

CNR: UPAN010037162019



| | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| Date of Institution | Date of Judgment | Age |
| 05-10-2019 | 12-05-2026 | 6 Y, 7 M, 7 D |
| Date of Argument | Date of Judgment | Age |
| 12-05-2026 | 12-05-2026 | 0 Y, 0 M, 0 D |
| Date of Judgment | Date of Uploading | Age |
| 12-05-2026 | 12-05-2026 | 0 Y, 0 M, 0 D |

**IN THE COURT OF THE SESSIONS JUDGE, AMBEDKAR NAGAR,
UTTAR PRADESH**

Presiding Officer: Chandroday Kumar, H.J.S. (JO Code: UP06553)

Sessions Trial No. 107 of 2019

(Arising out of Case Crime No. 55 of 2019, Police Station: Bhiti, District: Ambedkar Nagar)

State of Uttar Pradesh

Versus

1. **Ravi Singh**, Son of Vijay Kumar Singh, Resident of Manager Ka Purva, Pigiriyawa, Police Station: Bhiti, District: Ambedkar Nagar.
2. **Akash Singh**, Son of Manvas Singh, Resident of Pigiriyawa, Police Station: Bhiti, District: Ambedkar Nagar.

--- Accused Persons

Appearances:

For the State: Sri Govind Srivastav, D. G. C. (Criminal)

For the Accused: Sri N.N. Singh, Learned Counsel for the Defence

JUDGMENT

1. This judgment disposes of the criminal trial instituted against the accused persons, Ravi Singh and Akash Singh, who have been charge-sheeted by the police of Police Station Bhiti, District

Citations are hyperlinked.

Ambedkar Nagar, under [Sections 302](#) and [506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860](#), in connection with Case Crime No. 55 of 2019. The case, being triable exclusively by the Court of Session, was formally committed to this Court by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ambedkar Nagar, vide order dated September 28, 2019, in compliance with Section 209 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

INTRODUCTORY AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

2. The criminal machinery was set in motion on April 6, 2019, when the informant, Ramnayak Nishad (PW-1), presented a written application (Exhibit Ka-1) at Police Station Bhati at approximately 08:30 AM. The informant reported that his father, Gyan Prasad Nishad, aged approximately 70 years, had gone to sleep on the night of April 5, 2019, at his agricultural tube-well, as was his long-standing daily routine. On the morning of April 6, 2019, the deceased was found dead near the tube-well with his throat slit by a sharp-edged weapon. The written application alleged that unknown persons from the village had murdered his father.
3. Based on this written report, Head Moharrir Rupnarayan Dwivedi (PW-10) registered the First Information Report (FIR) under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code against unknown accused persons, vide General Diary Entry No. 11 dated April 6, 2019, at 08:30 AM. The initial investigation was taken up by Inspector Banshraj Pandey (PW-9), who prepared the site plan (Exhibit Ka-16), collected soil samples (Exhibit Ka-18), and seized a sickle (*hasia*) found lying openly on the ground at the spot of the occurrence (Exhibit Ka-17).
4. The investigation was subsequently transferred to the then-Thana In-charge, Inspector Manish Kumar Singh (PW-8). During the course of his investigation, on July 3, 2019, nearly three months after the incident, the informant submitted a second written application (Exhibit Ka-2) to the police, specifically naming the accused persons, Ravi Singh and Akash Singh, as the perpetrators of the crime. The informant claimed that he had become certain of their involvement through village gossip and that a dispute over a parcel of abadi land between his family and the accused, Ravi Singh, served as the primary motive for the homicide.
5. Furthermore, on July 19, 2019, the informant's brother, Ramnayan (PW-2), submitted an application (Exhibit Ka-3) alleging that the accused, **Ravi Singh**, had issued life threats to his family over the telephone and had sent vulgar and abusive messages to his son's

mobile phone via WhatsApp. Based on this supplementary allegation, the investigating officer added Section 506 of the Indian Penal Code to the case record, as documented in General Diary Entry No. 46 on July 24, 2019 (Exhibit Ka-14).

