASONS THEREOF:**

**Point No. (i):** *Whether on 20-03-2012 at about 5.30 P.M the accused had kidnapped or abducted Md. Joinal Abedin from Sirajuli Center in order that Joinal Abedin may be murdered or might be disposed of as to be put in danger of being murdered?*

8. In this case PW-1 Md. Abdul Rashid is the informant. He stated that, his son Joinal Abedin went to Sirajuli Center and did not come back. After 4 days of the incident Joinal called him over phone but could not say anything about his location. Later on Joinal was recovered at a place called Madhursapori. After returning, Joinal Abedin told him that he along with accused Abdul Salam and Md. Bahejuddin went to Orang for searching a bride for Abdul Salam. When they reached Orang turning some people suddenly got down from a Maruti Van and took Joinal to an unknown place in the Maruti Van. Accused Berek Ali, Abdul Salam and Md Bahejuddin had pushed Joinal to the Maruti Van. Some Alcoholic substances were also forcefully administered to Joinal for which he became unstable to move

9. PW.6 is the wife of the complainant and mother of the victim. She also stated that Joinal Abedin went to Sirajuli Center on that day. Later on she heard that Abdul Salam and Bahejuddin took him to Madhurchuburi. After 5 days police recovered Joinal from Madhurchuburi. Joinal told her that Abdul Salam and Bahejuddin kidnapped Joinal from Sirajuli Center.

10. PW.7 is the victim Joinal Abedin Khan. He deposed that Abdul Salam and Bahejuddin asked Joinal to go with them to Orang for searching a bride for Abdul Salam. He went with Abdul Salam on his Bike and Abdul took him towards Paharipathar road. There he saw one Maruti 800 which was standing on the road. Four persons were standing near the Maruti Car and they forcefully dragged him to the car. The said persons bound and gagged Joinal and also tighten up his eyes. Thereafter, they shifted Joinal to an unknown place, where he was kept in a house for 4/5 days. Later on, police recovered him from that unknown place and he came to know that the said place was Madhursapori.

11. PW.2 and PW.3 were two friends of Joinal Abedin namely Ajibur Rahman and Fakrul Islam. They said that they went to the house of the informant for attending "Sunnat". After attending the function they along with Joinal Abedin went to Sirajuli Center. Later on, they came to know that Bahejuddin and Abdul Salam took Joinal and thereafter Joinal Abedin went off missing.

12. PW.4 is a shopkeeper, who stated that, at the time of incident Ajibur Rahman, Fakrul Islam and Joinal Abedin came to the shop and they had tea together. Thereafter, they left his shop. Later on, he heard that Joinal Abedin went off missing.

13. PW.5 Tahidul Islam Khan has deposed that when he was about to close his shop, he saw that the motorcycle of the informant was standing in front of his shop. Then he told the informant who asked him to wait for some time and to search Joinal Abedin. But Joinal Abedin was not traced out. Later on, Joinal Abedin was recovered from Khetachar of Kharupetia.

14. PW.8 is another shopkeeper, who deposed that one boy came to his shop, purchased bread and left his shop. Later on, he came to know that the said boy went off missing.

15. PW.9 is retired Inspector of Police Sri Dhananjay Kr. Das. As the I.O Manik Rajbongshi expired, PW.9 has exhibited the seizure lists, charge-sheet, sketch map and the signatures of the I.O, as he is acquainted with the signature of the I.O SI Manik Rajbongshi.

16. These are the evidences adduced by the prosecution side in support of it's case. From these evidences it is seen that PW.2 and PW.3 were the two persons with whom the victim Joinal Abedin went to Sirajuli Center from his house. They have deposed about



the fact of going the victim to Sirajuli Center with them and his subsequent missing. PW.5 and PW.8 are two shopkeepers, who stated that the victim Joinal came to their shops and they also stated about their knowledge of subsequent missing of Joinal. PW.1, PW.6 and PW.7 were the informant/father of the victim, mother of the victim and victim himself respectively. PW.1 and PW.6 have stated that Joinal Abedin went to Sirajuli Center and did not come back. Later on, Joinal was recovered with the help of police. After recovery of Joinal Abedin, Joinal Abedin told them that he went with Abdul Salam and Bahejuddin to Orang and from Orang, Joinal was taken to an unknown place in a Maruti Van. PW.1 has deposed that Joinal Abedin told him that accused Berek Ali, Abdul Salam and Bahejuddin pushed Joinal into the Maruti vehicle. PW.7, who is the victim has stated that he went to Sirajuli Center with Ajibur Rahman and Fakrul Islam and thereafter, he went towards Orang with Abdul Salam and Bahejuddin. But at Paharipota road four unknown persons from a Maruti Car bound and gagged him and dragged him to the Maruti Car. They took him to an unknown place and kept him in a house for 4/5 days. Later on, he came to know that the said place was Madhursapori. Thus, it is seen that, by adducing the eight witnesses, the prosecution side has panted its story step by step that the victim went to Sirajuli Center with his friends. Thereafter, he went towards Orang with accused Bahejuddin and Abdul Salam and on the way he was bound and gagged

and took to Madhursapori from where police recovered him. After recovery, his parents came to know the story in detail from the victim. Thus it is seen that Joinal Abedin was forcefully taken to an unknown place.

