

**IN THE COURT OF CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
UDALGURI, ASSAM.**

**G.R. CASE NO. 374 of 2019
(PRC NO. 791/2019)**

U/S 324/427/34 I.P.C.

**Present: Smti. Ranjita Agarwalla,
Chief Judicial Magistrate,
Udalguri, Assam.**

STATE

-VS-

1. SRI RABI DAS

2. SMTI. BHARATI DAS.

----- Accused.

For the Prosecution : Mr. M. Khakhlari, Ld. Addl. P.P.

For the Defence : Mr. P. Sutradhar, Ld. Advocate.

**Date of Prosecution Evidence : 17-10-19, 07-11-19, 21-11-19,
20-03-21 and 30-11-2021.**

Date of Argument : 18-12-2021.

Date of Judgment : 30-12-2021.

J U D G M E N T

1. The prime facts stated within the prosecution case is as such that on 26-04-2019 one Sri Sonaram Das, S/o Late Paresh Das of village-Nepaligaon under Rowta Police Station lodged an ejahar before the Officer-in-Charge, Rowta Police Station stating inter-alia that on 22-04-2019 at about 4 P.M. when he along with his brother namely Sri Niranjan Das returned home at Nepaligoan after NRC work from Udalguri town, his brother saw some goats belonging to the accused persons entered into his vegetable garden by breaking bamboo fencing and destroyed some chilly plants. When he chased the goats to the

house of the accused persons to handover to them, the accused persons assaulted him with a stick (lathi) and fell him down on the ground. While the accused Sri Rabi Das was assaulting him, his daughter namely Smti. Bharati Das bite his brother on his chin and removed a piece of flesh from his face to which his brother became senseless and fell down pooled with blood. The villagers came, poured water on his head and immediately shifted him to Mangaldai Civil Hospital for his treatment. But for serious condition, on 23-04-2019 his brother was referred to Gauhati Medical College & Hospital. It is also stated that as he was busy with the treatment of his brother, delay was caused in lodging the ejahar. Hence he lodged this case.

2. On receipt of the ejahar to the effect aforesaid, the Officer-in-Charge of Rowta Police Station registered a police case vide Rowta PS case no. 62/2019 U/S 427/326/34 I.P.C. against the accused person and on completion of investigation, the Investigating Officer submitted the charge-sheet against the accused (1) Sri Rabi Das and (2) Smti. Bharati Das alleging commission of offences U/S 324/427/34 I.P.C.
3. Cognizance of offence was taken under Section **190 (1)(b)** of the Cr.PC. The processes were issued for causing appearance of the accused persons before the Court. Accordingly, both the accused appeared before the court and they were furnished with copies of all necessary relevant papers and documents in compliance with the provisions of Sec.207 Cr.P.C. Finding a prima-facie case for commission of offences U/S 324/427/34 I.P.C. charges were framed U/S 324/427/34 I.P.C., the ingredients of charges were read over and explained to the accused persons to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed to stand trial.
4. In order to bring home the case, the prosecution examined as many as eight(8) witnesses including the informant in the form of:

PW 1 Sri Sonaram Das (informant)

PW 2 Sri Niranjan Das

PW 3 Sri Lalita Das

PW 4 Sri Raghu Das

PW 5 Smti. Minati Das

PW 6 Smti. Ranju Bala Das

PW 7 Dr. Rajib Borah (Medical Officer) and

PW 8 A.S.I. Sarafat Ali (I.O.).

The prosecution has exhibited the following documents in the form of:

Ext. 1 Ejahar.

Ext. 2 Medical Report

Ext. 3 Sketch Map

Ext. 4 Charge-sheet.

5. After recording the prosecution witnesses, the accused persons were examined U/S 313 Cr.P.C. All the incriminating circumstances which appeared in evidence against the accused were put to them for their explanation. The accused denied all the circumstances and pleaded their innocence. Further the accused declined to adduce any evidence in defence.
6. I have heard the argument put forward by the learned Additional P.P. and the learned advocate appearing for the accused persons. I have also carefully gone through the entire evidence available with the case record.
7. **POINTS FOR DETERMINATION:** To ascertain the guilt of the accused persons on the charges alleged against them, the following points are sorted out for decision in the present case:

- (i) Whether on 22-04-2019 at about 4 P.M. at village Nepali Gaon under Rowta Police Station the accused persons in furtherance of common intention voluntarily caused hurt to one Sri Niranjan Das, the brother of the informant Sri Sonaram Das with stick and bite on his chin and thereby committed an offence punishable U/S 324/34 I.P.C?
- (ii) Whether on the same day at the same time and place the accused persons in furtherance of common intention committed mischief by causing wrongful loss or damage to the property of the informant and thereby committed an offence punishable U/S 427/34 I.P.C.?