6. The accused Akash Singh was arrested on July 17, 2019, and the accused Ravi Singh was arrested on July 25, 2019. Upon completing the investigation, the police submitted a charge sheet (Exhibit Ka-15) against both accused persons under Sections 302 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code.
7. Following the committal of the case to this Court, formal charges were framed against the accused persons, Ravi Singh and Akash Singh, for offences punishable under Sections 302 and 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code. Both accused persons pleaded not guilty, denied all allegations, and demanded a trial.

POINTS FOR DETERMINATION

8. To adjudicate this trial, this Court formulates the following points for determination:
 1. Whether the death of Gyan Prasad Nishad on the intervening night of April 5 and April 6, 2019, was homicidal in nature?
 2. Whether the prosecution has proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the accused, Ravi Singh and Akash Singh, in furtherance of their common intention, committed the murder of Gyan Prasad Nishad on the intervening night of April 5 and April 6, 2019, by slitting his throat with an iron sickle, thereby committing an offence punishable under Section 302 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code?
 3. Whether the accused, Ravi Singh, criminally intimidated the family of the deceased by threatening them over the phone and via digital messages, thereby committing an offence punishable under Section 506 of the Indian Penal Code?

EVALUATION OF EVIDENCE

Summary of Prosecution Evidence

9. The prosecution examined ten witnesses in support of its case. Ramnayak Nishad (PW-1), the informant and son of the deceased, deposed that his father left home after dinner at 8:00 PM on April 5, 2019, to sleep at the tube-well. He stated that his daughter, Anupa (PW-3), went to collect vegetables the next morning and discovered the body. PW-1 admitted that he filed the initial unnamed report because he was unsure of the identity of the
- Citations are hyperlinked.

killers, but claimed that after two to three months, he became certain of the involvement of the accused due to an abadi land dispute and subsequent village whispers. During cross-examination, he admitted that he did not see the incident, no villager told him they saw the incident, and no administrative or civil litigation existed concerning the alleged land dispute.

10. Ramnayan (PW-2), the brother of the informant, supported the narrative of the discovery of the body and the subsequent naming of the accused based on village rumours. He further deposed that Ravi Singh had threatened his family over his mobile phone and sent abusive messages to his son's WhatsApp. Under cross-examination, PW-2 admitted that he did not see the incident and that the accused, Akash Singh, was already in jail when he filed the threat complaint against Ravi Singh.
11. Anupa (PW-3), the granddaughter of the deceased, testified that she went to the tube-well between 6:00 AM and 7:00 AM to collect vegetables and found her grandfather lying dead in a pool of blood next to his cot. In her cross-examination, she admitted she had no personal knowledge of the identity of the assailants and had named the accused solely because of what she heard from other villagers.
12. Karmaraji (PW-4) and Meera (PW-5), the daughters-in-law of the deceased, deposed that the deceased went to sleep at the tube-well and was found dead. Both admitted during cross-examination that they did not see the incident and had no personal knowledge of the crime or the alleged land dispute.
13. Dr Manu (PW-6), the Medical Officer who conducted the autopsy, identified the post-mortem report (Exhibit Ka-4) and detailed five incised wounds on the front of the neck and chin, with the trachea being completely severed. He opined that death was caused by shock and haemorrhage resulting from these injuries. During cross-examination, he stated that the injuries were caused by a sharp-edged weapon but did not appear to be caused by a heavy weapon, and that death could have occurred in the early morning of April 6, 2019.
14. Inspector Pawan Kumar Sonkar (PW-7), who conducted the inquest, proved the Panchayatnama (Exhibit Ka-6) and stated that the inquest was conducted in the presence of the informant (PW-1) and the then-village Pradhan, Baijnath Gaur. He admitted that none of the panch witnesses expressed any suspicion against the accused persons during the inquest.

