

G.R.CASE NO. 1209/2014

**IN THE COURT OF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE FIRST
CLASS, DIBRUGARH, ASSAM**

G.R.CASE NO. 1209/2014

(U/S- 498A r/w Section 34 IPC)

Present: Smti. Sanskrita Khanikar, A.J.S.

Judicial Magistrate First Class, Dibrugarh

State

- VS -

1. Sri Manash Gohain @ Manab

S/O - Late Ranjan Gohain

R/O - Romai Kordoibam Gaon

P.S. - Lahowal

Dist - Dibrugarh, Assam

2. Sri Ranjan Gohain

S/O - Late Ambeswar Gohain

R/O - Romai Kordoibam Gaon

P.S. - Lahowal

G.R.CASE NO. 1209/2014

Dist - Dibrugarh, Assam

3. Smti. Sapna Gohain

W/O - Late Ranjan Gohain

R/O - Romain Kordoibam Gaon

P.S. - Lahowal

Dist - Dibrugarh, Assam

4. Smti. Borokha Gohain

W/O - Sri Parag Konwar

R/O - Romain Kordoibam Gaon

P.S. - Lahowal

Dist - Dibrugarh, Assam

.....**Accused persons.**

Advocate for the Prosecution	: Learned Smti. Lakshmi Mohan
Advocate for the Defence	: Learned Sri Manoj Sahu
Evidence recorded on	: 03-05-2016,05-01- 2018, 06-03-2018, 02-08-2018, 26-11-

G.R.CASE NO. 1209/2014

2018, 25-02-2019,
25-08-2021

Argument heard on : 22-11-2021

Judgment delivered on : 01-12-2021

J U D G M E N T

1. The prosecution case as stated in the F.I.R. registered on 13-05-2014 is that the informant Sri Pabitra Baruah is the father of Smti. Rimpi Baruah who was married to Sri Manash Gohain on 15-04-2011. The informant alleged in the F.I.R. that after the marriage, his daughter was subjected to physical and mental torture in connection with demands for dowry by her husband, her parents-in-law and her sister-in-law. On 13-05-2014 at about 3:00 p.m. in the evening, his daughter Smti. Rimpi Baruah sustained serious injuries on her person due to the atrocities committed upon her by her husband and in-laws due to which she had to be admitted to Adiya Nursing Home, Dibrugarh.
2. A case was registered at Lahoal P.S. subsequent to the lodging of this F.I.R. which was filed against the accused Sri Manash Gohain being the victim's

G.R.CASE NO. 1209/2014

husband, her father-in-law Sri Ranjan Gohain, her mother-in-law Smti. Sapna Gohain and her sister-in-law Smti. Borokha Gohain. Upon completion of investigation, the police submitted charge-sheet against them u/sec 498A of the Indian Penal Code (hereinafter referred to as I.P.C.).

3. The accused persons stood for trial. Copies of the relevant documents were furnished to them as required by Section 207 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (hereinafter referred to as Cr.P.C.). Upon careful perusal of the materials on record and after hearing both sides on the point of consideration of charge, a prima facie case was found u/sec 498A r/w Section 34 of the IPC against the accused persons. A formal charge u/sec 498A r/w Section 34, IPC was framed, read over and explained to the accused persons to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.
4. During the trial, accused Ranjan Gohain expired and vide order dated 20-01-2020 the instant case stood abated against the accused Ranjan Gohain.
5. In support of the case, the prosecution side has examined as many as 8 (eight) witnesses namely Sri Pabitra Baruah being the informant of the case as PW-1, Smti. Rumi Baruah as PW-2, Smti. Chimpi Gohain as PW-3, Sri Keshab Gohain as PW-4, Sri

G.R.CASE NO. 1209/2014

Siba Gogoi as PW-5, Smti. Sumalata Gohain as PW-6, Dr. Jagadish Konwar as PW-7 and Sri Kangan Baruah as PW-8.

The prosecution also took aid of 2 (two) documents which are as follows:

The ejahar as Exhibit 1 and the injury report of the victim Smti. Rimpi Baruah as Exhibit 2.

6. After recording the prosecution evidence, the statement of the accused persons were recorded u/sec 313 of Cr.P.C. The defence plea is that of total denial and the accused persons claimed innocence. The defence did not adduce any evidence.
7. I have heard the arguments from both sides and meticulously perused the entire evidence on record.
8. THE POINT FOR DETERMINATION:

Whether the accused persons being the husband, mother-in-law and sister-in-law of the victim Rimpi Baruah, in furtherance of their common intention, committed acts of physical and mental cruelty on her, followed by demands of dowry and thereby committed an offence punishable u/sec 498 A r/w Section 34 of the IPC?