17. PW.7 further stated that the accused have shown him a pistol while he was confined in the unknown place. Even if we do not consider the fact of showing the pistol as proved, taking a person by binding and gagging and confining him in an unknown place itself is sufficient for reasonable apprehension of danger. Thus, in absence of any adverse circumstance appeared from the evidence, I am of the opinion that there is no question on the fact of putting the victim in danger of being murdered.

18. IPC defines kidnapping in 2 ways viz.,(i) kidnapping from lawful guardianship and (ii) kidnapping from India. However no evidence is led by the prosecution side to show that the victim was a minor at the time of incident to consider the case in hand as a case of kidnapping from lawful guardianship. On the other hand, this is not a case of kidnapping from India also. Here the victim was not conveyed beyond limits of India. However, from the discussion of the forgoing paragraphs it is seen that taking away of the victim by the accused Bahejuddin and Berek Ali forcefully by binding and gagging him to an unknown place without his consent is proved. Thus, it is a clear case of abduction. The statement of the victim clearly indicates absence of his consent. He deposed that he was

bound and gagged by the accused. He was forcefully pushed into the Maruti Car. Some alcoholic substance was administered to him for which he became unstable. Pistol was shown to him during his confinement. All these facts indicate that the victim had no consent to his taking away to the unknown place by the accused persons.

19. The defence side tried to bring some contradictions by stating that the informant did not state before police that

“when my son and the accused persons reached the Orang turning some people suddenly got down from a Maruti Van and forcefully took my son to the Maruti Van and shifted him to an unknown place. My son further told me that some alcoholic substances were forcefully given to him and due to that he was in an unstable state of condition to move”.

20. The defence side has also stated that PW.6, the mother of the victim did not state before the police that

“my son Joynal Abedin went to Sirajuli Center for marketing. Later I heard Abdul Salam and Bahajuddin took him to Madhur Chapori. Thereafter, we have searched my son here and there but failed to trace him out. On next my husband received one phone call from unknown person with a demand of Rs. 50 Lacs for the release of my son. Then my husband lodged ejahar before the Police Station. After 5 days Police recovered my son from Madhur Chapori. My son told us that Abdul Salam and Bahajuddin kidnapped him from Sirajuli Center” and that “my son told us that Abdul Salam and Bahajuddin kidnapped him from Sirajuli Center”.

21. On perusal of the C/D, it appears that the said statements of PW.1 and PW.6, which were exhibited by the defence side as Ext. A and Ext. B are not present in their

statement under Section 161 of Cr.P.C. However, it is also seen from the C/D that the I.O has taken the statements of PW-1 & PW-6 before recovery of the victim Joinal Abedin. Their statements were taken just after filing the FIR. Those facts which were exhibited as Ext.A and Ext. B were came to the knowledge of PW.1 and PW.6 only after recovery of the victim Joinal Abedin. Thus, there is no question of stating those facts by PW.1 and PW.6 to the I.O before recovery of the victim Joinal Abedin. As such, I do not find any discrepancy in not stating those facts before the I.O by PW.1 and PW.6 which were not within their knowledge at the time of giving their statements u/s 164 of CrPC.

In view of the evidence available, it appears that the defence side could not rebut the evidences adduced by the prosecution side, by which the prosecution side has clearly proved that the accused were involved and the accused had abducted the victim Joinal Abedin. However, the victim himself has deposed that the accused Barek Ali in no way is connected with the incident. The victim being the primary witness of the entire incident has denied the involvement of the accused Barek Ali with the incident. Thus, the case against the accused Barek Ali became doubtful. Under such circumstance, I am of the opinion that the prosecution side has successfully proved beyond reasonable doubt that the accused Bahejuddin and Muzafar Ali have abducted the victim Joinal Abedin, but it

is not prayed that the accused Barek Ali has abducted Joinal.

