



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRA-D-359-DB-2005 (O&M)

Date of Decision:-9.4.2025

Krishan ... Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI**

Present:- Mr. Sonpreet Singh Brar, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Ranvir Singh Arya, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

- Appellant – Krishan assails judgment dated 19.4.2005 and order of sentence dated 21.4.2005 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonapat whereby learned Trial Court while holding him guilty of having committed offence punishable under Section 302 of Indian Penal Code, sentenced him as under:

| Offences | Imprisonment | Fine | In default of payment of fine |
|----------|-------------------|------------|-------------------------------|
| 302 IPC | Life imprisonment | Rs.5,000/- | -- |

- The matter arises out of FIR No.144 dated 23.8.2001 registered at Police Station Murthal, under Section 302 of Indian Penal Code (Ex.PL), at the instance of Bijender Singh (PW-14) pertaining to death of Smt. Bala wife of Sat Narain, whose dead-body was noticed hanging from a tree on the morning



CRA-D-359-DB-2005 (O&M)

(2)

of 19.8.2001 by one Narinder. The aforesaid Narinder reported the matter to the police on 19.8.2001 at 10:00 A.M. His statement (Ex.PA) as recorded by the police reads as under:

“I am a resident of Village Bakhtawarpur and work as a labourer. Today at about 05:40 A.M. when I came out from my house to answer the call of nature, then I saw a women hanging from a tree with a rope around her neck. I informed Smt. Sahab Kaur, Sarpanch and was now proceeding to the police station to furnish information, when he met me at Murthal Chowk, G.T., Road.

Sd/-

Narender Kumar”

3. After the aforesaid information was taken down in writing by ASI Jagat Singh (PW-1), he alongwith accompanying police officials rushed to the spot, where a dead-body of a lady was seen hanging from a rope from a ‘*kikkar*’ tree. The dead-body was brought down. Inquest proceedings were conducted. The place of occurrence as well as the dead-body were got photographed. A pair of slippers found at the spot were taken into possession. The dead body was sent for post-mortem examination to the hospital. A rough site plan of the place of occurrence was prepared. Statements of witnesses were recorded in terms of provisions of Section 161 Cr.P.C.
4. Subsequently, i.e. on 23.8.2001 Bijender (PW-14), brother of deceased submitted a written complaint (Ex.PR) on the basis of which formal FIR (Ex.PL) came to be lodged. The translated gist of the FIR is reproduced herein-under:

“To S.H.O. P.S. Murthal, Distt. Sonapat. The applicant submits as under:

(1) That I Bijender s/o Chander Singh, Jat am resident of village Dobh Tehsil and Distt. Rohtak and doing agricultural work. We are seven



brothers and sisters. One of my sister Bala was married with Sat Narain s/o Jage Ram of village Samchana, who died before three years. (2) My sister Bala for the livelihood of her two sons and old father-in-law used to work in the fields with Krishan s/o Chhaju Ram r/o Samchana. During this period, my sister Bala developed illicit relation with Krishan. A word was going around in the village that Krishan s/o Chhaju Ram r/o Samchana had abducted my sister Bala. We searched for our sister in the relation of Krishan then, on 17.7.2001 my uncle (Mosa) Jage Ram and I got a report lodged at P.S. Sampla. Thereafter, Krishan s/o Chhaju Ram r/o Samchana alongwith my sister appeared in police station on 31.7.2001 and police called my *mosa* (uncle). In his presence my sister Bala was handed over to my uncle Dalpat s/o Surat Singh and Jitender s/o Pyare Lal r/o Dobh, Tehsil and Distt. Rohtak, on the same day. Both of them took her to village and Bala started to reside with me. (3) That on 17.8.2001 when I came from the fields to house then I saw that Krishan s/o Chhaju Ram r/o Dobh, Teh. and Distt. Rohtak was talking to my sister Bala. I immediately told him to get out of my house. We slept after having dinner and when in morning we woke up, my sister Bala was missing from the house. I suspected that Krishan s/o Chhaju Ram of vill. Samchana had again abducted her. Thereafter, I enquired about Bala by visiting the house of sister of Krishan in village Palam (Delhi) who disclosed that my sister and Krishan had come and had gone to village Bakhtawarpur, Distt. Sonapat, where two of my sisters are married to Anand s/o Ram Diya and Satish s/o Manohar @ Kotha. I returned home the same day. On the next day i.e. on 19.8.2001, I again went to village Bakhtawarpur Teh. and Distt. Sonapat in search of Bala and asked about the house of Anand s/o Ram Diya and Satish s/o Manohar @ Kotha then villagers told me that some girl namely Bala of Dobh (Rohtak) who was married in village Samchana (Rohtak) who had come with Krishan of Samchana, had been eliminated by Anand, Satish, Raj Bala w/o Anand, Darshana w/o Satish and Krishan and that Police of P.S. Murthal had taken the dead body to hospital Sonapat. I was shocked. I visited in police Station Murthal where some people of village Samchana and village Dobh, met me who had been brought by the police. Fateh s/o Sudhan and Ram Kumar s/o Hari Ram village Samchana told me that Krishan came in the village and had disclosed that he alongwith his sisters Raj Bala and Darshana had committed the murder of Bala w/o Sat Narain vill. Samchana on the assumption that she was threat to their lives and was a thorn in their way and that he had committed the mistake. I applicant Bijender s/o Chander r/o Dobh Teh. & Distt. Rohtak pray to you