DISCUSSION, DECISION AND REASONS THEREON:

9. PW-1, being the informant, deposed in his evidence that the accused Sri Manash Gohain is his son-in-law, accused Late Ranjan Gohain is his father, accused Smti. Sapna Gohain is his mother and Smti. Borokha Gohain is his sister. His daughter Smti. Rimpi Baruah was married to accused Sri Manash Gohain in April, 2011. Thereafter Smti. Rimpi Baruah began residing at the matrimonial home at Ghuramara Kordoibam. On the day of the wedding, PW-1 got to know that the accused Sri Manash Gohain had passed his matriculation on that day. His daughter Smti. Rimpi Baruah at that time was studying in H.S. first year. He stated that about 15 days after their marriage, the accused persons started to harass Smti. Rimpi Baruah in connection with demand for dowry. He sometimes used to give money to the accused Sri Manash Gohain. On one occasion, he gave Rs. 50,000/- to the accused Sri Manash Gohain. Every now and then he used to give accused Sri Manash Gohain Rs. 10,000/- to Rs. 15,000/- and as such, he had given almost upto Rs. 3,00,000/- to the accused Sri Manash Gohain.

On one occasion, the accused Sri Manash Gohain and his daughter came to him and asked him for

G.R.CASE NO. 1209/2014

Rs. 15,000/-. He could give him Rs. 10,000/- only. They took the money but while returning back, the accused Sri Manash Gohain left Smti. Rimpi Gohain near Khanikar Park, Dibrugarh and went home alone. PW-1 then took his daughter back to her matrimonial home where the accused Sri Manash Gohain started physically assaulting her right in front of him. After about 15 days of this incident, his daughter Smti. Rimpi Baruh again came to him asking for money. The next day, Smti. Rimpi Baruah went back to the matrimonial home along with some articles. She was accompanied by her mother being PW-3 and her sister. They dropped Smti. Rimpi Baruah near the matrimonial home and returned back to their home. The next day, a local person from the village of the accused persons informed his sister-in-law over phone that his daughter Smti. Rimpi Baruah's condition was quite serious. Then, he immediately left for his daughter's matrimonial home but on the way, at Lahowal, he saw the accused Sri Manash Gohain taking his daughter to the hospital. His daughter was first taken to AMCH, Dibrugarh but subsequently, she was admitted to Aditya Nursing Home, Dibrugarh. He lodged the ejahar on being asked to do so by the doctors at the hospital. He proved Exhibit 1 as the ejahar by identifying

G.R.CASE NO. 1209/2014

Exhibit 1(1) as his signature therein. He later came to know that the accused persons had physically assaulted his daughter and had locked her in a room. The public had to break open the door of the room in order to rescue her. His daughter was admitted at Aditya Nursing Home for about 3 days after which she was brought to her parental home. Ever since, she had been staying at the parental home. His statement was recorded by the police. His daughter Smti.Rimpi Gohain expired on 04-01-2016 at Astha Hospital, Dibrugarh. At that time she was not keeping well.

During his cross-examination, he stated that the ejahar was written by the O/C, Lahowal P.S. It was then copied by his daughter Smti. Dimpi Baruah and signed by him. The marriage between his daughter and the accused Sri Manash Gogain was a love marriage. He stated that after their marriage, he visited his daughter's matrimonial home a few times. He does not know if the accused persons were not at home during the incident. He denied the defence suggestion that the accused persons were the ones who admitted his daughter to Aditya Nursing Home. He also denied the defence suggestion that his daughter had told him so. He stated that the police had only asked him his name and not recorded his

statement. The police had recorded his daughter's statement at the Aditya Nursing Home. He stated that he had not mentioned anything regarding demand of money in the ejahar. He neither mentioned in the ejahar nor mentioned to the police that he had given Rs. 3,00,000/- to the accused Sri Manash Gohain. He denied the defence suggestion that no such incident as deposed by him had taken place. He also denied the defence suggestion that he had deposed falsely in the Court.

