

**G.R. CASE NO. 1993/2016**

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

**G.R. CASE NO. 1993/2016**

(U/S- 498A/326 IPC)

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

Judicial Magistrate First Class, Dibrugarh

**State**

- VS -

**Sri Rama Urang**

S/O - Sri Ram Urang @ Bahira

R/O - Agnipathar Gaon

P.S. - Lahowal

Dist - Dibrugarh, Assam

.....Accused person

Advocate for the Prosecution : Learned Smti. Lakshmi  
Mohan

Advocate for the Defence : Learned Sri M.K.Yadav

**G.R. CASE NO. 1993/2016**

Evidence recorded on : 14-08-2017, 25-10-2017,  
08-02-2018, 29-03-2018,  
22-01-2019

Argument heard on : 03-01-2021

Judgment delivered on : 29-01-2022

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

1. The prosecution case as stated in the F.I.R. dated 20-07-2016 is that the accused Sri Rama Urang is the husband of the informant's daughter Smti. Pramila Kurmi. On 25-06-2016, the accused person physically assaulted Smti. Pramila Kurmi in connection with demands for dowry and even cut her legs with a 'dao' due to which she sustained grievous injuries on her legs. He then allegedly tied her up and did not provide her any medical aid due to which her legs were infected with septic. The victim somehow called her aunt and informed about the matter. When her parents came to know about the matter, they admitted her to the Assam Medical College and Hospital, Dibrugarh. During the course of her treatment, all the expenses were borne by the parents of the victim.

**G.R. CASE NO. 1993/2016**

2. A case was registered at Lahowal P.S. subsequent to the lodging of this F.I.R. which was filed against the accused Sri Rama Urang being the husband of the victim Smti. Pramila Kurmi. Upon completion of investigation, the police submitted charge sheet against the accused person for commission of the offences u/sec 498A/326 of the Indian Penal Code (hereinafter referred to as I.P.C.).
3. The accused stood for trial. Copies of the relevant documents were furnished to the accused 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/326 of the IPC against the accused. Accordingly, formal charges u/sec 498A/326 IPC were framed, read over and explained to the accused to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.
4. In support of the case, the prosecution side has examined as many as 08 (eight) witnesses, namely, Smti. Kusheswari Kurmi, informant of the case as PW-1, Smti. Pramila Kurmi being the victim as PW-2, Sri Ghana Kurmi as PW-3, Sri Tapan Kurmi as PW-4, Sri Babul Kurmi as PW-5, Smti. Bobita Urang as PW-

6, Sri Mahipal Sawasi as PW-7 and Dr. Pratap Kumar Deb as PW-8.

The prosecution also took aid of 02 (two) documents which are as follows:

The ejahar as Exhibit 1 and the victim's medical report as Exhibit 2.

5. After recording the prosecution evidence, the statement of the accused person was recorded u/sec 313 of Cr.P.C. The defence plea is that of total denial and the accused person claimed innocence. The defence did not adduce any evidence.
6. I have heard the arguments from both sides and meticulously perused the entire evidence on record.
7. THE POINTS FOR DETERMINATION:
  - i. Whether the accused being the husband of the victim Smti. Pramila Kurmi, on 25-06-2016 at Agnipather Bhimpara, committed acts of physical and mental cruelty upon her, followed by demands for dowry and thereby committed an offence punishable u/sec 498A of the IPC?
  - ii. Whether the accused on the same date, time and place voluntarily caused grievous hurt to Smti. Pramila Kurmi by means of a 'dao' which is a weapon for cutting and thereby

committed an offence punishable u/sec 326 of the IPC?

