

Andhra Pradesh High Court - Amravati

Gubbala Srinu, W.G.Dt., vs State Of Ap., Rep Pp., on 8 October, 2020

Bench: C.Praveen Kumar, B Krishna Mohan

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE C.PRAVEEN KUMAR
AND

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE B.KRISHNA MOHAN

CRIMINAL APPEAL No.1242 of 2014

JUDGMENT:- (Per Hon'ble Sri Justice C.Praveen Kumar)

Heard through Video Conferencing (Blue Jeans App).

The sole accused in Sessions Case No.150 of 2012 on the file of the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Narasapur is the appellant herein. He was tried for the offences punishable under Sections 302 and 201 I.P.C. By its judgment, dated 31.10.2014

, the learned Sessions Judge convicted the accused on both the counts and sentenced him to undergo imprisonment for life and to pay a fine of Rs.2,000/- in default, to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of one year for the offence punishable under Section 302 I.P.C. He was also sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year and to pay a fine of Rs.1,000/- in default, to suffer simple imprisonment for a period of three months for the offence punishable under Section 201 I.P.C. The substantive sentences were directed to run concurrently. Aggrieved by the same, the present appeal is filed by the accused.

2. The substance of the charge against the accused is that on 12.11.2010, at about 8:30 P.M., the accused took one Kadali Durga Kumari (hereinafter, referred to as "the deceased") to the tollgate bridge at S.R.Pet, H/o Penumadam, took her to the backside of a tree by the side of the bridge and beat her with his chappal, as a result of which, she fell down and lost her consciousness. He is said to have removed her dress and 2 CPK, J & BKM, J CrI.A.No.1242 of 2014 strangled her by tying one of the leg part of her pant around her neck and thereafter, threw the body into the Kaza drain.

The facts, as culled out from the evidence of prosecution witnesses, are as under: -

P.W.3 is the father of the deceased. P.W.4 is the mother of deceased and wife of P.W.3. P.W.5 is the brother of the deceased and son of P.Ws.3 and 4. P.W.6 is the resident of Ambativani Cheruvu Village, who knows the prosecution party and also the accused. The evidence on record would show that the deceased was going for coolie work. The accused, who is also the resident of the same village, used to follow her stating that he was in love with her and would marry her. Believing his words, the deceased moved with him. Later, the accused left for Dubai. It is said that in the year 2009, he returned from Dubai and again, started moving with the deceased.

On one day, P.W.3, who woke up in the midnight, found the deceased missing by the side of his wife. He immediately woke up his wife and others and proceeded to coconut garden where they found the accused and deceased together. The matter was placed before the elders and panchayat was called for, in which the accused agreed to marry the deceased on payment of Rs.65,000/- as dowry. The parents of the deceased agreed to pay the said amount. After three days, when P.Ws.3 and 4 asked the parents of the accused about the marriage, they replied that the accused is not available and asked them to do whatever they could. Then, P.W.3 lodged a report against the accused and his family members for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 376 and 417 r/w 3 CPK, J & BKM, J CrI.A.No.1242 of 2014 34 I.P.C and Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961. The said report was registered as a case in Crime No.48 of 2009 of Poduru Police Station and thereafter, a charge sheet came to be filed vide P.R.C.No.16 of 2009 on the file of the learned Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Palakol. On committal, it was numbered as Sessions Case No.289 of 2010 on the file of the learned Assistant Sessions Judge, Narsapur. During the pendency of trial in the said case, the accused was asking the deceased to compromise the matter by accepting some money but the deceased was insisting only for marriage with him. At that point of time, the accused is said to have threatened the deceased with dire consequences.

The evidence of P.Ws.3 to 5 also shows that on 12.11.2010, the deceased went to Venugopala Swamy Temple, Narsapur along with brother of P.W.3 and others for attending the marriage of Peethani Peddiraju's daughter but she did not return home. P.W.6, one Kadali Ramakrishna and others, who went to marriage along with deceased, thought that the deceased might have left with the accused. They searched for the deceased but could not trace her. Left with no other option, they informed the parents of the deceased about the same. For four days thereafter, they searched for the deceased but in vain. Ultimately, on 17.11.2010, at about 9:00 A.M., Village Revenue Assistant of Gondi Village noticed a dead body in downward condition at Kaza Drain. He informed the same to Village Revenue Officer, who came to the spot along with A.S.I and Police Constables.