15. Inspector Manish Kumar Singh (PW-8), the second Investigating Officer, proved the receipt of the subsequent application on July 3, 2019, the arrest of the accused, the addition of Section 506 IPC, and the filing of the charge-sheet. He admitted during cross-examination that no eyewitness was found during the entire investigation, and no electronic records or mobile phones were seized to verify the alleged threats.
16. Inspector Banshraj Pandey (PW-9), the first Investigating Officer, proved the site plan (Exhibit Ka-16) and the recovery of the sickle and soil samples. He admitted that the sickle was found lying openly on the ground and was not recovered at the instance of any accused, and that no fingerprint analysis was conducted on the sickle.
17. Retired Head Moharrir Rupnarayan Dwivedi (PW-10) proved the registration of the FIR (Exhibit Ka-21) and admitted that the informant did not sign the Chick FIR in the designated column.

Summary of Defence Evidence

18. The defence examined two witnesses. Sitaram (DW-1), a resident of the village, testified that there was no land dispute between the family of the informant and Ravi Singh. He deposed that there was deep-seated political and personal enmity between the former village Pradhan, Baijnath Gaur, and Ravi Singh, and that the accused were falsely implicated at the behest of Baijnath Gaur.
19. Rammurat (DW-2), the paternal uncle of Ravi Singh, testified that on the night of the incident, Ravi Singh was working with him at his tube-well, where a concrete roof-laying work was ongoing at the adjacent house of Ramdayal Yadav. He also testified that the granddaughter of the deceased had a relationship with one Abhishek alias Kallu, who had threatened the deceased two days prior to the incident, and that a photograph of the two was present in the village.

FINDINGS AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

Point No. 1: Homicidal Nature of Death

20. To determine whether the death of Gyan Prasad Nishad was homicidal, this Court examines the medical evidence on record. The post-mortem report (Exhibit Ka-4) and the testimony of the medical jurist, Dr Manu (PW-6), establish that the deceased sustained five severe incised wounds. The primary big injury was a cut wound measuring 3.0 x 0.5 cm on the front of the neck, 7 cm below the chin, which severed the trachea and cut through the

major blood vessels and the secondary big injury measuring 3.0 x 0.5 cm deep up to the windpipe on the front of the neck, 6 cm below the chin. The smallest injury was found on the front of the neck, 3 cm below the chin, measuring 2.5 x 0.5 cm deep up to the windpipe on the front of the neck.

21. The nature, depth, and placement of these wounds indicate that they were inflicted with considerable force using a sharp weapon. They could not have been self-inflicted or accidental. The medical officer concluded that the cause of death was shock and haemorrhage resulting from these ante-mortem neck injuries.
22. The deposition of the first Investigating Officer (PW-9) and the inquest report (Exhibit Ka-6) further corroborate that the body of the deceased was found in a pool of blood next to his cot outside the tube-well, with his neck visibly cut. Accordingly, this Court concludes that the prosecution has proved that the death of Gyan Prasad Nishad was homicidal in nature. Point No. 1 is decided in the affirmative.

Point No. 2: Criminal Liability under Section 302 read with Section 34 of the IPC

23. This case rests entirely on circumstantial evidence. In a trial where there is no direct ocular evidence of the crime, the prosecution is required to establish a chain of circumstances so complete and robust that it excludes any reasonable hypothesis of the innocence of the accused, pointing unerringly to their guilt.
24. This is the established standard of criminal proof as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in [*Sharad Birdhichand Sarda v. State of Maharashtra \(1984 AIR 1622\)*](#), where the Court defined the *Panchsheel* of circumstantial evidence. The circumstances must be of a conclusive nature and tendency, and they must leave no ground for a conclusion consistent with the innocence of the accused.
25. An analysis of the evidence on record reveals several significant gaps and fatal infirmities that break this circumstantial chain.