**DISCUSSION, DECISION AND REASONS THEREON:**

8. PW-1, being the informant, deposed in her evidence that the accused person is her son-in-law. She stated that her daughter Smti. Pramila Kurmi being the victim/PW-2 had eloped with the accused. The incident took place about 4 to 5 months after that but she could not remember the date of the occurrence. On one occasion her daughter/PW-2 had called and informed her that the accused used to come home in a state of intoxication and that he used to fight with her. Her daughter also informed her that the accused did not allow her to visit her parental home. One day, her daughter/PW-2 informed her that she was about to come to her parental home when the accused physically assaulted her and cut her legs due to which she sustained serious injuries on her legs and was unable to walk as her feet had started swelling and rotting. PW-1 stated that she came to know about her daughter's condition about 15 days after the actual occurrence. Her daughter/PW-2 asked her to bring her home. So, she sent her son/PW-4 to her daughter's matrimonial home. After returning from the victim's matrimonial home, her son/PW-4 informed her that her legs had started to rot. PW-1 again sent him to the

victim's matrimonial home and told him to inform the accused that she will take the victim/PW-2 to the hospital and that the accused should bring some money. On that very day, the accused brought the victim to her paternal aunt's house which was nearby the house of PW-1 and left the victim there on the pretext of arranging for some money. The next day when the accused did not show up, the PW-1 collected some people and took their opinions regarding the situation. As the victim's condition was quite serious, the PW-1 instead of going to the police station, took the victim to AMCH, Dibrugarh in the evening. The accused also came to the AMCH, Dibrugarh but he did not bring any money. The victim was admitted to AMCH, Dibrugarh for about 45 days. During that entire period of time, the accused visited the victim only once and his family members never visited or took any news of the victim. The expenses of her daughter's medical treatment were borne entirely by her. After the victim's discharge from the AMCH, Dibrugarh, the PW-1 brought her home. She lodged the ejahar against the accused 20 (twenty) days after her daughter was admitted to the AMCH, Dibrugarh. Her statement was recorded by the police. She proved the Exhibit 1 as the ejahar lodged by her by identifying Exhibit 1(1) as her signature thereon.

**G.R. CASE NO. 1993/2016**

During her cross-examination, she stated that she is not aware if the accused and her daughter/PW-2 socially married at all. She had severed ties with her daughter/PW-2 as she had eloped with the accused without informing her. She also stated that the accused never visited her house after eloping with her daughter/PW-2. Although she has no personal knowledge about her daughter's injuries, she was told about the same by her daughter/PW-2. When the accused had brought the victim to her paternal aunt's house, she had met him and asked him how her daughter/PW-2 sustained the injuries but he did not reply to her questions. She stated that she does not know if her daughter/PW-2 injured herself while cutting firewood with 'dao' in order to prepare food while the accused was not at home. She does not know if the accused took her to the hospital for treatment. She does not know if the accused treated the victim's injuries with locally prepared medicines. She denied the defence suggestion that she lodged the instant case falsely against the accused as he was unable to get her daughter medically treated due to his financial constraints. She stated that she saw the injuries on both legs of her daughter/PW-2 and as her stomach was tightly tied in a 'gamusa', she also noticed black marks on her stomach. The doctor had to cut and

remove the portion of her daughter's legs which were infected with septic.

9. PW-2 is the victim. She is the informant's daughter and the wife of the accused. She eloped and got married to the accused sometime in 2016. About 3 months after their marriage, the accused started coming home drunk and fighting with her in connection with dowry demands. On the date of the incident, she told the accused that she wanted to go to her parental home in order to bring some money. The accused refused to allow her to go and cut her legs with a 'dao'. In order to stop the profuse bleeding from her legs, he tied up her legs with tobacco leaves. On the same day, when she complained of stomach ache, the accused tied a cloth tightly around her stomach. Despite the severity of her wounds, she had to stay at the matrimonial home for about 15 days without any medical treatment. She then somehow called her paternal aunt and asked her to take her to her parental home. Her paternal aunt informed about the matter to her family. Her younger brother came to visit her and informed their mother/PW-1 about her condition. Their mother/PW-1 again sent her brother to bring her home. Then the accused carried her on his bicycle and left her at the residence of her paternal aunt. He informed her paternal aunt that he



had to go and arrange for some money but later on, he did not return. The next day, her parents rented a vehicle and took her to AMCH, Dibrugarh where she was admitted for about 42 days. During the entire period of her stay at AMCH, Dibrugarh, the accused and his family members did not visit her even once. After being discharged from AMCH, Dibrugarh, she has been living at her parental home.