4

CPK, J & BKM, J
CrI.A.No.1242 of 2014

Later, P.W.1 - V.R.O went to the place where the dead body was found, prepared a report and sent to Elamanchili Police Station. Ex.P-1 is the report. According to him, on the same day, the A.S.I Police, Elamanchili Police Station, came to the spot and requested him to come to Kaza drive along with others for identification of the body. They went to the said place and found the dead body in a decomposed and unidentifiable condition. However, they noticed one watch, one holy thread and one bangle on the dead body. M.O.1 is the gold coated wrist watch. M.O.2 is the aluminum metal design fancy bangle. M.O.3 is the holy thread with knot. Ex.P-2 is the scene observation report containing the signature of P.W.1 and others. It is to be noted here that on the same day, at 11.45 A.M., i.e., prior to preparing the observation report, P.W.13- Assistant Sub-Inspector of Police, basing on the report of P.W.1, registered a case in Crime No.114 of 2010 of Elamanchili Police Station under Section 174 Cr.P.C and issued Ex.P-14, the original F.I.R. He took up investigation and left

with staff to the scene of offence and in the presence of mediators, prepared a rough sketch under Ex-P-15. He also prepared a panchanama of the scene, which is placed on record as Ex-P.2. At about 2:00 P.M., he conducted inquest in the presence of P.W.2. Ex.P-3 is the Inquest Report. During the inquest, they observed a cut injury on the neck. After the inquest, the dead body was sent for post mortem examination. On 16.11.2010, a case in Crime No.98 of 2010 was registered under the head "Woman Missing" in Poduru Police Station. Then, he requested the concerned police constable to inform the parents of the missing woman to come to the Government Hospital, Palakol for identification of the dead 5 CPK, J & BKM, J CrI.A.No.1242 of 2014 body. It is said that on the same day, at 6:00 P.M., one Kadali Satyanarayana i.e., P.W.3 and his relatives came there and identified the body as that of the deceased basing on wrist watch and bangle. On 17.11.2010, P.W.8 took photographs of the deceased (four in number) and the same are marked as Ex.P-6 along with C.D. On 18.11.2010, at about 4:00 P.M., P.W.11, who is Assistant Civil Surgeon, conducted autopsy over the dead body of the deceased and issued Ex.P-10 - Post Mortem Certificate. According to doctor, the cause of death was caused due to strangulation by Asphyxia. He found ligature marks around the neck of the deceased. Ex.P-11 is the final report given by the Doctor basing on Ex-P12 - RFSL report. On 18.11.2010, on receipt of C.D. from A.S.I of police, P.W.15 altered the section of law to 302 I.P.C. Ex.P-16 is the altered F.I.R.

The evidence on record shows that on 24.11.2010, the accused appeared before V.R.O of Poduru Village and confessed about the commission of the offence on 12.11.2010 at S.R.Peta Bridge of Penumada Village and thereafter, threw the body into the canal. Pursuant to the same, V.R.O proceeded to the police station and produced the accused before P.W.14 - S.I of Police along with the report prepared by him (Ex.P-5) and also the confessional statement of the accused. On 21.11.2010, the Inspector of Police took up further investigation in the case and after verifying the contents of the F.I.R, visited the scene of offence where the dead body was found and also verified the sketch and mediators' report prepared by the Investigating Officer. According to him, on 24.11.2010, the accused surrendered before V.R.O, who brought him to Poduru Police Station, and after perusing the report of the 6 CPK, J & BKM, J CrI.A.No.1242 of 2014 V.R.O and the confession of the accused, P.W.16, who is the Inspector of Police, arrested the accused and later interrogated him in the presence of P.W.10 and others. The accused is alleged to have confessed about the commission of offence and also lead them to the place where he killed the deceased, from where the purse - M.O.8 was seized under a cover of panchanama. Further, a rold gold chain, steel anklet of the deceased together with a two wheeler were said to have recovered from the accused. After completing the investigation, the Inspector of Police filed the charge sheet, which was taken on file as of P.R.C No.40 of 2011 on the file of the learned Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Narsapur.

On appearance of the accused, copies of the documents as required under Section 207 Cr.P.C., were supplied to him. As the offences are triable by a Court of Sessions, the case was committed to the Court of the Sessions under Section 209 Cr.P.C. Accordingly, the same was made over to the Court of the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Narsapur, for trial and disposal in accordance with law.