The Omission of the Names of the Accused in the Earliest Version and Inordinate Delay

26. The homicidal incident occurred during the intervening night of April 5 and April 6, 2019. The initial FIR was registered on the morning of April 6, 2019, at 08:30 AM against "unknown" persons. Significantly, during the preparation of the inquest report (Exhibit Ka-6) on the same morning, which was attended by the informant,

Ramnayak Nishad (PW-1), and the then-village Pradhan, Baijnath Gaur, no suspicion was raised against the accused persons.

27. The names of the accused, Ravi Singh and Akash Singh, were introduced for the first time on July 3, 2019, via a subsequent written application (Exhibit Ka-2) submitted by the informant, almost three months after the occurrence.
28. The legal implications of this delay and subsequent introduction of the names of the accused are governed by the recent ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in [Govind Mandavi v. State of Chhattisgarh \(2025 INSC 1399\)](#). The Supreme Court held that where the earliest version of events (the FIR) is silent regarding the identity of the assailant despite alleged prior knowledge or enmity, subsequent improved versions must be approached with "great caution and suspicion". The Court emphasised that such a serious omission – especially in a case of prior enmity – strikes at the very foundation of the prosecution's case.
29. The Supreme Court in *Govind Mandavi* further reiterated that such omissions are treated as relevant facts under [Section 11 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872](#), as they make the existence of the subsequent prosecution story highly improbable.
30. In the present case, the informant (PW-1) and his brother (PW-2) attempted to explain this three-month delay by deposing that they were not "confirmed" at the time of filing the FIR and only became sure of the involvement of the accused after hearing whispers (*sugbugahat*) and rumours in the village.
31. This explanation is legally unsustainable. In [Kalyan Kumar Gogoi v. Ashutosh Agnihotri \(AIR 2011 SC 760\)](#), the Hon'ble Supreme Court scrutinised the admissibility of hearsay evidence and village rumours. The Court held that hearsay evidence is excluded on the ground of its intrinsic weakness, its incompetency to satisfy the mind of a judge, and the danger of fraud that may be practised under its cover. The Court observed that accepting such evidence would be "attaching importance to false rumour flying from one foul lip to another" and held that statements based on information received from others are inadmissible.
32. Every single fact-witness examined by the prosecution – PW-1, PW-2, PW-3, PW-4, and PW-5 – admitted during cross-examination that they did not see the incident, that no one in the village had told them they saw the accused committing the crime, and that they named the accused solely based on village whispers and suspicion. Suspicion, however strong, cannot take the place of legal proof, as held in *Sharad Birdhichand Sarda*.

33. The three-month delay in naming the accused, combined with the reliance on village rumours, creates a substantial gap in the prosecution's case.

Enmity as a Double-Edged Sword and the Absence of Motive

34. The prosecution alleged that a dispute over a parcel of abadi land between the family of the deceased and the accused, Ravi Singh, served as the primary motive for the murder. However, the prosecution failed to produce any documentary evidence, revenue records, police complaints, or litigation files to establish the existence of any such land dispute. PW-1 admitted in his cross-examination that there was no active litigation or administrative complaint filed before any authority prior to the murder regarding this land, and that he could not name even twenty independent villagers who could confirm the existence of any dispute between his family and Ravi Singh.
35. Conversely, the defence established that there was active political and personal hostility between the accused, Ravi Singh, and the former village Pradhan, Baijnath Gaur. Both PW-1 and PW-2 admitted during cross-examination that Baijnath Gaur was their close associate, was present at the time of the inquest and post-mortem, and actively assisted them in the proceedings.
36. It is a well-settled principle of criminal jurisprudence that "enmity is a double-edged sword". While it may provide a motive for committing a crime, it also provides an equally strong motive for the false implication of rivals. In [Aslam alias Imran v. State of M.P. \(2025 INSC 403\)](#) and [Balaram v. State of M.P. \(2023 INSC 1000\)](#), the Hon'ble Supreme Court emphasised that in cases where there is prior animosity, the possibility of false implication cannot be ruled out, and the court must scrutinise the evidence with a high degree of caution and circumspection.
37. The active involvement of the inimical former Pradhan, Baijnath Gaur, coupled with the three-month delay in naming the accused on the basis of village rumours, points to the possibility of a planned and motivated false implication of the accused.
38. In [Narsinbhai Haribhai Prajapati v. Chhatrasinh \(AIR 1977 SC 1753\)](#), the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that the presence of motive and the recovery of articles are wholly insufficient to sustain a conviction for murder in the absence of other reliable, clinching, and corroborative evidence. In the present case, the motive itself is unproven, and the presence of prior enmity with the former Pradhan suggests a reason for false implication.