DISCUSSION, DECISION AND REASONS THEREOF :

For sake of convenience of discussion I would like to reproduce the evidences of prosecution witnesses.

- 8. PW-1 Sri Sonaram Das** is the informant. He testified that he knows the accused persons. On 22-04-2019 at about 4 P.M. after finishing of his NRC work at Udalguri he returned to his house and while he was taking meal his niece Smti. Lalita Das apprised him that his brother Sri Niranjan Das was being assaulted by Sri Rabi Das at a distance of two houses from his residence. Getting the information he rushed to the place of occurrence and found blood oozing from the chin of his brother and he was pooled with blood. In the mean time the villagers came and poured water on the head of his brother. Rabi Das and his daughter Bharati Das were standing nearby the bamboo fencing of the place. Considering the serious injury of his brother and as per advice of the public he immediately took his brother to Mangaldai Civil Hospital in his own vehicle and there he kept his brother for one day and then brought him to Amingaon and Dispur GNRC hospital respectively, but as the departmental doctors were not available there, he was brought back to his home and on the next day he was provided medication at Gauhati Medical College and Hospital, Guwahati. As he was busy with the medication of his brother, he could not lodge the ejahar immediately, but on 26-04-2019 he lodged a written ejahar. Ext. 1 is the ejahar Ext. 1(1) is his signature. The injury of his brother was almost cured.
- 9. PW 2 Sri Niranjan Das**, the victim of the case averred that the informant is his brother and the accused persons are his co-villager. On 22-04-2019 at about 4 P.M. after doing his work of NRC when returned to his residence he found goats were grazing chilly plants and flower saplings at his garden and as such he chased the said goats to the nearby road and found Sri Rabi Das and his daughter Smti. Bharati Das were sitting in their residence. When he asked them whether the goats belonged to them or not, thereby Smti. Bharati Das scolded him with filthy language and his brother Rabi Das came there and rolled him down by pushing. When he fell down in the ground, his wife Smti. Jayanti Das came and tried to pick him up. Bharati Das, daughter of Rabi Das came and removed the flesh of his chin by biting. Immediately he became senseless and fell down and thereby did not know what happened. Subsequently he regained his sense at Mangaldai hospital. Subsequently he got sound by taking medication at GMCH. At present his injury is cured without any scar.

- 10. PW 3 Smti. Lalita Das** disclosed that the informant is her uncle and both the accused persons are known to her. On 22-04-2019 at about 4 P.M. while she was on the road her uncle Niranjan Das saw goats were destroying the chilly and flower plants and thereby his uncle chased those goats towards the road and in the house of nearby resident Rabi Das and his daughter Bharati Das who were sitting there, asked them whether the said goats belonged to them or not. Then Smti. Bharati Das replied that what did their goats do. To this her uncle replied that if their goats come again and grazed on his chilly plant, he would break the legs of their goats. Then Rabi Das, father of Bharati Das came out and fell his uncle down by kicking whereas Bharati Das bit off flesh from the chin of his uncle. Seeing the injury of her uncle she immediately came and poured water on his wound and subsequently his uncle was taken to Mangaldai hospital where he took primary treatment for one day and then he was shifted to Gauhati Medical College & Hospital there he was provided medication. At present his uncle is cured.
- 11. PW 4 Sri Raghu Das** deposed that he knows the informant as well as the accused persons. On 22-03-2019 at about 3-45 P.M. he heard goats bleating and came out to the road and found Sri Rabi Das and Sri Niranjan Das were attacking each other by holding necks of each other. He also found Bharati Das was among them. After a little while they separated each other and he found blood oozing out from the chin of Niranjan Das. When he came forward a few yards, Niranjan Das fell down. He saw the injury of Niranjan Das and saw from the injury that flesh came out from his chin. He also found a piece of flesh lying on the ground. As per his assumption, Bharati Das bit off flesh from the chin of Niranjan Das. As the condition of Niranjan Das was serious, he was sent to hospital. He heard that at present Niranjan Das is cured after taking medication at Mangaldai and Guwahati.
- 12. PW 5 Smti. Minati Das** disclosed that she knows the informant as well as the accused as co-villagers. About seven months back one evening at about 4 P.M. after hearing outcries at road he came out and found that the villagers were pouring water on the head of the injured Niranjan Das for his injury and later, he was shifted to hospital for medication.
- 13. PW 6 Smti. Ranju Bala Das** deposed that she knows the informant his brother and the accused persons. About eight months back one evening at about 4 P.M. while she was at her shop, she heard shouts nearby and as such,