10. PW-2 is the informant's wife. In her evidence she deposed that the accused Sri Manash Gohain is his son-in-law, accused Sri Ranjan Gohain is his father, accused Smti. Sapna Gohain is his mother and Smti. Borokha Gohain is his sister. Her daughter married the accused Sri Manash Gohain in the year 2012. It was a love marriage, but subsequently, the marriage rituals were performed socially. Thereafter, her daughter began residing at the matrimonial home. According to her, about 6 months after her daughter's marriage, the informant/PW-1 was admitted in hospital due to some illness. Smti. Rimpi Baruah paid them a visit in the hospital but her family members stopped her to help with the informant's care at the hospital. After she went back to the matrimonial

G.R.CASE NO. 1209/2014

home, the accused persons began harassing her in connection with demand for dowry. She stated that she and her husband had given Rs. 50,000/- to the accused Sri Manash Gohain for purchasing a vehicle. Subsequently, the accused began demanding money from them, sometimes they demanded Rs. 15,000/- to Rs. 20,000/-. The PWs 1 and 2 used to give them money because the accused used to harass their daughter in connection with these demands. On one occasion, the accused demanded money from the PW-2 over phone. When the PW-2 expressed her inability to give the money, they sold her daughter's gold earrings. According to the PW-2, the accused did not want their daughter to conceive a child and they made her consume some locally made medicines.

On one occasion, her daughter came to the parental home and stayed the night. The next day, she was informed over the phone by some people that her daughter's condition was serious and that they should bring her back from the matrimonial home. Then, she called the accused Sri Manash Gohain and asked him to bring back their daughter. The accused persons brought her daughter to AMCH, Dibrugarh but PW-2 and her family got the victim admitted to Aditya Nursing

G.R.CASE NO. 1209/2014

Home, Dibrugarh. At that time, her daughter's wrists were cut. Her daughter recovered after undergoing treatment at Aditya Nursing Home. All her daughter's medical expenses were borne by the PWs 1 and 2. She was then brought back to the parental home. The accused persons did not take any news of their daughter even once. After about a year since this incident, Smti. Rimpi Baruah developed a cough and as such, she was admitted to Pooja Hospital. On 04-01-2016 she expired at Pooja Hospital. According to the doctors there, water had accumulated in her heart due to intake of something bad. On being asked by the doctor, PW-2 told him about the locally made medicines which her daughter was made to consume by the accused persons. She stated that her daughter was alive at the time of institution of the instant case.

During her cross-examination, she stated that after her daughter's marriage, she had been to her daughter's matrimonial home about three times. Her statement was recorded by the Police at Aditya Nursing Home. She did not state before the police that the accused had demanded Rs. 15,000/- to Rs. 20,000/- from her. She also did not state to the Police that upon her inability to accede to the monetary demands of the accused, they

G.R.CASE NO. 1209/2014

sold off her daughter's gold earrings. She did not state to the police that her daughter's wrists were cut as the Police had not asked her about it. She denied the defence suggestion that in 2014, when her daughter was pregnant, she disclosed about the pregnancy only to her and not to her husband. She has no knowledge if her daughter had undergone abortion without informing her husband. She denied the defence suggestion that her daughter asked the accused Sri Manash Gohain to not ask her anything about the abortion and that otherwise she would kill herself. She has no knowledge if her daughter cut her wrists on her own in the absence of the accused persons. She denied the defence suggestion that the accused had admitted her daughter to Aditya Nursing Home and that all her medical expenses were borne by the accused. She denied the defence suggestion that she deposed falsely in the Court.

11. PW-3 deposed in her evidence that the accused persons are known to her. The informant is not known to her. The incident occurred in the year 2014. At that time, she was visiting the house of the accused when upon entering the victim Smti. Rimpi Baruah's room she saw her lying on the floor. She also saw blood on the floor of Smti. Rimpi Baruah's room. She immediately ran out and

G.R.CASE NO. 1209/2014

informed her uncle Sri Keshab Gohain (PW-4) about the incident. Then, Sri Keshab Gohain and the neighbours upon hearing the cries of Smti. Rimpi Baruah brought her outside. She was then taken to the hospital. Subsequently, Smti. Rimpi Baruah went to her parental home and stayed there until her death. The said incident occurred about 3 years after the marriage of the victim Smti. Rimpi Baruah. The victim Smti. Rimpi Baruah had no children.

During her cross-examination, she stated that her statement was recorded by the police at her house which was near the victim's matrimonial home. On the day of the incident, the victim was alone at her matrimonial home. She stated that the victim had never spoken to her anything against her husband. According to the PW-3, the victim appeared to live peacefully with the accused. She could not remember if she had stated to the police that there was blood on the floor of the victim's room at the time of the incident.