Investigative Lapses and the Lack of Forensic Linkage

39. The prosecution placed reliance on the recovery of the murder weapon, a sickle (*hasia*), marked as Material Object 1, which was seized from the spot of occurrence.
40. First, this weapon was not recovered pursuant to any disclosure statement made by the accused under [Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872](#). It was found lying openly at the crime scene during the initial inspection by PW-9 on April 6, 2019, long before the accused were even named or arrested.
41. Second, **the investigating agency failed to conduct any fingerprint / DNA analysis on the weapon and the dog squad.** No lie detection methodology was used on the arrest of the accused persons in this blind case of murder. Inspector Banshraj Pandey (PW-9) admitted in his cross-examination that, although he was fully aware that lifting fingerprints from the weapon and comparing them with the suspects' specimen prints could establish the handler's identity, he made no effort to lift fingerprints from the sickle.
42. In a case resting solely on a chain of circumstantial evidence, the failure to secure forensic linkages (such as fingerprints or DNA matching the accused on the weapon) creates an irreparable gap in the prosecution's case. In [State of Bihar v. Prashant Kumar Mehta \(AIR ONLINE 2021 PAT 240\)](#), the court noted that the failure to lift and compare fingerprints from a suspected murder weapon, combined with other gaps in the circumstantial chain, must result in the accused receiving the benefit of doubt.
43. There is no forensic or scientific evidence linking either Ravi Singh or Akash Singh to the sickle found at the crime scene. There is no last seen evidence. There is no confessional statement.
44. The defence also presented a witness, Rammurat (DW-2), who provided an alibi for Ravi Singh, stating that Ravi Singh was working with him at his tube-well on the night of the incident, and mentioned an alternative suspect, Abhishek alias Kallu, who had allegedly threatened the deceased.
45. While the defence is not required to prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt, the presence of these alternative explanations, coupled with the significant gaps in the prosecution's case, reinforces the existence of reasonable doubt.
46. Therefore, the circumstantial chain presented by the prosecution is completely broken, and it cannot be concluded that, within all human probability, the act must have been done by the accused. The court is not hesitant in observing that this case was unsuitable

for a charge sheet or trial based on the available evidence. Point No. 2 is decided in the negative, in favour of the accused.