came out and found Niranhjan Das sitting on the ground by holding his chin and the public was pouring water on it. She also poured water seeing blood oozing from the chin of the injured person as flesh was removed from his chin due to biting. She came to know from the public that accused Bharati Das bit off flesh from the chin of the injured Niranjan Das.

- 14. PW 7 is the Medical Officer Dr. Rajib Deka.** He deposed that on 23-04-2019 while he was posted as Registrar of surgery at Gauhati Medical College & Hospital, that day at about 11-13 A.M. he examined the victim namely Sri Niranjan Das, aged about 38 years. The patient was also examined with a history of human bite on the previous day. On examination he found:

Laceration of 4cm x 4 cm x 2 cm on chin.

He opined that the nature of injury was **SIMPLE** caused by **human bite**.

He has exhibited the Medical report Ext. 2 and his signature Ext. 2(1) thereon.

- 15. PW 8 A.S.I. Sarafat Ali** deposed that on 26-04-2019 while he was working as I/C of Lalpool outpost under Rowta Police Station, the Officer-in-Charge of Rowta Police Station registered a case and he was endorsed for conducting investigation of the case and as per his direction and accordingly, he conducted the investigation of the case and on completion of investigation he submitted the charge-sheet against the accused Sri Rabi Das and Smti. Bharati Das U/S 427/324/34 I.P.C. He had exhibited the sketch map as Ext. 3 and charge-sheet as Ext. 4 and Ext. 3(1) and Ext. 4(1) his signatures respectively.
- 16.** On evaluation, appreciation and close scrutiny of the evidences of prosecution witnesses it reflects that **PW 2 Sri Niranjan Das, PW 3 Smti. Lalita Das, PW 4 Sri Raghu Das** are all ocular witnesses. **PW 2 Sri Niranjan Das** in his testimony clearly stated that on 22-04-2019 at about 4 P.M. he saw goats were grazing on chilly plants and flower saplings of his garden. He chased the goats and getting Sri Rabi Das and Smti. Bharati Das who were sitting in front of their residence enquired as to whether the goats belonged to them. In reply to that, the accused Sri Bharati Das scolded him with filthy language and co-accused Sri Rabi Das rolled him down in the ground by pushing and his wife Smti. Jayanti Das came to pick him up. Thereby the accused Smti. Bharati Das bit off a part of flesh from his chin. Therefore, he became senseless. PW 3 Smti. Lalita Das who is niece and a nearby resident of PW 2 supporting the version

of PW 2 stated that on 22-04-2019 at about 4 P.M. initially there was an altercation regarding grazing of goats in the garden of her uncle Sri Niranjan Das. Accused Rabi Das, father of co-accused Bharati Das pulled leg from behind and co-accused Bharati Das bit on the chin of her uncle. Seeing the injury of her uncle she immediately poured water on his body. Similarly, PW 4 Sri Raghu Das stated in his evidence that on the aforesaid day at about 3-45 P.M. initially he heard outcries regarding goat and hence he came out and found Rabi Das and Niranjan Das were attacking each other by holding necks. He also saw Smti. Bharati Das in between them and also found blood was oozing out from the chin of Niranjan Das. Thereafter, he also found flesh came out from the chin of the injured Niranjan Das and he fell down on the floor after going a few yards. He assumed that Smti. Bharati Das bit off the said flesh from the chin of victim Niranjan Das. Seeing the seriousness of Niranjan Das he took arrangement for sending him to hospital. Moreover, PW 7 Dr. Rajib Borah, the Medical Officer has narrated in his evidence that on 23-04-2019 he examined injured Niranjan Das at Casualty Department, Gauhati Medical College & Hospital, Guwahati and found :

Laceration of 4cm x 4 cm x 2 cm on chin.