During her cross-examination, she stated that there had never been any social marriage between her and the accused. She does not remember the date when she first went to the matrimonial home. She stated that the accused used to demand dowry from her. He did not make demands for any specific monetary amount but he would ask her to bring money from her parental home. She does not know if the police had seized the 'dao' which was used by the accused to cut her legs. On the day before the incident, she had asked the accused to cut some firewood but he refused. She denied the defence suggestion that she injured her legs while cutting firewood. The injuries on her leg ultimately caused septic due to which her parents admitted her in AMCH, Dibrugarh. She denied the defence suggestion that the accused never demanded any money from her. She had informed her paternal aunt that the accused demanded money from her. The

accused did not provide her any medical aid or treatment for about 15 days after the incident. She stated that before this incident, she had not lodged any case against the accused for his dowry demands. Her mother/PW-1 and paternal aunt had not given any money to the accused. She denied the defence suggestion that the instant case has been falsely lodged against the accused as his family refused to accept her. While being admitted to AMCH, Dibrugarh, she did not inform the doctor that the accused had cut her legs. Her statement was recorded by the police two days after she was admitted to AMCH, Dibrugarh.

10. PW-3 is the informant's husband and the victim's father. The accused is his son-in-law. In his evidence he deposed that his daughter/PW-2 had eloped with the accused and the incident took place after about 6 months. Soon the accused began to have fights with his daughter/PW-2 in connection with monetary demands. When his daughter used to visit her parental home, her mother often gave her money. One day, his daughter/PW-2 called her paternal aunt and informed her that the accused had cut her legs and asked her to bring her home. The paternal aunt informed the matter to PWs 1 and 3 and also asked the accused to bring the victim to her home. The accused then carried the victim on a bicycle and

brought her to her paternal aunt's house and then, from there he took her to her parental home. The PW-3 then noticed that his daughter's legs were cut and that she was unable to walk. Her legs were swollen due to septic infection. On being asked, his daughter/PW-2 replied that the accused had cut her legs. He then collected some village people and took their advice. He borrowed some money and admitted his daughter/PW-2 to the AMCH, Dibrugarh where she was admitted for about 42 days. After her discharge from AMCH, Dibrugarh, his daughter/PW-2 has been living with him and his wife. Since the time of her admission in AMCH, Dibrugarh, the accused and his family members have not taken any news of his daughter/PW-2. The instant case was instituted when his daughter/PW-2 was undergoing treatment at AMCH, Dibrugarh. His statement was recorded by the police.

During his cross-examination, he stated that after his daughter/PW-2 eloped with the accused, he and his wife/PW-1 took news of her and even visited his daughter's matrimonial home along with some other villagers. Three months later, his daughter/PW-2 was visiting her parental home. Whenever she would visit her parental home, her mother/PW-1 would give her some money as their daughter/PW-2 told them that the accused used to demand money from her.

He had not seen the incident. His daughter/PW-2 was left untreated for about 20 days. When the accused brought his daughter/PW-2 to his home, he left to arrange some money but later on, he did not return. He stated that even after being informed by his daughter/PW-2 that the accused cut her legs, he did not inform the matter to the police. Later on, his wife/PW-1 filed the instant case against the accused as he neither took any news of the victim/PW-2 nor contributed towards her medical expenses. He also stated that if the accused would have given some money for the victim's medical expenses, his wife/PW-1 would not have lodged the instant case against him. He denied the defence suggestion that the accused did not cut his daughter's legs and that she injured herself while cutting firewood. He did not visit the village of the accused in order to find out how his daughter sustained the injuries as his daughter was in a serious condition and needed immediate medical treatment. He denied the defence suggestion that the accused never demanded any money from his daughter/PW-2 and that his daughter/PW-2 used to take money from them only in order to purchase her things for her own.