Point No. 3: Criminal Intimidation under Section 506 of the IPC

47. The charge under Section 506 of the Indian Penal Code against the accused, Ravi Singh, is based on the application dated July 19, 2019 (Exhibit Ka-3), submitted by Ramnayan (PW-2), alleging that the accused threatened his family over the phone and sent abusive messages to his son's mobile phone via WhatsApp.
48. To prove a charge of criminal intimidation through electronic communications, the prosecution is required to produce admissible electronic records in compliance with the statutory provisions of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872.
49. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in [Arjun Panditrao Khotkar v. Kailash Kushanrao Gorantyal \(2020 7 SCC 1\)](#) settled the law regarding the admissibility of electronic evidence. The Supreme Court held that the production of a certificate under Section 65B(4) of the Evidence Act is a mandatory condition precedent for the admissibility of any secondary electronic record, such as call data records (CDRs), printouts of text messages, or WhatsApp chat logs. In the absence of such a certificate, any secondary electronic evidence is strictly inadmissible, and oral evidence cannot be led to substitute for or prove its contents.
50. In the present case, the investigating officer, Inspector Manish Kumar Singh (PW-8), admitted in his cross-examination that during the investigation, he did not seize the physical mobile phones on which the threats were allegedly received, nor did he collect any certified call logs, WhatsApp chat histories, or audio recordings. No certificate under [Section 65B\(4\)](#) was ever prepared, submitted, or proved before this Court.
51. Consequently, there is an absence of legal evidence to substantiate the charge of criminal intimidation. The oral assertions of PW-2, uncorroborated by any admissible documentary or forensic electronic evidence, do not inspire confidence, especially given that the accused, Akash Singh, was already in jail at the time of the alleged threats, and Ravi Singh was facing active hostility from the village faction led by Baijnath Gaur. The court is not hesitant in observing that this case was not fit for a charge sheet or trial based on the available evidence on the point of section 506 IPC, too.
52. Therefore, the prosecution has failed to prove the charge under Section 506 of the Indian Penal Code against the accused, Ravi

Singh, beyond a reasonable doubt. Point No. 3 is decided in the negative, in favour of the accused.

CONCLUSION

53.Hon'le Apex Court in the case of [Manojbhai Jethabhai Parmar \(Rohit\) vs The State Of Gujarat \(2025 INSC 1433\)](#) has mandated **TABULATED CHARTS OF EVIDENCE**, which is as follows:

54.Table 1: Standardised Chart of Witnesses Examined

| Prosecution / Defence Witness No. | Name of the Witness | Brief Description / Role of the Witness | Evidentiary Character and Key Summary |
|---|------------------------|--|--|
| PW-1 | Ramnayak Nishad | Informant and son of the deceased | Ocular witness to the post-incident scene; introduced the names of the accused after three months based on village rumours. |
| PW-2 | Ramnayan Nishad | Brother of the informant and son of the deceased | Ocular witness to the post-incident scene; alleged threats under Section 506 IPC on the mobile phone without electronic verification. |
| PW-3 | Anupa | Granddaughter of the deceased | First-contact witness who discovered the body at the tube-well; confirmed she did not see the incident. |
| PW-4 | Karmaraji | Wife of PW-1 and daughter-in- law of the deceased | Hearsay witness; deposed regarding the alleged abadi land dispute without supporting documents. |
| PW-5 | Meera | Wife of PW-2 and daughter-in- | Hearsay witness; admitted to having no |

| Prosecution / Defence Witness No. | Name of the Witness | Brief Description / Role of the Witness | Evidentiary Character and Key Summary |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | law of the deceased | personal knowledge of the occurrence. |
| PW-6 | Dr. Manu | Medical Jurist / Medical Officer | Conducted the post- mortem; proved the homicidal nature of death due to tracheal and neck incised wounds. |
| PW-7 | Inspector Pawan Kumar Sonkar | Senior Sub Inspector, PS Bhiti | Prepared the Inquest Report (Panchayatnama); confirmed no suspect was named during the inquest. |
| PW-8 | Inspector Manish Kumar Singh | Second Investigating Officer | Conducted the latter half of the investigation, arrested the accused, and submitted the charge-sheet. |
| PW-9 | Inspector Banshraj Pandey | First Investigating Officer | Inspected the spot, prepared the site plan, and seized the sickle; admitted failure to lift fingerprints. |
| PW-10 | Rupnarayan Dwivedi | Head Moharrir (Retired) | Registered the initial Chick FIR and entered the GD details on April 6, 2019. |
| DW-1 | Sitaram | Independent Villager | Defence witness; established running political enmity between the former |

| Prosecution/ Defence Witness No. | Name of the Witness | Brief Description / Role of the Witness | Evidentiary Character and Key Summary |
|---|--------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | Pradhan and the accused, Ravi Singh. |
| DW-2 | Rammurat | Paternal Uncle of Accused | The defence witness provided an alibi for Ravi Singh and deposed regarding local alternative suspects. |