that legal action be taken against the culprits. I shall be very thankful to you. Sd/- Bijender s/o Chander dt. 23.8.2001.

Sd/-
Dharampal, ASI
No.9035 PT”

5. The matter was investigated by the police. The accused was arrested on 14.12.2001. Upon conclusion of investigation, a challan was presented against the appellant Krishan in the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Sonapat on 16.2.2002, who committed the case to the Court of Sessions vide commitment order dated 6.3.2002. Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonapat framed charges against the accused for having committed offence punishable under Section 302 of Indian Penal Code on 30.4.2002 to which the accused pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

6. The prosecution, in order to establish its case, examined as many as 18 PWs. The gist of their testimonies is being briefly referred to herein under:-

PW-1 ASI Jagat Singh to whom Narinder had furnished information regarding a dead-body hanging from a tree, stated that he had recorded the statement (Ex.PA) of Narinder and had thereafter proceeded to Village Bakhtawarpur where a dead-body of a female was seen hanging from a tree with the help of a rope. He stated that he got the place of occurrence photographed and conducted inquest proceedings and thereafter sent the dead-body to the hospital for post-mortem examination. He stated that Azad and Ali Mohd. had identified the dead-body.

PW-2 Inspector Suresh Kumar, Anti Extremist Cell, Jind stated that during the course of investigation, he had recorded statement of Partwari Sardool Singh under Section 161 Cr.P.C. and that upon



conclusion of investigation, he had prepared the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. and forwarded the same to the Court.

PW-3 Ram Singh before whom the accused Krishan had made extra-judicial confession, which finds mention in the FIR, stated in respect of the same. His statement shall be discussed later.

PW-4 Dr. Adarsh Sharma, Medical Officer, Civil Hospital, Sonapat, who had conducted post-mortem examination on the dead-body of Bala stated that he alongwith Dr. Arun Garg and Dr. Alankrita had conducted post-mortem examination on the dead-body of Bala. He stated that a ligature mark was seen around the neck except on the back of neck and that the ligature mark was having pattern of a twined rope. He stated that as per their opinion the cause of death was 'asphyxia due to hanging'. The said witness was briefly cross-examined on behalf of the accused, wherein a formal suggestion was given that there were no signs of any struggle and violence on the dead-body of the deceased except for the ligature mark, which the doctor accepted to be correct and further stated that possibility of the death being a case of suicide could not be ruled out.

PW-5 Inspector Lekh Raj stated that on 14.12.2001 he was posted as Welfare Inspector in Haryana Police in the office of Superintendent of Police, Sonapat and that on the said day Devender Singh had produced Krishan before him in connection with the present case and he had formally arrested Krishan and lodged him in the lockup.

PW-6 Head Constable Azad Singh, who is a formal witness, tendered his affidavit Ex.PJ in evidence.