11. PW-4 is the son of the informant/PW-1 and the brother of the victim/PW-2. The accused is his

brother-in-law. In his evidence, he deposed that the incident occurred about 6 months after his sister/PW-2 married the accused. He stated that after his sister's marriage, the accused used to send his sister/PW-2 to her parental home to bring money and that he also used to physically assault his sister/PW-2 in connection with dowry demand. On the day of the occurrence, the accused physically assaulted the victim/PW-2 and he cut her legs with a 'dao'. He cut one of her legs above the knee and the other leg below the knee. About 20 days later, he visited his sister/PW-2 at her matrimonial home and found her legs in a very bad condition. That day, he did not meet the accused there. He came back home and informed his mother/PW-2 about his sister's condition. Thereafter, the accused brought his sister/PW-2 to the house of her paternal aunt wherefrom her family took her to AMCH, Dibrugarh. She was admitted to AMCH, Dibrugarh for about 45 days and after being discharged from there, she has been living with her family at the parental home.

During his cross-examination, he stated that he does not know the name of the village where his sister's matrimonial home is located but he stated that it lies at a distance of about 7 km from his village. He does not know the date of the occurrence. He did not bring his sister/PW-2 from her matrimonial

home, it was the accused who brought her to the house of her paternal aunt. He did not see the incident and he does not know if the accused was present during the incident. He denied the defence suggestion that the accused was not present at the time of the occurrence and that his sister/PW-2 injured herself while cutting firewood. He denied the defence suggestion that the accused provided locally prepared medicines to his sister/PW-2 and took her for better treatment to her paternal aunt's house as she was already infected with septic. He stated that the accused had also come to AMCH, Dibrugarh on the day his sister/PW-2 was being admitted there. The police did not seize any 'dao' in connection with his case. He denied the defence suggestion that the accused tried to take back his sister/PW-2 to the matrimonial home after her discharge from AMCH, Dibrugarh. He denied the defence suggestion that he deposed falsely in the Court.

12. PW-5 is the informant's brother-in-law. He deposed in his evidence that the accused is known to him and that the incident occurred in the month of June, 2016 after about a year of the victim's marriage with the accused. He was informed about the incident by the informant/PW-1. When he saw the victim/PW-2, he noticed that both her legs had been cut, one leg

was cut above the knee and the other leg was cut below the knee and that they had begun to rot. He came to know that the accused had physically assaulted the victim/PW-2. The victim/PW-2 was later taken to AMCH, Dibrugarh for her medical treatment and the entire expenditure of her treatment was borne by her parents.

During his cross-examination, he stated that he did not see the incident but had only heard about it from other people. He had never visited the victim's matrimonial house. His statement was not recorded by the police. He denied the defence suggestion that he did not ask the victim/PW-2 about the incident. He does not know who brought her to her parental home. He denied the defence suggestion that he deposed falsely in the Court and that the instant case was instituted against the accused simply because he failed to bear the medical expenses of his wife being the victim/PW-2.

13. PW-6 deposed in her evidence that the informant/PW-1 is her sister-in-law and the accused is the informant's son-in-law. She does not remember the date or time of the incident. About 6 month's after the victim's marriage with the accused, she received a phone-call at night from the victim/PW-2 and the victim/PW-2 informed her that

the accused had cut both her legs and asked her to inform the matter to her parents. The next morning, PW-6 informed about the matter to the victim's mother i.e. the informant/PW-1. When she returned from work in the evening, she found that the victim had been brought to her house by the accused. She stated that both the legs of the victim were cut and the victim's legs appeared to be swollen with pus. She then informed the matter to the informant/PW-1. The informant/PW-1 came to her house and took the victim/PW-1 to her own house. The victim/PW-2 was then admitted to AMCH, Dibrugarh and according to PW-6, she was admitted there for nearly 3 months. Her statement was recorded by the police.

During her cross-examination, she stated that she does not know how and in what circumstances, the accused had cut the victim's legs. She denied the defence suggestion that the victim injured herself while cutting some firewood. She does not know if the accused visited the victim/PW-2 while she was admitted at AMCH, Dibrugarh. She denied the defence suggestion that the victim never told her that it was the accused who physically assaulted her and cut her legs. She does not remember if she disclosed to the police that the victim/PW-2 had informed her about her legs being cut by the



accused. She denied the defence suggestion that a false case has been lodged against the accused.