12. PW-4 deposed in his evidence that the accused persons are his relatives. The informant is not known to him. The victim Smti. Rimpi Baruah i.e. the wife of the accused Sri Manash Gohain was known to him. He stated that at present the victim

does not stay with the accused Sri Manash Gohain. He does not know anything about the incident. His cross-examination has been declined by the defence.

13. PW-5 deposed in his evidence that the accused persons are his neighbours. The informant is not known to him. The victim Smti. Rimpi Baruah being the wife of the accused Sri Manash Gohain is known to him. According to him the victim and the accused Sri Manash Gohain had married out of love but that subsequently, the victim left her matrimonial home. He does not know anything about the incident. His cross-examination has been declined by the defence.
14. PW-6 deposed in her evidence that the accused persons are known to her. The informant is not known to her. She does not know anything about the incident. Her cross-examination has been declined by the defence.
15. PW-7 being the M.O. deposed in his evidence that on 13-05-2014 at about 3:00 p.m. he was serving as Medical Officer at Aditya Nursing Home. On that day he examined Smti. Rimpi Baruah Gohain, W/O Sri Manash Gohain, female, R/O of Kordoibam Village with alleged history of cut injury. Upon

G.R.CASE NO. 1209/2014

examination of the patient, he found cut injury with sharp weapon i.e. blade on both hands near wrist joint of 1 ½ inch length with slight bleeding. The patient was admitted for treatment for a day. The injury was of simple nature caused by sharp object. He proved Exhibit 2 as the medical report by identifying Exhibit 2(1) as his signature therein.

During his cross-examination, he stated that the patient was admitted in the hospital by her husband. The police did not examine him in connection with the instant case. There is no issue number on the medical report and the same did not contain any forwarding from the Superintendent of the hospital. The injury was self-cut injury.

16. PW-8 deposed in his evidence that the informant is his father but he expired on 13-04-2019. The accused persons are known to him as they are the husband, parents-in-law and sister-in-law of his sister Smti. Rimpi Baruah. Sometime in the year 2014, when he was at Moran, he was informed over the phone by his sister Smti. Dimpi Baruah that his sister Smti. Rimpi Baruah had cut her wrists at her matrimonial home. He then immediately rushed to Aditya Nursing Home, Dibrugarh where he saw his siter Smti. Rimpi

G.R.CASE NO. 1209/2014

Baruah in a state of unconsciousness. Both her wrists bore cut injuries. A few days later, when his sister Smti Rimpi Baruah gained consciousness, she stated that members of her husband's family cut her wrists. After her discharge from the hospital, she was brought to her parental home. Then the informant/PW-1 lodged the instant case.

His sister Smti. Rimpi Baruah was married in April, 2011. According to the PW-8, his sister Smti. Rimpi Baruah's relation with her in-laws was not very good as they had eloped in order to get married. Sometime after his sister's marriage, he came to know from his mother (PW-2) that his sister's in-laws had demanded Rs. 50,000/- from his father (PW-1/informant). He does not know if his father actually paid the said cash amount to the accused. He also stated that the accused Sri Manash Gohain sometimes used to physically assault his sister Smti. Rimpi Baruah regarding demands for money.

During his cross-examination, he stated that Smti. Rimpi Baruah had married the accused Sri Manash Gohain out of love and that they had visited the parental home of the victim after their marriage. He also stated that even though they were a married couple but every now and then there were arguments between them. The PW-8 stated that

although he mentioned during his examination-in-chief that the accused used to subject the victim to physical assault he did not see it for himself but had only heard about it from others. On 2014, his sister was pregnant but he does not know if his sister had informed the accused Sri Manash Gohain about the abortion or not. He does not know if his sister had cut her wrists on being asked about the abortion. He does not know who admitted his sister to Aditya Nursing Home. He denied the defence suggestion that his sister was alone at the matrimonial home during the time of the incident. He does not know if the accused Ranjan Gohain and the accused Sri Manash Gohain were not at home during the time of the incident. He does not know if the accused Smti. Sapna Gohain and Smti. Borokha Gohain were not at home during the time of the incident. He does not know how many houses there are around his sister's matrimonial home. His statement was recorded by the police. He stated that the police had also recorded the statements of his father (PW-1) and sister Smti. Dimpi Baruah. Although he has not seen the sufferings of his sister at the hands of her in-laws with his own eyes, he had heard about it from his mother (PW-2) and his sister Smti. Dimpi Baruah. He denied the defence

suggestion that his sister Smti. Rimpi Baruah did not state about the acts of physical assault committed upon her by the accused to her mother.