- PW-7** UGC Suraj Bhan, who is another formal witness, tendered his affidavit Ex.PK in evidence.
- PW-8** Sub Inspector Satbir Singh stated that 23.8.2001 he was posted as Station House Officer at Police Station Murthal and had visited the place of occurrence and prepared a rough site plan and had also recorded the statements of Narender, Maman, Ali Mohd. and Azad Singh. During the course of cross-examination he stated that Ram Kumar never met him in connection with the murder of Bala as long as the investigation remained with him.
- PW-9** Constable Ram Dass stated that on 23.8.2001 he was posted at Police Station Murthal and on the said day he had delivered the special reports to the Judicial Magistrate, Sonapat, Superintendent of Police, Sonapat and also to Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sonapat.
- PW-10** Sardoo Singh, Patwari stated that on 15.1.2002 he had prepared a scaled site plan (Ex.PN) on the asking of the Investigating Officer.
- PW-11** Narender, who had furnished intimation to the police in the first instance as regards his having seen a dead-body hanging from a tree, stated to this effect. He further stated that he had also informed Sahab Kaur, Sarpanch of Village Bakhtawarpur.
- PW-12** Maman stated that about 1³/₄-2 years back he had seen a dead-body hanging from a '*kikkar*' tree in the area of Village Bakhtawarpur in the presence of large number of villagers. He further stated that the woman, whose dead-body was hanging, was not known to him. The said witness was declared hostile and was permitted to be cross-



examined by the Public Prosecutor, but nothing substantial could be elicited during the deep cross-examination.

PW-13 Suresh Kumar, Naib Tehsildar stated that on 19.8.2001 he was posted as Naib Tehsildar and on the said day he had gone to Village Bakhtawarpur upon being requested by the police and had examined the dead-body, which was hanging from a tree and had prepared inquest report 'Ex.PQ'. He further stated that Maman, Lambardar, Ali Mohd., Chowkidar & Anand identified the dead-body. He also stated that he had recorded statements of Ali Mohammad, Maman, Lambardar and Azad Singh.

PW-14 Bijender Singh at whose instance the FIR was lodged stated that as a matter of fact he had initially made a complaint on 17.7.2001 to the police to the effect that Krishan had abducted his sister Bala by enticing her away and that later on 31.7.2001 Krishan came to the police station alongwith his sister Bala. Bala was then handed over by the police to his uncle Dalpat Singh and to his brother Jitender and she was accordingly taken to their Village Dobh, District Rohtak and she started living with them. He further stated that on 17.8.2001 Krishan had come to their house, but they told him to leave, but later on the next morning they found that his sister Bala was missing from the house. PW-14 stated that he went to the house of Krishan's sister namely Bimla as even on earlier occasion Krishan had taken Bala to the house of his sister Bimla and that Bimla informed him that Krishan and Bala had come to her house, but she had told Krishan to go away and that they had gone to



Village Bakhtawarpur. PW-14 further stated that on 19.8.2001 he set out for Village Bakhtawarpur from his house, where two sisters of Krishan were residing alongwith their husband. However, since he was not feeling well, therefore, he got down from the three-wheeler while on way to Village Bakhtawarpur. He further stated that when he was proceeding to Village Bakhtawarpur, then 2-3 persons met him and told him that a woman named Bala had been murdered and upon hearing the said news he went to Police Station Murthal, where he found some residents of Village Dobh and Samchana had assembled there and when he asked the In-charge Police Station to record his statement, he (Incharge Police Station) advised him (Bijender) that he should first cremate the dead-body of his sister and thereafter report the matter. PW-14 further stated that after post-mortem examination was conducted, the dead-body was cremated at Village Samchana and it was on 23.8.2001 that he made a complaint (Ex.PR) to the Station House Officer concerned on the basis of which formal FIR was lodged.

PW-15 Constable Tej Pal, who had taken photographs of the dead-body proved the photographs as Exs.P-6 to P-10 and the negatives as Exs.P-1 to P-5.

PW-16 Constable Ram Naresh stated that after the post-mortem examination of deceased Bala wife of Sat Narain had been conducted in the hospital, the doctors had handed over three sealed parcels to him, which he further passed on to ASI Jagat Singh, who took the same in his possession vide recovery memo Ex.PF.



PW-16-A Ali Mohammad stated that about one and a half year ago he had seen a dead-body hanging from a tree and that he did not know the name of the deceased.

PW-17 ASI Dharampal stated that on 23.8.2001 he was posted as ASI at Police Station Murthal and upon receipt of complaint 'Ex.PR' from Bijender, he had recorded formal FIR 'Ex.PL'.