14. PW-7 deposed in his evidence that the accused is known to him but that he does not anything about the occurrence.

His cross-examination was declined by the defence.

15. PW-8 is the M.O. In his evidence, he has deposed that on 05-07-2016, he was serving as Registrar of surgery, AMCH, Dibrugarh and on the same day, he examined Smti. Pramila Kurmi, female, aged 21 years, R/O - Agnipather, Dibrugarh. Upon examination, he found that the patient had raw area with cellulitis of the left leg to which treatment was given. He proved Exhibit 2 as the medical report of the victim Smti. Pramila Kurmi by identifying Exhibit 2(1) as his signature thereon.

During his cross-examination, he stated that there was no alleged history of the injury mentioned in the report and that there was no police escort when the victim was produced before him. He did not mention the age of the injury in the report and he also did not mention the reason for the cellulitis of the patient's left leg in the report. No reference number was mentioned in the report. The weapon used for causing the said injuries was also not mentioned in the report. He denied the defence suggestion that

he did not examine the patient in respect of this case.

16. I have heard the arguments of the learned Asst. Public Prosecutor and the learned defence counsel.
17. It appears from the prosecution evidence that the victim/PW-2 is the sole direct witness in this case. Admittedly, the accused person and the informant's daughter/victim/PW-2 are husband and wife. The informant/PW-1, PW-3 and PW-4 are the mother, father and brother of the victim respectively. The PW-5 is the informant's brother-in-law and the victim's uncle. The PW-6 is the paternal aunt of the informant/PW-1. Now, the stage has been set to appreciate the evidence on record in the light of the following essential ingredients of the offences alleged to have been committed by the accused.
18. The essence of the offence u/sec 498A, IPC lies in the Explanation to section 498A 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 498A, 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. In the instant case, the informant/PW-1 has not stated anything regarding any incident of physical assault upon her daughter/PW-2 by the

accused in connection with dowry. She has also not stated about any grave injury suffered by her daughter/PW-2 on account of such physical assault on her by the accused except the incident of 25-06-2016 as stated in the Exhibit 1 being the ejahar. She has also not deposed anything about the accused demanding any dowry from her daughter/PW-2. In her testimony, the informant/PW-1 deposed that her daughter/PW-2 had eloped with the accused and as such, her relation with her family was strained. Due to this reason, her daughter/PW-2 did not visit the parental home. But, contrary to this, the PW-3, being the father of the PW-2/victim deposed that she used to visit her parental home after her marriage to the accused and on such visits, she used to take money amount of Rs. 400 to Rs. 500 from her mother/informant/PW-1. None of the other PWs deposed anything about incidents of physical assault or torture upon the victim/PW-2 by the accused in connection with dowry. The Prosecution witnesses have also not mentioned about the commission of any such acts upon the victim/PW-2 by the accused which can be presumed to be of such nature as to drive her to commit suicide.

20. Now let us go through the medical evidence submitted by the prosecution side. PW-8 being the M.O. in the instant case has stated during his cross-

examination that there was no alleged history of the injury mentioned in Exhibit 2 and that when the victim/PW-2 was produced before him, she was not escorted or identified by any police escort. There was no mention of any reference case number. The age and nature of the injury and also the weapon used for causing the injury has not been mentioned in Exhibit 2. Resultantly, it transpires that the prosecution case is bereft of first element of the explanation to Section 498A, IPC as envisaged in clause (a).

21. The second element of the explanation to Section 498A, 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 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, even though the victim/PW-2 deposed that about three months after her marriage, the accused used to fight with her regarding dowry, neither the victim/PW-2 herself nor her parents being the informant/PW-1 and PW-2 nor her brother/PW-4 have stated the dates/approximate time, the amount(s) of money or the nature of any other dowry article or property alleged to have been

demanded by the accused person at various times during the marriage. The PW-5 and PW-6 have also not deposed about any dowry demand or acts of physical assault on the victim/PW-2 before the alleged incident dated 25-06-2016. Even though the victim and the other PWs have spoken about the cut injuries sustained by her, it cannot be ascertained clearly whether the said injuries were caused by none other than the accused and that the same was inflicted upon the victim/PW-2 by the accused in connection to unlawful demand for dowry. The same is also not supported by the medical evidence available on record. In such a situation, the whole prosecution case is shrouded in mystery and a doubt has been created on the overall credibility of the prosecution evidence.