17. Now, the stage has been set to appreciate the evidence on record in the light of the essential ingredients of the offences alleged to have been committed by the accused. It appears from the prosecution evidence that the victim Smti. Rimpi Baruah was the sole direct witness in this case. From the evidence on record, it transpires that Rimpi Baruah was married to the accused Sri Manash Gohain sometime in the month of April, 2011 and the instant case was instituted in the month of May, 2014. But from the order dated 27-06-2016, it transpires that the victim Rimpi Baruah expired. A copy of her death certificate was annexed with the service report of the summons to her and the same has been found tagged with the case record. As such, her evidence could not be recorded by the Court. PWs 1, 2 and 8 are the informant's father, mother and brother respectively. They have mostly reiterated the testimonial version of PW-1 i.e. the informant. PWs 4, 5 and 6 have categorically deposed that they do not know anything about the incident and as such, their cross-examinations were declined by the defence. The I.O. of the instant case Sri Rohit

Sadhanidhar had expired on 01-01-2020 and as such, his evidence could not be recorded by the Court.

18. Coming to the offence u/sec 498 A, its essence lies in the Explanation to section 498 A, IPC which defines cruelty as follows:

Explanation - For the purposes of this Section, "cruelty" means-

- a. Any wilful conduct which is of such a nature as is likely to drive the woman to commit suicide or to cause grave injury or danger to life, limb or health (whether mental or physical) of the woman; or
- b. Harassment of the women where such harassment is with a view to coercing her or any person related to her to meet an unlawful demand for any property or valuable security or is on account of failure by her or any person related to her to meet any unlawful demand for any property or valuable security or is on account of failure by her or any person related to her to meet such demand.

Thus, it becomes clear that as per Section 498A of the IPC, the term 'cruelty' is comprised of two elements. Let us first examine whether these elements are present in the prosecution case.

19. The first element of the explanation to Section 498 A, IPC is physical torture, which may result in death by way of suicide or cause grave injury or danger to life, limb or health (whether physical or mental). It implies that the situation created by the conduct of the accused must be such which the accused knows would drive the wife to commit suicide or would cause grave injury or danger to her life, limb or health. PW-1 deposed in his evidence that on one day the accused Sri Manash Gohain physically assaulted his daughter right in front of him. But he could not mention the date of the incident. The same is also not corroborated by the evidence of any other PWs. The PW-2 deposed in her evidence that her daughter was forced to consume locally made medicines by the accused in order to avoid becoming pregnant. This has also not been corroborated by the evidence of any other PWs. Though the PW-2 has linked the cause of her daughter's death in 2016 to the forcible consumption of the so called locally made medicines, there is no evidence to prove the same. From the testimonies of PWs 1 and 2, it transpires that on one day, they received information from someone over the phone that their daughter was in a serious condition at the matrimonial home and that they need to come and take her from there.

G.R.CASE NO. 1209/2014

Both PWs 1 and 2 being the parents of the victim, did not mention the date on which the incident occurred. While coming to their daughter's matrimonial home, they saw the accused already taking their daughter to AMCH, Dibrugarh. Both PWs 1 and 2 deposed that the accused wanted to admit her to a sub-standard medical facility like AMCH, Dibrugarh but then PWs 1 and 2 got her admitted to Aditya Nursing Home, Dibrugarh. At this stage, the Court would like to point out that the accused atleast brought the victim to a medical facility instead of leaving her at the matrimonial home. The PW-1/informant deposed in his evidence that Rimpi Baruah was admitted to Aditya Nursing Home for three days but the PW-7 being the M.O. deposed in his evidence that the victim Rimpi Baruah was admitted to Aditya Nursing Home only for a day. Also, it is not clear from the testimonies of the PWs including the testimony of the PW-3 who was present at the place of the occurrence as to whether the accused persons were actually present at the matrimonial home when the victim allegedly cut her wrists.

20. The PW-7 is the Medical Officer who deposed that the injuries of the victim on her wrists were simple in nature, self-inflicted, were cut with a blade and for the same she was admitted for treatment for a

day. The PW-3 deposed in her evidence that on the date of the occurrence she was visiting the victim's matrimonial home, when she found the victim lying on the floor of her room with blood on the floor and thereafter upon the arrival of the neighbours, she was taken to the hospital. She did not state anything in her deposition as to who took the victim to the hospital. During her cross-examination, she stated that the victim never disclosed anything negative about the accused. In the instant case, although the PW-1, PW-2 and PW-8 have stated in their evidence that acts of physical cruelty like beating and physical assault were meted out to her in connection with demands for dowry, yet such acts cannot be presumed to be of such nature as to drive her to commit suicide. Since the evidence of the victim herself could not be recorded by the Court, it cannot be conclusively drawn that it was the accused persons who compelled her to take such a drastic step. Resultantly, it transpires that the prosecution case is bereft of element of the explanation to Section 498 A, IPC as envisaged in clause (a).