3. Basing on the material available on record, charges under Sections 302 and 201 I.P.C. came to be framed against the accused, read over and explained to him in Telugu, to which, he pleaded not

guilty and claimed to be tried.

4. To substantiate its case, the prosecution examined P.Ws.1 to 16 and got marked Exs.P-1 to P-18 and M.Os.1 to 8. After the closure of the prosecution evidence, the accused was examined under Section 313 Cr.P.C., with reference to the incriminating 7 CPK, J & BKM, J CrI.A.No.1242 of 2014 circumstances appearing against him in the evidence of the prosecution witnesses to which he denied. No oral or documentary evidence was adduced on behalf of the accused.

5. Basing on the evidence of P.Ws. 3 to 5, 7 and 10, the learned Sessions Judge convicted the accused and sentenced him, as stated supra. Challenging the same, the present appeal came to be filed by the accused.

6. Learned counsel appearing for the appellant would contend that there are no eye witnesses to the incident and the circumstances relied upon by the prosecution i.e., the accused being last seen in the company of the deceased, extra judicial confession made by the accused before P.W.7, recovery of ornaments belonging to the deceased pursuant to the confession made by the accused are not established beyond all reasonable doubt. He further submits that there is any amount of doubt with regard to the identification of the body as that of the deceased. According to him, the version of the prosecution that the accused caused the death of the deceased by throttling her neck is not proved by the evidence of the Doctor. In other words, it is urged that the circumstances relied upon by the prosecution are not proved and even if they are taken to be true, they do not form a chain of events connecting the accused with the crime.

7. Learned Public Prosecutor opposed the same contending that the prosecution was able to establish the guilt of the accused beyond all reasonable doubt. The motive for the accused to commit crime, coupled with recoveries made and the extra judicial confession made by the accused before P.W.7, are proved by the 8 CPK, J & BKM, J CrI.A.No.1242 of 2014 prosecution beyond all reasonable doubt. According to him, there is no rule that the statements of the accused recorded by P.W.7 has to be reduced into writing. If it is found reliable and trustworthy, the same can be taken into consideration to connect the accused with the crime.

8. The short point that arises for determination is:

"Whether the circumstances relied upon by the prosecution are proved and if proved whether they form a chain of events connecting the accused for the offences punishable under Sections 302 and 201 I.P.C.?"

9. POINT:-

It is to be noted here that there are no eye witnesses to the incident and the case rests on circumstantial evidence. In a case arising out of circumstantial evidence, the prosecution has to prove each of the circumstances relied upon by them and the circumstances so proved should form a chain of events connecting the accused with the crime. In *Jawaharlal Das v. State of Orissa's case*,¹ the Apex Court held that to base a conviction in a case arising out of circumstantial evidence, three

conditions are required to be satisfied. 1) the circumstances from which an inference of guilt is sought to be drawn must be cogently and firmly established; 2) those circumstances should be of a definite tendency unerringly pointing towards the guilt of the accused; and

3) the circumstances, taken cumulatively, should form a chain so complete that there is no escape from the conclusion that within all human probability, the crime was committed by the accused 1 AIR 1991 SC 1388 9 CPK, J & BKM, J CrI.A.No.1242 of 2014 and none else, and it should also be incapable of explanation on any other hypothesis than that of the guilt of the accused.

10. Keeping in view the principles laid down by the Apex Court in the judgment referred to above, we shall now proceed to deal with the case on hand.

As can be seen from the record, the prosecution relied upon four circumstances.

i. Motive for commission of the offence.

ii. The accused being last seen in the company of the deceased iii. Extra judicial confession made by the accused before P.W.7 and iv. Recovery of the articles i.e., a rold gold chain and anklets belonging to the deceased from the house of the accused.

11. Insofar as the theory of accused being last seen in the company of the deceased is concerned, P.W.5, who is the son of P.Ws.3 and 4, deposed that in the year 2010, the deceased went to a marriage at Venugopala Swamy Temple, Narsapur and that the accused was moving on a bike outside the marriage and thereafter, the deceased was missing from the marriage venue. Thereafter, they searched for the deceased at their relatives' houses but in vain. It will be useful to refer to that portion of the evidence of P.W.5 which is as under:-

"In the year 2010 my sister went to Venugopala Swamy Temple, Narsapur who attended the marriage of daughter of Peethani Peddiraju along with Kadali Ramakrishna. We learnt that accused is moving on bike outside the marriage. My sister was missing and Kadali Ramakrishna, Bokka Venkateswara Rao searched for my sister. But she was not 10 CPK, J & BKM, J CrI.A.No.1242 of 2014 traced and they informed us about missing of my sister. We searched for my sister at my relatives houses."