According to him the injury was **Simple** caused by **human bite**. Thus, the Ext. 2 the medical report corroborated the version of the prosecution case. Those evidences of ocular witnesses are supported by the medical evidence. Here, charge is framed under Section 324 I.P.C. against the accused persons. The accused caused hurt to Sri Niranjan Das by means of cutting i.e. human biting is within the provision of Section 324 I.P.C. Other PWs i.e. PW 1, the informant, on getting information about the incident from Lalita Das (PW2) that Rabi Das was assaulting his brother Niranjan Das, came to the spot and found his brother was soaked in blood and the villagers were pouring water on his body and found the accused persons namely Rabi Das and his daughter Ahati Das @ Bharati Das were standing along the bamboo fencing. PW 6 Raju Bala Das stated that on the day of the occurrence on hearing outcries she came out and saw Niranjan Das was sitting holding his chin and she also poured water on his body and she came to know from the villagers that accused Bharati Das bit off flesh from the chin of Niranjan Das. Thus, PW 1 and PW 6 saw the injury of Niranjan Das and they came to know that it was caused by the accused persons at the spot. Likewise, PW 5 also saw that the

public pouring water on the body of the injured Niranjana Das, while she came out hearing outcries on the road.

- 17.** Here, the defence do not disputed the injury of PW 2 . According to defence, such injury may be caused to PW 2 by falling on sharp bamboo fencing. In this context the defence also put suggestion to PW 7, who also admitted the same. During cross of prosecution witnesses the defence created a story that Niranjana Das came to the residence of Bharati Das and touched her breast with intent to outrage her modesty and thereby there was a jostling and Niranjana Das sustained injury on his chin by falling down on the bamboo fencing. Although the defence claimed that a cross case was lodged in this context, but the Investigating Officer of this case in his cross-examination asserted that neither any cross-case was registered nor investigated by him.
- 18.** PW 1 and PW 3 stated that they knew that accused Bharati Das and Rabi Das also lodged a case against PW 1 and PW 2, but PW 2 the victim stated that he has no knowledge if any case was lodged against him by the accused persons. Similarly, PW 4 stated that he has no knowledge if Bharati Das had lodged a case against Niranjana Das. Although the defence has claimed that a case was lodged against the victim but the defence has no given any specific number or reference of the same and as the Investigating Officer claims that no case was registered therefore, it is hard to believe that there is existence of any cross case. Learned defence counsel during argument highlighted that PW 1 in his cross examination admitted that the incident occurred on 22-04-2019 and the ejarah was lodged on 26-04-2019 and during cross examination PW 1 admitted that while he was going to Mangaldai hospital in his vehicle taking his brother PW 2, he apprised the incident over telephone to the police station. But PW 8 in his cross-examination asserted that on the basis of the oral information no GD entry was made.
- 19.** In my considered view here, PW 1 has not specifically stated that whom he apprised specifically at the police station. It is settle position of law that every fault in the part of investigating agency is not fatal to the prosecution case. In this context I would like to mention a case law: **Nasiruddin Ahmed Vs State of Assam (1996) 2 GLR 285 "Every lapse on the part of the investigating agency is not destructive to the prosecution case"**

Similarly, in **State of Karnataka Vs. V.K. Yarappa Reddy** reported **AIR 2000 SC 185** the Hon'ble Apex Court held that **the defect and irregularities in the investigation cannot be ground for acquittal.**