Hence point No. (i) is decided **negative against the accused Barek Ali and decided affirmative against the accused Bahejuddin and Muzafar Ali.**

**Point No. (ii):** *Whether on the same day, time and place the accused, in order to commit extortion, had put or took attempt to put Joinal Abedin, the son of the informant, in fear of death or grievous hurt?*

22. The prosecution side has stated that the accused had demanded Rs. 50 lakhs from the informant over phone. But no call list in support of the plea is adduced by the prosecution side. Even the phone of the informant was not seized. The mobile phone of the accused Nasirul Haque along with SIM card was seized, but the seizure was not proved by adducing the evidence of the seizure witnesses. On the other hand, the victim has stated that he was released by the accused persons by telling him that his father has paid the demanded money. But he does not know to whom his father paid the money. The informant as PW-1 has stated that he received phone call by demanding money. But except this oral testimony, no proof is adduced by the prosecution side in that respect. Even his mobile phone or call list was not adduced which are important material and concrete evidence to prove the prosecution case. On the basis of only oral

testimony where there is sufficient scope of collection of material and documentary evidences, I am of the opinion that the prosecution side has miserably failed to prove the plea of extortion. Here neither the demand nor the payment is proved with sufficient evidence. Hence, I hold that the prosecution has failed to prove beyond reasonable doubt the extortion or even any attempt of extortion by the accused persons.

Hence point No. (ii) is decided **negative**.

**Point No. (iii):** *Whether from 20-03-2012 for a consecutive period of three days or more, the accused had wrongfully confined Joinal Abedin in an unknown place?*

23. From the discussion of point No. (i), it is seen that the prosecution side has successfully proved that the victim Joinal Abedin went to Sirajuli Center with PW.2 and PW.3. PW.2 and PW.3 have stated the said fact and also deposed about their knowledge regarding subsequent missing of Joinal Abedin. PW. 5 and PW.8 who were two shopkeepers of Sirajuli Center also deposed about their knowledge regarding missing of Joinal, after he came to Sirajuli Center. PW.1 and PW.6 have deposed about the fact of missing of Joinal Abedin and his subsequent recovery. Joinal Abedin has stated the entire story of his kidnapping and PW.1 and PW.6 have also stated about their knowledge derived from Joinal Abedin regarding the kidnapping of Joinal Abedin by the accused persons. Thus, there is no missing link in the prosecution case regarding

the abduction of Joinal Abedin by the accused Bahejuddin and Abdul Salam and their associates as well as the subsequent recovery of Joinal, although the case against accused Barek Ali is not prayed beyond doubt. Joinal Abedin has stated the same facts in his statement u/s 164 Cr.P.C which is exhibited as Ext.2. The FIR is also proved by PW.1 as Ext.1. Joinal has clearly described the incident as to how the accused had kept him in a house for 4/5 days in an unknown place. His statement u/s 164 of Cr.P.C is totally corroborative to his deposition before this court as PW.7. In view of the nature of the offence, i.e, confining someone secretly in a place, the circumstance does not always demands so many other witnesses to depose about personal knowledge regarding the secrete confinement. Under the given circumstance the sole testimony of the victim which is corroborative with his statement u/s 164 of Cr.P.C and also with earlier statement u/s 161 of Cr.P.C, is sufficient to consider the deposition as reliable. Apart from that, PW.1 and PW.6 have also supported the statement of the victim as they heard those facts from the victim just after the recovery of the victim. The defence side could neither rebut the prosecution evidence, nor brought any other circumstance to the light to show that the victim was not abducted or confined by the accused persons and he was at some other place only. The witnesses PW-1, 6 and 7 have proved 5 days confinement of the victim by their oral testimony.

24. There is a mistake in citing the date of occurrence by PW.6. PW.6 is a lady, who is by profession of a house wife. The incident took place in the year 2012 and her evidence was recorded in the year 2019. She has cited the date of occurrence as 03-03-2012, which should be 20-03-2012, as per the prosecution story. But it appears that this mistake of date is an acceptable human error. Except the date, her other descriptions regarding the incident, are not deviated from the prosecution story. As such, I am of the opinion that mere mistake of this date is not fatal to the prosecution story.

25. In view of the aforesaid observations, I am of the opinion that it is proved beyond reasonable doubt that the accused Bahejuddin and Abdul Salem had wrongfully confined Joinal Abedin in an unknown place. However, the victim himself denied the involvement of the accused Berek Ali in the incident. Hence, the case is not proved against the accused Berek Ali beyond reasonable doubt.

Hence point No. (iii) is decided **negative against the accused Berek Ali and decided affirmative against the accused Bahejuddin and Muzafar Ali.**

26. From the discussion of point No.(i), it is seen that accused Md. Bahejuddin Seikh and Md. Muzafar Ali abducted Md. Joinal Abedin from Sirajuli Center in order that Joinal Abedin may be murdered or might be disposed of as to be put in danger of being murdered. From the discussion of point No.(iii), it is seen that the accused Md.