12. P.W.6, who is also a resident of Ambativani Cheruvu Village, knew P.Ws.3 to 5 and others. In his evidence, he deposed that he along with the deceased and others attended the marriage at Venugopala Swamy Temple, Narsapur about four years prior to the date of giving evidence. When they sat at the temple, the accused was passing on Stemer Road, Narsapur. When he and Kadali Ramakrishna went into the temple, the deceased, who came along with them to the marriage, was found missing. They searched for her but could not trace her and about four days later, a report came to be lodged. It would be useful to extract the relevant portion in evidence of P.W.6, which reads as under:-

"I know P.W.3 to P.W.5 and Kadali Ramakrishna and Chellinkula Raju. I know the accused. I know the deceased (Kadali Durga Kumari). She is the daughter of P.W.3. We came to attend the marriage of Venugopala Swamy Temple, Narsapur about four years ago. When we sat at the temple, the accused passing on Stemer Road, Narsapur. Myself and Kadali Ramakrishna went into temple. But Kadali Durga Kumari who came along with us to the marriage was missing, we searched for her, myself and Kadali Ramakrishna thought that Kadali Durga Kumari might have left with the accused".

13. From the evidence of these two witnesses, prosecution made an effort to establish that the accused was last seen in the company of the deceased. But as seen from the evidence of these two witnesses, nowhere they deposed about the deceased in the company of the accused. It is not in the evidence of these two witnesses that they saw the deceased going out of the temple while all of them were sitting together or that they saw deceased and accused going on a motor bike. At this stage, it is to be noted that though the prosecution cited one Chellinkula Raju (L.W.8) to speak 11 CPK, J & BKM, J CrI.A.No.1242 of 2014 about witnessing the deceased in the company of the accused on 12.11.2010 at Venugopala Swamy Temple, Narsapur, but they failed to examine him. There is no explanation from the prosecution as to why they gave up this witness. Therefore, the first circumstance relied upon by the prosecution i.e., the accused was last seen in the company of the deceased is not established beyond all reasonable doubt.

14. The second circumstance relied upon by the prosecution is the extra judicial confession made by the accused before P.W.7, who is the V.R.O of Poduru Village. P.W.7, in his evidence, deposed that on 24.11.2010, at about 11.00 A.M., the accused came to his house, introduced himself as Gubbala Srinu and then informed him that he killed the deceased with chunni on 12.11.2010 at S.R.Pet Bridge of Penumadam Village and then threw her into a canal. P.W.7 seems to have given a report to the S.I under Ex.P-5. But in the cross examination, he admits to have stated before the police that he took the accused to the police station on 26.11.2010 (i.e., two days later) and handed over him to the S.I. of Police. He denies the suggestion that he did not state before the police that the accused came to him while he was in office. It would be useful to extract the relevant portion in the cross examination of P.W.7, which is as under:-

"It is true that I have stated to police that I took the accused to Poduru Police Station on 26.11.2010 at 12.00 noon and handed over him to the S.I. of Police, Poduru. I did not state to police that Gubbala Srinu (accused) came to me while I was in office. I did not take the identity or photograph of Gubbala Srinu (accused). I have acquaintance with the accused."

15. From the evidence of this witness, it is clear that though the accused visited him on 24.11.2010 at 11.00 A.M., and introduced himself and thereafter, made a confession involving himself in the commission of the offence but he produced the accused before the police on 26.11.2020. Secondly, it is very difficult to believe as to why the accused would go and make a confession before a stranger. It may be true that P.W.7 is a V.R.O of the village but still, there was no necessity for him to go and make a confession before him disclosing the commission of the offence. If really such a confession was made, he would have sought for some help from the V.R.O or would have made the confession informing him the possibility of harassment in the hands of police if he surrenders before the police and thereby, seeking his involvement in his surrender. But such a thing was never referred to in the evidence of P.W.7. Without claiming any benefit or any relief from P.W.7, it is difficult to believe that the accused would have simply gone to the V.R.O and confessed about the commission of offence, more so when no one was aware as to who the accused was, by then.

