

CNR: UPAN010001952018



Date of Institution	Date of Judgment	Age
22-01-2018	18-05-2026	8 Y, 3 M, 26 D
Date of Argument	Date of Judgment	Age
15-05-2026	18-05-2026	0 Y, 0 M, 3 D
Date of Judgment	Date of Uploading	Age
18-05-2026	18-05-2026	0 Y, 0 M, 0 D

**IN THE COURT OF THE SESSIONS JUDGE, AMBEDKAR NAGAR
PRESIDING OFFICER: CHANDRODAY KUMAR, H.J.S.**

JO CODE: UP06553

SESSIONS TRIAL NO. 19 OF 2018

(Arising out of Case Crime No. 115 of 2017)

Police Station: Sammanpur, District: Ambedkar Nagar

STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH ... *Prosecution*

VERSUS

ANIL KUMAR

Son of Chunnilal,

Resident of Rustampur, Jallahia,

Police Station: Sammanpur, District: Ambedkar Nagar ... *Accused*

Appearances:

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

For the Accused: Sri Syed Mohd Ali Zaidi, Learned Counsel for the Defence

JUDGMENT

1. The accused, Anil Kumar, faces trial for committing offences punishable under [Section 302](#) (Punishment for murder) and

Section 201 (Causing disappearance of evidence of offence, or giving false information to screen offender) of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter referred to as 'IPC'), following a charge-sheet submitted by the Police of Police Station Sammanpur, District Ambedkar Nagar.

I. BRIEF CORPORAL FACTS AND THE PROSECUTION NARRATIVE

2. The genesis of the prosecution's case is anchored upon a written report (*Tehrir*) (Ex. Ka-1) submitted by the informant, Ram Bachan (PW-1), on 16.10.2017 at approximately 06:30 hours at Police Station Sammanpur.
3. The broad lineaments of the prosecution's narrative, as carved out from the written complaint (*Tehrir*), are as follows:
 - 1) The informant's daughter, Kumari Babita alias Asma (aged about 17 years), was sleeping at her home on the night intervening 11.10.2017 and 12.10.2017, from where she mysteriously disappeared.
 - 2) Despite extensive searches by the family members, her whereabouts could not be ascertained.
 - 3) The informant asserted that the accused, Anil Kumar, who was a friend of his son Vipul, frequently visited their household at odd hours and was accustomed to speaking with the deceased girl. It was alleged that on the fateful night of 11/12.10.2017, the accused had visited the house and interacted with Babita.
 - 4) On the morning of 16.10.2017, a highly decomposed corpse, infested with worms, was discovered inside a disused latrine soak-pit situated behind the informant's residence. The informant identified the body as that of his missing daughter by her clothes.
 - 5) Consequently, the informant expressed a strong conviction that the accused, Anil Kumar, had murdered Babita over an undisclosed dispute and threw her corpse into the latrine pit to obliterate evidence of the crime.

II. REGISTRATION OF FIR AND INVESTIGATION

4. On receipt of the written report (Ex. Ka-1), Head Moharrir Bhupendra Singh (PW-10) registered the First Information Report (FIR) as Case Crime No. 115 of 2017 under Sections 302 and 201

IPC against the sole named accused, Anil Kumar, vide Chick FIR (Ex. Ka-12) and corresponding General Diary (GD) Entry No. 8 dated 16.10.2017 at 06:30 AM.

5. The statutory investigation was spearheaded by Inspector Devi Charan Gupta (PW-9), the then Station House Officer of P.S. Sammanpur. The Investigating Officer visited the crime scene, recorded statements of the material witnesses, and prepared the site map (Ex. Ka-9).
6. Under the guidance of the Investigating Officer, the inquest proceedings (*Panchayatnama*) were executed by Sub-Inspector Ghanshyam Mishra (Now Retired)(PW-7) on 16.10.2017 between 06:30 AM and 08:50 AM. The inquest report (Ex. Ka-2) was drawn up along with ancillary police documents (Ex. Ka-3 to Ex. Ka-7), and the cadaver was sealed up and dispatched for post-mortem examination to ascertain the exact cause of death.
7. Following the completion of the investigation, the Investigating Officer found sufficient incriminating material against the accused and submitted a charge-sheet (Ex. Ka-11) before the competent court.

III. COMMITTAL AND FRAMING OF CHARGES

8. Since the offences under Sections 302 and 201 IPC are triable exclusively by a Court of Session, the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ambedkar Nagar, after complying with the mandatory provisions of [Section 207](#) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (hereinafter referred to as 'Cr.P.C.'), committed the case to the Court of Sessions vide order dated 11.01.2018.
9. On formal commencement of the trial, this Court framed explicit charges against the accused, Anil Kumar, for the offences under Sections 302 and 201 IPC. The charges were read over and explained to the accused in vernacular, who pleaded absolute innocence, refuted the accusations, and claimed to be tried.