55. Table 2: Standardised Chart of Exhibited Documents

| Exhibit Number | Description of the Document | Proven / Attested By (Witness) | Traceability and Evidentiary Value / Purpose |
|---------------------------|--|---|--|
| Exhibit Ka-1 | Original Written Complaint (Unnamed) | Ramnayak Nishad (PW-1) | The earliest written version of events does not name any suspect or dispute. |
| Exhibit Ka-2 | Subsequent Complaint (Naming Accused) | Ramnayak Nishad (PW-1) | Submitted nearly three months later; introduces Ravi and Akash Singh as suspects based on rumours. |
| Exhibit Ka-3 | Threat Complaint (Section 506 IPC) | Ramnayan Nishad (PW-2) | Alleges phone and WhatsApp threats; unsupported by CDR or Section 65B certificate. |
| Exhibit Ka-4 | Post-Mortem Report | Dr. Manu (PW-6) | Establishes the medical cause of death (shock and haemorrhage from tracheal cuts). |

| Exhibit Number | Description of the Document | Proven / Attested By (Witness) | Traceability and Evidentiary Value / Purpose |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| Exhibit Ka-5 | Letter to Chief Medical Officer | Dr. Manu (PW-6) | Official police request accompanying the body for autopsy. |
| Exhibit Ka-6 | Inquest Report (Panchayatnama) | Inspector P. K. Sonkar (PW-7) | Documents the physical state of the body on April 6, 2019; signed by informant without naming suspects. |
| Exhibit Ka-7 | Photo Nash (Photograph (sketchy) of the deceased) | Inspector P. K. Sonkar (PW-7) | Used for the marking of bodily injuries during the inquest. |
| Exhibit Ka-8 | Challan Nash (Inquest Dispatch Form) | Inspector P. K. Sonkar (PW-7) | Procedural document for forwarding the body for autopsy. |
| Exhibit Ka-9 | Police Form No. 13 | Inspector P. K. Sonkar (PW-7) | Authorisation form for conducting post-mortem examination. |
| Exhibit Ka-10 | Letter to CMO | Dr. Manu (PW-6) | Official procedural correspondence for autopsy. |
| Exhibit Ka-11 | Letter to Reserve Inspector | Dr. Manu (PW-6) | Autopsy administrative record. |
| Exhibit Ka-12 | GD of Panchayatnama | Inspector P. K. Sonkar (PW-7) | Entry recording the departure of the police for the inquest. |
| Exhibit Ka-13 | Specimen Seal (Namuna Mohar) | Inspector P. K. Sonkar (PW-7) | Seal print used to preserve the integrity of the body during transit. |

| Exhibit Number | Description of the Document | Proven / Attested By (Witness) | Traceability and Evidentiary Value / Purpose |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| Exhibit Ka-14 | GD Entry for Section 506 IPC Addition | Inspector M. K. Singh (PW-8) | Official record showing the addition of criminal intimidation charges on July 24, 2019. |
| Exhibit Ka-15 | Charge-Sheet (No. 85 of 2019) | Inspector M. K. Singh (PW-8) | Final police report submitted under Section 173 CrPC. |
| Exhibit Ka-16 | Site Plan (Naksha Nazri) | Inspector B. Pandey (PW-9) | Graphical layout showing the location of the tube-well and where the body was found. |
| Exhibit Ka-17 | Recovery Memo of Iron Sickle | Inspector B. Pandey (PW-9) | Records the seizure of the sickle found lying openly on the ground at the spot. |
| Exhibit Ka-18 | Seizure Memo of Soil Samples | Inspector B. Pandey (PW-9) | Seizure memo of plain and blood-stained soil collected from the scene. |
| Exhibit Ka-19 | General Diary Entry No. 28 | Inspector B. Pandey (PW-9) | Entry recording the deposit of seized articles at the police station. |
| Exhibit Ka-20 | General Diary Entry No. 49 | Inspector B. Pandey (PW-9) | Records the questioning of the alternative suspect, Shubham Singh. |
| Exhibit Ka-21 | Chick First Information Report | Rupnarayan Dwivedi (PW-10) | Formal registered FIR copy under Section 154 CrPC. |