16. Be that as it may, the evidence of P.W.14, S.I of Police, would show that on 24.11.2010, at about 11:00 A.M., P.W.3 gave a report which lead to registration of a case in Crime No.98 of 2010. On the very same day, at the very same time, V.R.O is said to have produced the accused before him along with a report-Ex.P-5 and confessional statement of the accused. It would be useful to extract the evidence of this witness, which is as under:-

"I am resident of Palakol. I am retired S.I. of Police, Palakol. Previously I worked as S.I. of Police, Poduru from 20.02.2010 to 28.02.2011. On 24.11.2010 at 11:00 A.M., Kadali Satyanarayana gave a report and I registered the case in Crime No.98 of 2010 U/S Woman Missing. On 13 CPK, J & BKM, J Crl.A.No.1242 of 2014 24.11.2010 at 11.00 A.M., V.R.O. Poduru gave a report produced before me along with accused and his confession statement."

17. As seen from above, the witness deposes about V.R.O producing the accused before him on 24.11.2010 along with the report and confessional statement of the accused. Strangely, the confessional statement recorded by P.W.7 was not placed on record and the same does not see the light of the day. There is no explanation from the prosecution as to why the statement said to have been recorded by P.W.7 is not placed on record. The argument of the learned Public Prosecutor that there is no necessity for reducing the confessional statement into writing by the person before whom such confession was made, may be correct but having reduced the same into writing, there is no justification for withholding the same. Apart from that, one another factor which goes to the root of the matter is that as per the evidence of P.W.7, the accused is said to have made the extra judicial confession on 24.11.2010 at 11:00 A.M in the house of P.W.7, which is evident from his evidence. But P.W.16 -Investigating Officer, in his evidence, states that P.W.7 stated to him that the accused came to his office and made the confession. The relevant portion is as under:-

"It is true that P.W.7 stated to me that accused came to his office."

18. Therefore, the following five circumstances, namely i. Discrepancy with regard to the place where the accused is alleged to have made the extra judicial confession.

14

CPK, J & BKM, J
CrI.A.No.1242 of 2014

ii. Suppression of the statement of the accused recorded by P.W.7.

iii. Extra judicial confession and the report of P.W.3 being on the same day and at the same time.

iv. The statement before the police that he produced the accused on 26.11.2010 at 12.00 noon which is two days after the accused made the alleged extra judicial confession before P.W.7.

v. The accused making confession before a stranger without seeking any favour from him.

These five circumstances throw any amount of doubt as to whether the accused had really confessed about his guilt before P.W.7.

19. Coming to the last circumstance i.e., recovery of the articles pursuant to the confession made by the accused on 24.11.2010. It is to be noted that P.W.16, Investigating Officer, in his evidence deposed about the same. According to him, on 24.11.2010, after the accused was produced before the police by the V.R.O, he arrested the accused and on interrogation in the presence of P.W.10 and another, the accused is said to have confessed about commission of the offence and then lead them to the scene of offence where the purse of the deceased was recovered and thereafter, produced a rold gold chain, steel anklets of the deceased and the two wheeler motorcycle vehicle used in the commission of offence from his house.

15

CPK, J & BKM, J
CrI.A.No.1242 of 2014

It would be useful to extract the same which is as under:- "I have arrest of the accused and sent him, on interrogation he voluntarily confessed in the presence P.W.10 and Setharama Swamy, under a cover mediators report. The accused lead us to the place where he killed the deceased and seized purse of deceased under a cover of panchanama and also seized rold gold chain, steel anklets of deceased together with two wheeler bearing AP 37 AE 5738 of Hero Honda of accused home, under a cover of panchanama."

20. From the evidence of this witness, it appears that the accused is said to have confessed about the commission of offence leading to recovery on 24.11.2010, before P.W.10 and other witnesses. But P.W.10, who is also a retired V.R.O of Penumadam Village, in his evidence, deposed that on 24.11.2010, at about 1:00 P.M., he drafted mediators' report at Poduru Police Station and also recorded the statement. According to him, there was one Anjaneyulu present with him. He deposed that he does not remember as to whether they secured the accused on the same day. At about 3:00 P.M., he also prepared scene observation report, which is marked as Ex.P-8, and he also drafted mediators' report at 5:00 P.M., which is placed on record as Ex.P-9. According to him, M.O.5 - rold gold chain, M.O.6 - anklets, M.O.7 - Hero Honda Splendor Motor Cycle, M.O.8 - chocolate colour ladies small purse were seized. He admits that he had written more than two hundred mediators' reports during his service and that he cannot identify the accused. He further admits that he does not remember from whom M.Os.5 to 8 were recovered. It would be useful to extract the same which is as under:-

"I have written more than 200 mediators reports during my service. I cannot identify the accused. I do not remember from whom M.O.5 to 8 were recovered."