IV. STATEMENT OF THE ACCUSED UNDER SECTION 313 CR.P.C.

10. After the conclusion of the prosecution's evidence, the incriminating circumstances appearing against the accused were put to him during his examination under [Section 313 Cr.P.C.](#)
11. The accused categorically denied every adverse circumstance and maintained that the entire prosecution's story is a web of falsehood. He claimed that he had been falsely implicated in the present case by the police and the informant based on pure

suspicion, conjecture, and family-driven animosity. He stressed that there are no eyewitnesses to the alleged occurrence and that he was completely innocent.

V. EVIDENCE ADDUCED DURING TRIAL

A. Prosecution Evidence

To substantiate its accusations, the prosecution examined ten witnesses, whose testimonies are encapsulated below:

- 1) **PW-1 (Ram Bachan):** The informant and father of the deceased. He reiterated the narrative contained in the written complaint (Ex. Ka-1). In his cross-examination, he admitted that he did not see the accused committing the murder or hiding the body, as he was asleep. He further admitted that his accusations were driven by absolute belief and suspicion. He also claimed to have lodged a missing report on 13.10.2017.
- 2) **PW-2 (Setu Ram):** A neighbour whose agricultural field is adjacent to the latrine pit. He turned completely hostile, stating that he knew nothing of the occurrence, did not see any incident, and did not identify the accused. He denied making any statement under Section 161 Cr.P.C. to the police.
- 3) **PW-3 (Durgavati):** The mother of the deceased. She deposed that on the night of the incident, she and Babita were sleeping on separate cots in the outer veranda. She claimed that she woke up during the night to urinate and noticed Babita was missing, but assumed she had gone to the restroom and fell back asleep. She admitted in cross-examination that she did not witness any assault or the concealment of the body by the accused. She also admitted that her husband, PW-1, was not present at home on the night of the incident. That time, PW-1 was in Kajpura.
- 4) **PW-4 (Phoolpatti):** A neighbour who claimed that on the evening of the incident, the accused came to the village around 09:00 PM–10:00 PM and enquired about the (male) family members. She told him they were away at Kajpura. She later saw him going towards the house of the deceased. Crucially, she admitted that she and her daughter Anita were the first to discover the body due to the foul smell while going to use the latrine. She conceded that she did not see the accused eloping with, killing, or hiding the body of the deceased.
- 5) **PW-5 (Sharda Devi):** A neighbour who deposed that she saw the accused walking towards the house of the informant on the night

of the incident. She admitted that she did not see any actual occurrence and that her testimony was based on speculation and local rumours.

- 6) **PW-6 (Poonam alias Phoolan Devi):** The sister-in-law of the deceased. She set up a hypothetical theory that the accused followed the deceased when she went to urinate, attempted to force himself upon her, and, upon her resistance, strangled her to death. However, during her cross-examination, she explicitly admitted that she resides in Kajpura, was not present at the spot, did not witness the incident, and that her entire knowledge was derived from what her mother-in-law (PW-3) had narrated to her.
- 7) **PW-7 (Retired SI Ghanshyam Mishra):** Conducted the inquest proceedings. He testified that the body was in an advanced stage of putrefaction, covered with worms, and the skin had turned black. He noted that no apparent visible external injuries could be detected due to the severe state of decomposition.
- 8) **PW-8 (Dr Ravi Prakash Rajbhar):** The medical officer who conducted the autopsy. He testified that the corpse was completely decomposed and reduced to bare skeletal remains. He confirmed that no external or internal injuries could be found on the body. Due to the advanced decomposition, the cause of death could not be ascertained, prompting him to preserve the viscera.
- 9) **PW-9 (Inspector Devi Charan Gupta):** The Investigating Officer who detailed the steps taken during the investigation. He admitted that there was no eyewitness to the crime and that the charge sheet was submitted without receiving the Viscera Report.
- 10) **PW-10 (Head Moharrir Bhupendra Singh):** Recorded the FIR. He explicitly discredited PW-1's assertion by stating that no missing or elopement report was filed at the police station between 11.10.2017 and 16.10.2017.

B. Defence Evidence

- **DW-1 (Chalaku alias Nanhelal):** Examined by the defence to demonstrate that the accused was not in constant communication with the family, did not visit the scene with him, and was falsely implicated by the village factions.

VI. POINTS FOR DETERMINATION

The following primary points arise for determination by this Court:

1. Whether the death of the deceased, Kumari Babita alias Asma, was homicidal in nature?
2. Whether the prosecution has established an unbroken chain of circumstantial evidence proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the accused, Anil Kumar, caused the death of the deceased on the night of 11/12.10.2017?
3. Whether the accused intentionally hid the corpse of the deceased in the latrine pit with the object of screening himself from legal punishment, thereby committing an offence under Section 201 IPC?