PW-18 Azad Singh stated that about 4 years ago he had come to know that a dead-body of a woman was hanging from a '*kikkar*' tree near the house of Narender and that he had called the chowkidar and had also called Narender and had sent Narender to the police station for furnishing information. He stated that thereafter the police came at the spot and brought the dead-body down from the tree.

7. The prosecution gave up PW- Fateh Singh and PW- Devender Singh having been won over and closed its evidence on 15.4.2005. Upon closure of the prosecution evidence, statement of the accused was recorded in terms of provisions of Section 313 Cr.P.C., wherein he denied the case of prosecution and pleaded false implication. The accused, however, did not lead any evidence in his defence.
8. Learned Trial Court upon appraisal of the evidence on record returned its findings to the effect that the prosecution had fully established its case qua accused/appellant Krishan and accordingly held him guilty of having committed offence punishable under Section 302 of Indian Penal Code vide impugned judgment dated 19.4.2005.
9. Learned counsel representing the appellant submitted that it is a case based totally on circumstantial evidence and that the accused has been falsely



implicated on the basis of an alleged extra-judicial confession, which apart from being a weak piece of evidence would also be inadmissible inasmuch the accused had allegedly confessed his guilt before one Fateh Singh, where Ram Singh (PW-3) was also present and since Fateh Singh had never been examined, a serious doubt had crept in as regards the case of prosecution. It has further been submitted that there is a gross delay in lodging the FIR inasmuch as while the death had taken place on 19.8.2001, the FIR came to be lodged on 23.8.2001. Learned counsel submitted that it is a case where even as per the doctor, who had conducted post-mortem examination, the possibility of suicide could not be ruled out particularly when no sign of injury was found on the dead-body.

10. Opposing the appeal, learned State counsel submitted that although it is a case based on circumstantial evidence, but the collective effect of the evidence brought on record particularly the extra-judicial confession leaves no manner of doubt that it is the accused, who had murdered the deceased.
11. We have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court and with the assistance of learned counsel have also perused the record of the case.
12. Undisputedly, it is a case based on circumstantial evidence where dead-body of a woman was first noticed by PW-11 Narender on 19.8.2001, who reported the matter to the police and the police thereafter reached at the spot and conducted the inquest proceedings and subjected the dead body to post-mortem examination. A Board of Doctors comprising of PW-4 Dr. Adarsh Sharma, Medical Officer, Civil Hospital, Sonapat, Dr. Arun Garg & Dr. Alankrita had conducted the post-mortem examination on the dead body of deceased Bala and as per the opinion of the board, the cause of death was



asphyxia due to hanging. The relevant extract pertaining to the opinion of the doctor and also the cross-examination is reproduced herein-under:

“There was a ligature mark of brownish colour of width 1.8 cms. all around the neck except in the back of neck where it was defficient. Mark was in the form of deep furrow with abraded margins going obliquely backward and upward. It was situated at the level of thyroid cartilage. Ligature mark was having pattern of twined rope.

XXX

XXX

XXX

In our opinion, the cause of death was asphyxia due to hanging which was ante-mortem in nature and sufficient to cause death in normal course of life.

XXX

XXX

XXX

It is correct, there was no signs of struggle and violence on the body of the deceased except ligature marks. Possibility cannot be ruled out that it is a pure suicide.”

13. A perusal of the aforesaid statement would clearly show that it is a case of death by asphyxia due to hanging, wherein no signs of any force or any injury were found on the dead-body and the doctor has stated that even suicide could not be ruled out.
14. In a case, based on circumstantial evidence, the inference of guilt can be drawn only when all the incriminating facts and circumstances are found to be incompatible with the innocence of the accused. The law with regard to appreciation of circumstantial evidence has been clearly enunciated in the case of Hanumant v. State of Madhya Pradesh, AIR 1952 Supreme Court 343, wherein it was held as follows:

"10. It is well to remember that in cases where the evidence is of a circumstantial nature, the circumstances from which the



conclusion of guilt is to be drawn should in the first instance be fully established, and all the facts so established should be consistent only with the hypothesis of the guilt of the accused. Again, the circumstances should be of a conclusive nature and tendency and they should be such as to exclude every hypothesis but the one proposed to be proved. In other words, there must be a chain of evidence so far complete as not to leave any reasonable ground for a conclusion consistent with the innocence of the accused and it must be such as to show that within all human probability the act must have been done by the accused."