21. The second element of the explanation to Section 498 A, IPC is harassment caused with a view to coerce the woman or any person related to her to meet the unlawful demand for property or valuable

G.R.CASE NO. 1209/2014

security. It implies a situation where the wife is continuously tormented with demands for dowry, irrespective of the fact whether such unlawful demand is accompanied by any physical torture. In the instant case, the PWs 1 and 2 have testified that the accused Sri Manash Gohain used to demand money from the victim on several occasions but in the absence of the evidence of the victim herself, the depositions of the PWs 1 and 2 cannot be enough to establish the guilt of the accused. The PW 2, being the victim's mother deposed that on one occasion when she expressed her inability to give money to the accused, her gold daughter's gold earrings were sold by the accused. None of the other PWs have corroborated this statement deposed by the PW-2.

22. The prosecution has failed to examine the I.O. in the instant case as he expired before his evidence could be recorded. The I.O. in this case would have been one of the most important witnesses who could have deposed about the details of the investigation of the case including the statements of the witnesses recorded by him. Non-examination of the I.O. thus, casts reflection on the truthfulness of the prosecution story.

Resultantly, the prosecution has failed to prove the second element as envisaged in clause (b) of the explanation to Section 498 A, IPC in the acts of the accused persons.

23. As far as the roles of accused Smti. Sapna Gohain and Smti. Borokha are concerned, none of the prosecution witnesses could depose anything regarding their parts or any act(s) committed by them upon the victim Rimpi Gohain in connection with demand for dowry. The PWs of the instant case could not point out even a single specific act of cruelty either mental or physical committed upon the victim by the accused Smti. Sapna Gohain and Smti. Borokha Gohain in connection with demand for dowry. In the absence of any cogent evidence, I am not inclined to hold the accused Smti. Sapna Gohain and Smti. Borokha guilty u/sec 498 A r/w Section 34 of the IPC.
24. It is one of the cardinal principles of criminal jurisprudence that the prosecution must prove the guilt of the accused beyond all reasonable doubt. As is clear from the above discussion, the evidence on record is quite inadequate to establish the prosecution case and there is ample scope of reasonable doubt as to the factum of the occurrence alleged. Situated thus, I am

G.R.CASE NO. 1209/2014

constrained to hold that the prosecution has failed to establish the guilt of the accused persons namely Sri Manash Gohain @ Manab, Smti. Sapna Gohain and Smti. Borokha Gohain u/sec 498 A r/w Section 34, IPC beyond all reasonable doubt. As such, the point of determination is answered in the negative in favour of the above-named accused persons.

ORDER

25. In view of the decision made above, the accused persons namely Sri Manash Gohain @ Manab, Smti. Sapna Gohain and Smti. Borokha Gohain are acquitted of the charge of the offence under section 498 A r/w Section 34 IPC and set at liberty forthwith.

Their bail bonds shall remain in force for six months from today in compliance with section 437-A, Cr.P.C.

The case is disposed of on contest.

Given under my hand and the seal of this Court on this 1st day of December, 2021 at Dibrugarh.

Typed by: Self

Sanskrita Khanikar

Judicial Magistrate First Class

Dibrugarh

APPENDIX

A. Prosecution witnesses:-

- i) Sri Pabitra Baruah being the informant of the case as PW-1
- ii) Smti. Rumi Baruah as PW-2
- iii) Smti. Chimpi Gohain as PW-3
- iv) Sri Keshab Gohain as PW-4
- v) Sri Siba Gogoi as PW-5
- vi) Smti. Sumalata Gohain as PW-6
- vii) Dr. Jagadish Konwar as PW-7
- viii) Sri Kangan Baruah as PW-8

B. Defence witnesses:- Nil

C. Prosecution exhibits:-

- i) The Ejahar as Exhibit No. 1
- ii) The injury report of victim Rimpi Gohain as Exhibit No. 2

D. Defence exhibits: Nil

Sanskrita Khanikar

Judicial Magistrate First Class

Dibrugarh