| Exhibit Number | Description of the Document | Proven / Attested By (Witness) | Traceability and Evidentiary Value / Purpose |
|----------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Exhibit Ka-22 | Registration General Diary Entry | Rupnarayan Dwivedi (PW-10) | GD Entry No. 11 on April 6, 2019, recording the start of the case. |
| Exhibit Ka-23 | FSL Report | Tendered by the Prosecution | Blood-stained soil - disintegrated. Human blood on the sickle. |

56. Table 3: Standardised Chart of Material Objects Produced

| Material Object No. (MO) | Description of the Object | Seized From / Location | Witness Who Proved Relevance | Forensic Linkage Established? |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|---|
| Material Object 1 | Iron Sickle (<i>Hasia</i>) | Lying openly on the ground near the tube-well (Crime Scene). | Inspector Banshraj Pandey (PW-9) | No. No fingerprints were lifted, and no FSL analysis linked the blood on it to the accused. |
| Material Object 2 | Blood-stained Soil | Ground at the spot of occurrence. | Inspector Banshraj Pandey (PW-9) | No. Confirmed to be human blood, but not scientifically connected to the accused. |
| Material Object 3 | Plain Soil | Crime scene area (uncontaminated soil). | Inspector Banshraj Pandey (PW-9) | Used as a control sample for forensic comparison. |

57. A meticulous evaluation of the entire oral and documentary evidence on record leads to the conclusion that the prosecution has failed to establish a complete and unbroken chain of circumstances. Citations are hyperlinked.

pointing unerringly to the guilt of the accused persons, Ravi Singh and Akash Singh.

58. The prosecution's case is entirely based on subsequent improvements, inadmissible hearsay, and village rumours introduced after an unexplained delay of nearly three months. The alleged motive of a land dispute remains unproven, and the possibility of false implication due to local political animosity with the former village Pradhan, Baijnath Gaur, cannot be ruled out.
59. Furthermore, there is a failure to establish any forensic linkage between the weapon of offence and the accused, and the charge of criminal intimidation lacks the mandatory electronic certification required by law.
60. In a criminal trial, the burden of proving the guilt of the accused beyond a reasonable doubt lies on the prosecution, and this burden never shifts. If two views are reasonably possible based on the evidence on record, the view that is favourable to the accused must be adopted, as the presumption of innocence is a fundamental right.
61. Consequently, both accused persons are entitled to the benefit of doubt and must be acquitted.

ORDER

1. The accused, **Ravi Singh** and **Akash Singh**, are hereby **acquitted** of the charges framed against them under Sections 302 and 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, by extending the benefit of doubt.
2. The accused persons are on bail. Their bail bonds are discharged, and their sureties are released from their liabilities.
3. The personal bonds and surety bonds submitted by the accused persons in compliance with Section 437A of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, shall remain active and valid for a period of six months from today.
4. The material objects produced during the trial, including the iron sickle (*hasia*) and soil samples, shall be destroyed in accordance with the rules after the expiry of the period prescribed for filing an appeal.
5. Let a copy of this judgment be uploaded on the official portal and provided to the accused free of cost, as well as the Superintendent of Police, to spread awareness amongst investigating officers, in the light of the observation recorded in paras 41 to 50 of this judgment.

Judgment signed, dated and pronounced in open Court on this 12th day of May, 2026.

Date: 12.05.2026

(Chandroday Kumar)

Sessions Judge,

Ambedkar Nagar

(JO Code: UP06553)