16

CPK, J & BKM, J
Crl.A.No.1242 of 2014

21. Therefore, the evidence of the mediator throws any amount of doubt with regard to the recovery of M.Os.5 to 8 from the accused, more so, as he failed to identify the person from whom the articles were seized and also failed to identify him.

22. At this stage, it would be useful to refer to the evidence of the Photographer - P.W.8 to demonstrate the falsity in the recovery of anklets from the accused. P.W.8, who took photographs of the scene of offence and also the dead body, deposed that on 17.11.2010, he took the photographs of the deceased which are placed on record as Exs.P-6 and P-7, which are the photographs and C.Ds of the deceased.

However, in the cross examination, he admits that he found anklets to the ankles of the dead body. It would be useful to extract the said admission, which is as under:-

"It is true that I found anklets to the ankles of dead body."

23. When the anklets were on the body of the deceased, it is strange as to how the police recovered the said anklets from the house of the accused. The same appears to have been planted making the recovery false, when really the photographs show anklets on the body of the deceased.

24. At this stage, learned Public Prosecutor tried to contend that when the prosecution has proved motive, the other circumstances pale into insignificance. In other words, his argument appears to be

that even if the prosecution failed to establish the circumstances beyond all reasonable doubt, but when the motive is strong, the same, by itself, is sufficient to connect the accused 17 CPK, J & BKM, J CrI.A.No.1242 of 2014 with the crime. It may be true that there was some hot-blood between accused and the deceased prior to the incident, and when the accused went back to marry the deceased, a criminal case was registered against seven accused vide S.C.No.289 of 2010 on the Court of the learned Assistant Sessions Judge, Narsapur. It may also be true that the accused initially agreed to marry her but later went back. It may also be true that the accused tried to threaten the deceased with dire consequences if she does not compromise with the accused. But as seen from the record, a sessions case, which came to be filed when the accused went back on his promise to marry the deceased, ended in acquittal vide judgment in S.C.No.289 of 2010, dated 21.02.2011, of course, after the death of the deceased.

25. But the Hon'ble Apex Court in "catena" of judgments held that however strong the motive is, the same cannot occupy the place of proof and motive can only be one of the circumstances in the chain to be proved. Things would have been different had the prosecution was able to prove some of the circumstances relied upon by them to connect the accused with the crime. Hence, it may not be safe to convict the accused only on motive, more so, when there is no other evidence on record connecting the accused with the offences punishable under Sections 302 and 201 I.P.C.

26. As all the circumstances relied upon by the prosecution are not proved, it can be safely concluded that the prosecution has failed to prove its case beyond all reasonable doubt against the appellant for the offences punishable under Sections 302 and 201 18 CPK, J & BKM, J CrI.A.No.1242 of 2014 I.P.C. and as such, the judgment of the trial Court is liable to be set aside.

27. In the result, the conviction and sentence recorded by the learned Additional District & Sessions Judge, Narsapur vide judgment, dated 31.10.2014, in Sessions Case No.150 of 2012 against the appellant/accused for the offences punishable under Sections 302 and 201 I.P.C. are set aside. The appellant/accused shall be released forthwith if he is not required in any other crime. M.Os.6 and 7 shall be returned to the appellant/accused. Fine amount, if any, paid by the appellant/accused shall be refunded to him.

Accordingly, the Criminal Appeal is allowed. Miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, in this Criminal Appeal shall stand closed.

----- JUSTICE C.PRAVEEN KUMAR
JUSTICE B.KRISHNA MOHAN Date: 08.10.2020
AKN 19 CPK, J & BKM, J CrI.A.No.1242 of 2014 THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE C.PRAVEEN
KUMAR AND THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE B.KRISHNA MOHAN CRIMINAL APPEAL
No.1242 of 2014 Date: 08.10.2020 AKN