15. The aforesaid principles have consistently been followed and have been affirmed in catena of authorities. Recently, a three Judges Bench of Hon'ble Apex Court reiterated the aforesaid position of law in 2025(1) RCR (Criminal) 12, Vishwajeet KerbaMasalkar vs. State of Maharashtra, while stating as under:

"20. The law with regard to conviction on the basis of circumstantial evidence has very well been crystalised in the judgment of this Court in the case of *Sharad Birdhichand Sharda v. State of Maharashtra (1984) 4 SCC 116 : 1984 INSC 121*, wherein this Court held thus:

"152. Before discussing the cases relied upon by the High Court we would like to cite a few decisions on the nature, character and essential proof required in a criminal case which rests on circumstantial evidence alone. The most fundamental and basic decision of this Court is *Hanumant v. State of Madhya Pradesh [(1952) 2 SCC 71 : AIR 1952 SC 343 : 1952 SCR 1091 : 1953 Cri LJ 129]*. This case has been uniformly followed and applied by this Court in a large number of later decisions up-to-date, for instance, the cases of *Tufail (Alias) Simmi v. State of Uttar Pradesh [(1969) 3 SCC 198 : 1970 SCC (Cri) 55]* and *Ramgopal v. State of Maharashtra [(1972) 4 SCC 625 : AIR 1972 SC 656]*. It may be useful to extract what Mahajan, J. has laid down in Hanumant case [(1952) 2 SCC 71 : AIR 1952 SC 343 : 1952 SCR 1091 : 1953 Cri LJ 129] :



"It is well to remember that in cases where the evidence is of a circumstantial nature, the circumstances from which the conclusion of guilt is to be drawn should in the first instance be fully established, and all the facts so established should be consistent only with the hypothesis of the guilt of the accused. Again, the circumstances should be of a conclusive nature and tendency and they should be such as to exclude every hypothesis but the one proposed to be proved. In other words, there must be a chain of evidence so far complete as not to leave any reasonable ground for a conclusion consistent with the innocence of the accused and it must be such as to show that within all human probability the act must have been done by the accused."

153. A close analysis of this decision would show that the following conditions must be fulfilled before a case against an accused can be said to be fully established:

- (1) the circumstances from which the conclusion of guilt is to be drawn should be fully established. It may be noted here that this Court indicated that the circumstances concerned "must or should" and not "may be" established. There is not only a grammatical but a legal distinction between "may be proved" and "must be or should be proved" as was held by this Court in ***Shivaji Sahabrao Bobade v. State of Maharashtra [(1973) 2 SCC 793 : 1973 SCC (Cri) 1033 : 1973 Crl LJ 1783]*** where the observations were made: [SCC para 19, p. 807: SCC (Cri) p. 1047]

"Certainly, it is a primary principle that the accused must be and not merely may be guilty before a court can convict and the mental distance between 'may be' and 'must be' is long and divides vague conjectures from sure conclusions."

- (2) the facts so established should be consistent only with the hypothesis of the guilt of the accused, that is to say, they should not be explainable on any other hypothesis except that the accused is guilty,



- (3) the circumstances should be of a conclusive nature and tendency,
- (4) they should exclude every possible hypothesis except the one to be proved, and
- (5) there must be a chain of evidence so complete as not to leave any reasonable ground for the conclusion consistent with the innocence of the accused and must show that in all human probability the act must have been done by the accused.

154. These five golden principles, if we may say so, constitute the ***panchsheel*** of the proof of a case based on circumstantial evidence."

21. It can thus clearly be seen that it is necessary for the prosecution that the circumstances from which the conclusion of guilt is to be drawn should be fully established. The Court held that it is a primary principle that the accused 'must be' and not merely 'may be' proved guilty before a court can convict the accused. It has been held that there is not only a grammatical but a legal distinction between 'may be proved' and 'must be or should be proved'. It has been held that the facts so established should be consistent only with the guilt of the accused, that is to say, they should not be explainable on any other hypothesis except the one where the accused is guilty. It has further been held that the circumstances should be such that they exclude every possible hypothesis except the one to be proved. It has been held that there must be a chain of evidence so complete as not to leave any reasonable ground for the conclusion consistent with the innocence of the accused and must show that in all human probabilities, the act must have been done by the accused."
16. In the present case, the prosecution, however, in order to establish that it is not a case of suicide, but a homicidal death allegedly caused by appellant/accused Krishan mainly relies upon the extra-judicial confession in the shape of statement of PW-3 Ram Singh. PW-3 Ram Singh, before whom the accused Krishan had made extra-judicial confession, which finds mention in the FIR, stated that on 19.8.2001 when he was sleeping in the 'baithak'