22. It transpires from the prosecution evidence that prior to the lodging of this case, neither the victim/PW-2 nor her parents or brother had informed about the cruelty meted out to her by the accused person to the police or to any women's committee/organisation. Quite surprisingly, the date of the incident has been mentioned as 25-06-2016 but the ejahar was lodged on 20-07-2016. No reasonable cause as to the delay in lodging the F.I.R. has been mentioned in the Exhibit 1. The informant/PW-1 herself testified that the ejahar was

lodged about 20 days after the victim/PW-2 was admitted to AMCH, Dibrugarh but she failed to explain the cause of such an inordinate delay in lodging the ejahar. It has been alleged that the accused had inflicted grievous cut injuries on the legs of the victim/PW-2 with a 'dao'. But it transpires from the materials on record that the same has not been seized by the I.O. during the investigation. Moreover, the prosecution failed to examine the I.O. of the case as he expired even before being summoned by the Court. Non-examination of the I.O. in a case of allegations of such a serious nature is fatal to the prosecution case. Resultantly, it is found that the second element as envisaged in clause (b) of the explanation to Section 498A, IPC is also absent in the prosecution case.

23. Coming to the offence u/sec 326 IPC, the prosecution has to satisfy the following ingredients in the act of the accused:-
- (i) Voluntarily causing hurt
  - (ii) The hurt caused must be grievous in nature
  - (iii) The grievous hurt must be caused by dangerous weapon or means

The informant/PW-1 failed to explain the cause of delay in lodging the F.I.R. There were no eye witnesses who saw the accused committing the alleged act. Most importantly, the medical report of

the victim being the Exhibit 2 is silent about the age and nature of the victim's injury and nothing has been stated therein about the weapon used for causing the said injury. The M.O. being the PW-8 also stated during his cross-examination that the reason for cellulitis on the victim's left leg was not mentioned in the Exhibit 2 being the medical report of the victim. During the course of investigation, no weapon of attack could be seized by the I.O. Infact, the prosecution failed to examine the I.O. himself. As such, it transpires that the act of the accused is bereft of the essential ingredients of Section 326 IPC and in the absence of any cogent evidence, I am not inclined to hold the accused guilty u/sec 326 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 not inclined to hold the accused persons namely, Sri Rama Urang guilty of the charges u/sec 498A/326 IPC. As such, the points of determination are answered in the negative in favour of the accused person.



**ORDER**

25. In view of the decision made above, the accused persons, namely, Sri Rama Urang is acquitted of the charges of the offences under section 498A/326 IPC and set at liberty forthwith.
26. His bail bond shall remain in force for six months from today in compliance with section 437-A, Cr.P.C.
27. The case is disposed of on contest.
28. Given under my hand and the seal of this Court on this 29<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2022 at Dibrugarh.

Typed by: Self

Sanskrita Khanikar

Judicial Magistrate First Class

Dibrugarh

**APPENDIX**

**A. Prosecution witnesses:-**

- i) Smti. Kusheswari Kurmi, informant of the case as PW-1
- ii) Smti. Pramila Kurmi being the victim as PW-2
- iii) Sri Ghana Kurmi as PW-3
- iv) Sri Tapan Kurmi as PW-4
- v) Sri Babul Kurmi as PW-5
- vi) Smti. Bobita Urang as PW-6
- vii) Sri Mahipal Sawasi as PW-7
- viii) Dr. Pratap Kumar Deb as PW-8

**B. Defence witnesses:- Nil**

**C. Prosecution exhibits:-**

- i) The Ejahar as Exhibit 1
- ii) The Medical Report of the victim as Exhibit 2

**D. Defence exhibits: Nil**

Sanskrita Khanikar  
Judicial Magistrate First Class  
Dibrugarh