- 20.** Moreover, PW 1 clearly stated in his evidence that as he was busy with the medication of his brother (PW2) and he lodged the ejahar on 26-04-2019 although the incident occurred on 22-04-2019.
- 21.** In my opinion, since PW 1 is the brother of injured PW 2, it was his prime duty to provide medication to him rather than to lodge this case. According to defence, since the telephonic information was first in point of time GD Entry should have been made as per Police Manual. Further, the defence created doubt that the Ext. 2 is silent regarding reference no. or PS case no. and the same is also silent regarding the age of the injury and Mangaldai civil hospital case no. as per Ext. 2 the patient was examined at 23-04-2019 at GMCH, Guwahati.
- 22. PW 1** in his cross examination stated that after one day of lodging the ejahar he went to GMCH, Guwahati as on that day he was he was not provided medication and after three days he again went to GMCH, Guwahati. According to PW 1 initially he brought his bother Niranjana Das to Mangaldai hospital for primary medication and then went to Amingaon and Dispur GNRC hospital, but as departmental doctor were not available there, he brought his brother to their residence and on the next day he brought him to GMCH, Guwahati for medication.
- 23.** I have perused the Injury Report. In the Injury Report. it is clearly mentioned that the patient was examined with a history of physical assault at 4 P.M. on 22-04-2019 at Nepaligaon. Initially treatment was taken at Mangaldai hospital and then patient was brought to **Casualty Department, GMCH, Guwahati** at 11:30 A.M. on 23-04-2019. Here, PW 1 and PW 2 in their evidences clearly stated that after one day of the occurrence they went to GMCH. Although PW 2 claimed that on that day he was not provided medication again after three days he was taken to GMCH, Guwahati.
- 24.** In my considered view, as the Ext. 2 clearly stated about the time of examination which is also corroborated by the prosecution witnesses as well as initial treatment at Mangaldai hospital and the Ext. 2 is documentary evidence

which prevails over the oral evidence. PW 2 may not recollect as to what happened on the next day of occurrence at GMCH, Guwahati.

25. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case **Bharwada Bhoginbhai Hirjibhai vs State Of Gujarat reported in AIR 1983 SC 753** held that "Over much importance cannot be attached to minor discrepancies."

The reasons are obvious:

- (1) ***By and large a witness cannot be expected to possess a photographic memory and to recall the details of an incident. It is not as if a video tape is replayed on the mental screen.***
- (2) ***Ordinarily it so happens that a witness is overtaken by events. The witness could not have anticipated the occurrence which so often has an element of surprise. The mental faculties therefore cannot be expected to be attuned to absorb the details.***
- (3) ***The powers of observation differ from person to person. What one may notice, another may not. An object or movement might emboss its image on one person's mind whereas it might go unnoticed on the part of another. (4) By and large people cannot accurately recall a conversation and reproduce the very words used by them or heard by them. They can only recall the main purport of the conversation. It is unrealistic to expect a witness to be a human tape recorder.***
- (5) ***In regard to exact time of an incident, or the time duration of an occurrence, usually, people make their estimates by guess work on the spur of the moment 1.1 at the time of interrogation. And one cannot expect people to make very precise or reliable estimates in such matters. Again, it depends on the time- sense of individuals which varies from person to person.***
- (6) ***Ordinarily a witness cannot be expected to recall accurately the sequence of events which take place in rapid succession or in a short time span. A witness is liable to get confused, or mixed up when interrogated later on.***
- (7) ***A witness, though wholly truthful, is liable to be overawed by the court atmosphere and the piercing cross examination made by counsel and out of nervousness mix up facts, get confused regarding sequence of events, or fill up details from imagination on the spur of the moment. The sub-conscious***

mind of the witness sometimes so operates on account of the fear of looking foolish or being disbelieved though the witness is giving a truthful and honest account of the occurrence witnessed by him-Perhaps it is a sort of a psychological defence mechanism activated on the spur of the moment."

- 26.** In another case **Bidhan Nath and Parijat Mousam Nath Vs State of Assam** reported in (2001) **GLR 557**, the **Hon'ble Gauhati High Court** held that: ***"Over importance should not be attached to omission, contradiction and minor discrepancies which do not go to the root of the matter and shake the basic version of the prosecution."***
- 27.** Again learned defence counsel agitated that PW2 the victim stated in his evidence that when he fell down on the ground his wife Smti. Jayanti Das came to pick up him but the prosecution has not examined such vital witness. Admittedly and evidently the said Smti. Jayanti Das was not listed witness in the charge-sheet as eye witness of the occurrence. Other eye witnesses are also total silent regarding presence of said Jayanti Das in the spot on the relevant day.
- 28.** In my view, since the prosecution case is supported by the victim as well as other ocular witnesses corroborative medical evidence as well as by the ejahar and the Investigating Officer after due investigation of the case finding materials against the accused persons submitted the charge sheet. Therefore, non-examination of Smti. Jayanti Das hardly give any benefit to the defence. The **Supreme Court** in a catena of decision held that : ***"Once prosecution case is believed non-examination of any witness cannot throw doubt on the testimony of the witnesses who have examined and believed by the court. "***
- 29.** Thus, evidence of ocular witness coupled with medical evidence Ext. 2 and the ejahar Ext. 1 it is clear that the accused Smti. Bharati Das bit off flesh from the chin of Sri Nirajan Das and the co-accused Sri Rabi Das also fell him down on the floor by pushing. Since, both the accused persons are father and daughter in relation and they with their common intention caused hurt to PW 2, therefore, I affirmly hold that the accused persons are guilty of committing offence **U/S 324 of I.P.C.** and the same is established by the prosecution beyond all reasonable doubt.