(sitting room) in the house of Lakhi Ram in Village Samchana and Fateh Singh was also sleeping there on another cot, then at about 04-04:30 P.M. Krishan came there and spoke to Fateh Singh. He (Ram Singh) stated that he had overheard Krishan telling Fateh @ Fateh Singh that he (Krishan) alongwith his sister Raj Bala and her husband Anand, his another sister Darshna alongwith her husband Satish, resident of Village Bakhtawarpur had killed Bala. PW-3 stated that Krishan further told Fateh that even on an earlier occasion, they had saved him when he (Krishan) had abducted Bala and when the father-in-law of Bala had made a complaint to the police and, as such, Krishan requested Fateh to save him again from the police as he had committed a mistake by murdering Bala. PW-3 stated that Fateh Singh expressed that he was not sure as to whether Krishan was speaking the truth or not and told him (Ram Kumar) to call his brother Lakhi Ram to the 'baithak' (sitting room). PW-3 accordingly went to call Lakhi, but when he returned back with Lakhi, the accused Krishan was not found in the 'baithak'. PW-3 further stated that later in the day at about 04:30 P.M. a constable from Police Station Murthal informed about murder of Bala and then they realized that Krishan had been telling them the truth.

17. Interestingly, a perusal of the FIR lodged on 23.8.2001 does make a reference as regards Krishan having confessed his guilt before Fateh Singh and Ram Kumar inasmuch Fateh Singh and Ram Kumar are alleged to have told the complainant on 19.8.2001 when he had gone to Police Station Murthal that Krishan had confessed his guilt before them, but Ram Singh's statement was never recorded by Sub Inspector Satbir Singh (PW-8), before whom the complainant had made his statement 'Ex.PR' leading to lodging of FIR. The cross-examination of PW-8 SI Satbir Singh reads as under:



“xxxxx by defence counsel Sh. B.K. Tyagi, Advocate.

Ram Kumar s/o Hari Singh resident of village Samchana never met me in connection with murder of Bala. So long as the investigation of this case remained with me, identity of the murdered was not known.”

18. Coming to the statement of PW-3 Ram Singh, a perusal of his statement shows that while he alongwith Fateh Singh was present in the house of Lakhi Ram on 19.8.2001 when Krishan came there and confessed his guilt before Fateh Singh, which he confessed while Ram Singh was also hearing the conversation. However, it remains unexplained as to why Ram Singh despite having come to know about the alleged murder of deceased Bala by Krishan did not report the matter to the police on the same day itself i.e. on 19.8.2001. Still further Fateh Singh, before whom Krishan had actually confessed his guilt, has been given up by the prosecution having been won over. As already stated above, PW-8 Sub Inspector Satbir Singh never recorded the statement of Ram Kumar.
19. Under these circumstances, the veracity, admissibility and reliability of the said extra-judicial confession rather becomes highly suspect. In any case, extra-judicial confession, otherwise also is a weak type of evidence. Other than the said extra-judicial confession, there is hardly any connecting evidence so as to hold the appellant responsible for the murder of deceased Bala. Infact, as per the doctor’s opinion even suicide could not be ruled out.
20. As an upshot of the aforesaid discussion, the impugned judgment, wherein the accused has been held guilty, cannot sustain and is liable to be set aside.
21. The instant appeal, as such, is allowed and impugned judgment dated 19.4.2005 and order of sentence dated 21.4.2005 passed by learned



CRA-D-359-DB-2005 (O&M)

(17)

Additional Sessions Judge, Sonapat are hereby set aside. The appellant – Krishan is acquitted of all the charges framed against him. His bail bonds/surety bonds shall stand discharged.

22. A copy of this judgment be sent to the quarters concerned. Case property be dealt with under rules upon expiry of limitation for filing appeal.

**(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE**

9.4.2025

Pankaj

**(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking /reasoned Yes / No

Whether Reportable Yes / No