Bahejuddin Seikh and Md. Muzafar Ali had wrongfully confined Md. Joinal Abedin in an unknown place for a consecutive period of more than 3 days. As such **I hold the accused Bahejuddin and Mujafar Ali guilty U/S 364 and section 343 of IPC.**

27. In the interest of justice and considering the nature of the offence, I decided **not to release the accused persons Bahejuddin and Mujafar Ali on probation of good conduct** as it will encourage occurrence of this type of offence in the society and faith of the people on justice delivery system will be decreased by such release. Apart from that this is a case of affecting personal liberty of movement of a person, which is a case of serious nature. Also, there exists every possibility that the accused will commit offence of the same type without any hesitation if they are so released without allowing them to suffer the consequences of their act.

**SENTENCE HEARING:**

28. The accused Bahejuddin and Abdul Salem were heard on the question of sentence. Considering their statements, nothing appeared to me to deal with the matter of the sentence of the accused persons in a lenient way. Mere presence of kids, unmarried sister or aged parents at home cannot be a sufficient ground to evade the process of law. However, from the facts and circumstances of the case, it appears that, the prosecution

side has not adduced any evidence to show that the victim has sustained any injury as a consequence of putting the victim in danger of being murdered. The victim was recovered in a sound condition. No mental or physical injury appeared as suffered by the victim. The victim was recovered after five days, which cannot be considered as a very long period of detention in a case of abduction. As such, I do not prefer to impose punishment upon the accused Bahejuddin and Mujafar Ali towards the upper limit provided by the IPC. Hence, **for the offence u/s 364 of IPC the accused Bahejuddin and Mujafar Ali are sentenced to rigorous imprisonment for five years with a fine of Rs. 500/-, each, in default S.I for 10 days. For the offence u/s 343 of IPC the accused Md. Bahejuddin and Md. Mujafar Ali are sentenced to rigorous imprisonment for two years. Both the imprisonments will run concurrently.**

29. As per provision of **section 428 of Cr.P.C.** the period of detention already undergone by the accused persons Bahejuddin and Mujafar Ali during investigation, inquiry and trial of the case be **set off** against the sentence of imprisonment.

30. The **fine**, after realization, be **given to the victim Joinal Abedin.**

31. The seized Maruti 800, R/C, Mobile phone, 2 SIM Cards, Motorcycle R/C be returned to the rela owners in due course of law.

32. Accused **Md. Berek Ali is acquitted from the case. Bail bond for Md. Berek Ali extended for next six months.**

33. Let the **free certified copy of the judgment be furnished to the accused Md. Bahejuddin and Md. Mujafar Ali.**

Given under my hand and the seal of this Court on this 29<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2022.

( **C. Khanikar** )  
Asstt. Sessions Judge,  
Sonitpur, Tezpur

**APPENDIX -14**  
**LIST OF PROSECUTION / DEFENCE / COURT WITNESSES**

**A. Prosecution:**

<b>RANK</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>NATURE OF EVIDENCE</b> (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
PW: 1	Md. Abdul Rashid Khan	informant
PW: 2	Md. Ajibur Rahman	Other witness
PW:3	Md. Fakrul Islam	Other witness
PW:4	Md. Abdul Ali	Other witness
PW:5	Md. Tahidul Islam	Other witness
PW:6	Musstt. Jiraton Nessa	Other witness
PW:7	Md. Joinal Abedin	victim
PW:8	Sri Ajit Kr. Roy	Other witness
PW:9	Sri Dhananjay Kr. Das	I.O

**B. Defence Witnesses, if any :**

<b>RANK</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>NATURE OF EVIDENCE</b> (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
NIL	NIL	NIL

**C. Court Witnesses, if any :**

<b>RANK</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>NATURE OF EVIDENCE</b> (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
NIL	NIL	NIL

**LIST OF PROSECUTION/ DEFENCE/ COURT EXHIBITS****A. Prosecution:**

<b>Sr. No</b>	<b>Exhibit Number</b>	<b>Description</b>
1.	Ext.1	FIR
2.	Ext.2	Sketch Map
3.	Ext.3	Seizure List
4.	Ext.4	Seizure List
5.	Ext.5	Seizure List
6.	Ext.6	Charge-Sheet
7.	Ext.7	Statement of the victim u/s 164 CrPC

**B. Defence:**

<b>Sr. No</b>	<b>Exhibit Number</b>	<b>Description</b>
1	EXT A	Part of deposition of PW- 1
2	EXT B	Part of deposition of PW- 6

**C. Court Exhibits:**

<b>Sr. No</b>	<b>Exhibit Number</b>	<b>Description</b>
NIL	NIL	NIL

**D. Material Objects:**

<b>Sr. No</b>	<b>Exhibit Number</b>	<b>Description</b>
NIL	NIL	NIL

( **C. Khanikar** )  
Asstt. Sessions Judge,  
Sonitpur, Tezpur