- 30.** Pertaining to the offence **U/S 427 I.P.C.** i.e. committing mischief to the property of the complainant or his brother Niranjan Das it is come into light that some goats destroyed chilly plants and flower saplings in the garden of Sri Niranjan Das, but the prosecution side has failed to prove that the said goats belonged to the accused persons. When Sri Niranjan Das came to near Smti. Bharati Das and Rabi Das enquiring about the goats the incident took place.
- 31.** Here, **PW 1 Sri Sonaram Das (informant), PW 4 Sri Raghu Das, PW 5 Smti. Minati Das** and **PW 6 Smti. Ranju Bala Das** are silent regarding the offence U/S 427 I.P.C. only **PW 3 Smti Lalita Das** stated that some goats grazed the chilly plants and flower saplings in the garden of her uncle Sri Niranjan Das. Further, the informant stated in the ejahar that the accused persons some goats grazed chilly plants and flower saplings in the garden of his brother, but the said informant being PW 1 was silent in his evidence in this context. In absence of any corroborative evidence that the said goats belonged to the accused persons, it is not justified to convict the accused persons **U/S 427 I.P.C.**
- 32.** Since the accused persons jointly caused hurt to **PW 2 Sri Niranjan Das** and bit off flesh from his chin to the extent, he had to take medication at Mangaldai as well as at GMCH, Guwahati, therefore, I can not myself address to provide benefit under **Probation of Offenders Act, 1958** to the accused persons.
- 33.** The accused persons are **heard on the question of sentence.** The accused Smti. Bharati Das stated that she is mother of a minor child and the other accused Sri Rabi Das is an aged person and sole bread earner of his family, therefore they should be dealt with leniency. I have considered the submissions of the accused persons.

O R D E R

- 34.** In the result, both the accused persons namely Sri Rabi Das and Smti. Bharati Das are acquitted from the offence **U/S 427/34 I.P.C.** However, they are convicted **U/S 324/34 I.P.C.** and sentenced to undergo **Simple Imprisonment** for **6(six)** months each and to **pay fine** of **Rs. 5000/-** (rupees five thousand) only each. In default of the payment of fine amount, shall undergo **Simple Imprisonment** for **1(one)** month each.

- 35.** The period of detention already undergone by the accused persons, if any, as UTP in the jail hajot, shall be set off from period of substantive sentence so imposed.
- 36.** Supply free copies of the judgment to the accused persons.
- 37.** Send a copy of this judgment to the District Magistrate, Udalguri for kind information as per provision of Section 365 Cr.P.C.
- 38.** The Judgment is delivered in the open Court and tagged with the case record.

Given under my hand and seal of this court on this 30th day of December, 2021 at Udalguri, Assam.

Dictated and corrected by me:

(Ranjita Agarwalla)
Chief Judicial Magistrate
Udalguri, Assam.

(Ranjita Agarwalla)
Chief Judicial Magistrate.
Udalguri, Assam.

APPENDIX

- A. Prosecution witnesses : **PW 1 Sri Sonaram Das (informant)**
PW 2 Sri Niranjan Das
PW 3 Sri Lalita Das
PW 4 Sri Raghu Das
PW 5 Smti. Minati Das
PW 6 Smti. Ranju Bala Das
PW 7 Dr. Rajib Borah (Medical Officer) and
PW 8 A.S.I. Sarafat Ali (I.O.).
- B. Defence witness : Nil.
- C. Documents exhibited : **Ext. 1 Ejahar.**
Ext. 2 Medical Report
Ext. 3 Sketch Map
Ext. 4 Charge-sheet.

(Ranjita Agarwalla)
Chief Judicial Magistrate
Udalguri, Assam.