VII. ARGUMENTS ADVANCED

12. The learned District Government Counsel (Criminal), representing the State, forcefully argued that although there is no direct eyewitness to the occurrence, the circumstantial evidence is compelling. He argued that the accused was seen approaching the house of the deceased on the night of her disappearance by PW-4 and PW-5. The subsequent discovery of the dead body from the latrine pit of the informant's house, coupled with the sudden disappearance of the accused from his residence, firmly points towards his guilt.
13. Conversely, the learned counsel for the defence argued that the entire case rests on absolute suspicion and lacks any legal foundations. He pointed out that the medical evidence completely failed to determine the cause of death, making it impossible to assume the death was homicidal. He argued that the "last seen together" theory is legally untenable due to a protracted time gap of five days between the disappearance and recovery of the body. He further stressed that the alleged confession made before the police officer is legally inadmissible and that the unexplained five-day delay in lodging the FIR falsifies the prosecution's narrative.

VIII. APPRECIATION OF EVIDENCE AND LEGAL REASONING

Point No. 1: Homicidal Nature of Death (Corpus Delicti)

14. Before a person can be convicted of murder under Section 302 IPC, the foundational factum to be proved by the prosecution is that the death of the victim was homicidal. In cases where the body is highly decomposed, the medical evidence assumes paramount importance.
15. In the present trial, the medical evidence completely fails to prove that Babita met a homicidal death. PW-8, Dr Ravi Prakash Rajbhar,

who performed the post-mortem examination, stated in clear terms that the corpse was completely decomposed, with only bones remaining. He explicitly noted:

"I did not see any apparent injury on the external or internal parts of the body during the post-mortem... The cause of death could not be determined due to advanced decomposition, and therefore, the viscera were preserved."

16. Crucially, the Investigating Officer (PW-9) admitted that the charge-sheet was submitted without waiting for the Viscera Report. The Viscera Report was brought on record by the prosecution, which states that no poison was found.

17. In the absence of any scientific evidence pointing to poisoning, asphyxia, or mechanical injury to the skeletal remains, it is medically and legally impossible to rule out a case of accidental fall into the open latrine pit or natural death. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in *Palvinder Kaur vs The State Of Punjab* (Rup ... on 22 October, 1952 (1952 AIR 354) has held that where the medical report is inconclusive and the cause of death cannot be established, the court cannot proceed on the assumption that the death was homicidal. Thus, the prosecution has failed to discharge the primary burden of proving a homicidal death.

Points No. 2 & 3: Circumstances and the Golden Chain of Evidence

18. Since this case rests entirely on circumstantial evidence, this Court must guide itself by the five golden principles ("Panchsheel") articulated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the landmark case of *Sharad Birdhi Chand Sarda vs State Of Maharashtra* on 17 July, 1984 (1984 AIR 1622):

- 1) The circumstances from which the conclusion of guilt is to be drawn should be fully established;
- 2) The facts so established should be consistent only with the hypothesis of the guilt of the accused;
- 3) The circumstances should be of a conclusive nature and tendency;
- 4) They should exclude every possible hypothesis except the one to be proved; and
- 5) There must be a chain of evidence so complete as not to leave any reasonable ground for the conclusion consistent with the innocence of the accused.

Let us evaluate each circumstance relied upon by the prosecution against these touchstones.

A. The Theory of "Last Seen Together"

19. The prosecution relies on the testimonies of PW-1, PW-3, PW-4, and PW-5 to establish that the accused was seen going to the informant's house on the night of 11/12.10.2017. However, a close analysis of their cross-examinations exposes glaring discrepancies:

- 1) **PW-1** admits he was asleep and did not see the accused taking his daughter or assaulting her.
- 2) **PW-3** (mother) states that she saw the accused speak to her daughter "secretly" on prior occasions, and that night he visited, but she went to sleep and only noticed her daughter's absence later. She did not see them in a compromising or exclusive company at the time of death.
- 3) **PW-4** states that she saw the accused walking *towards* the house around 9:00–10:00 PM, but admits she does not know whether he actually entered the house or where he went. Rest part of her evidence is hearsay and not admissible.

20. Even if it is accepted that the accused was present in the vicinity on the night of 11.10.2017, the corpse was recovered on the morning of 16.10.2017 – after a gap of nearly five days. The law relating to the "last seen together" principle is well-settled. In [State Of Goa vs Sanjay Thakran And Anr on 2 March, 2007 \(2007\) 3 SCC 755](#), the Apex Court held that if the time gap between the point when the accused and the deceased were last seen together and when the deceased is found dead is long, it becomes highly unsafe to imply guilt without robust corroborative links. The substantial time gap of five days breaks any presumption, as third parties had ample opportunity to access the deceased or the open area.

B. Hearsay and Speculative Evidentiary Value

21. The testimony of PW-6 (Poonam), who offered a descriptive sequence of elopement, attempted sexual assault, and strangulation, must be rejected out of hand. She admitted that she lived miles away in Kajpura, did not witness any event, and was merely repeating what her mother-in-law told her. Under [Section 60](#) of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, oral evidence must be direct. Her testimony is classic hearsay evidence and lacks any legal efficacy.

C. Unexplained Delay in Lodging FIR and False Claims of Missing Report

22. The deceased allegedly went missing on the night of 11/12.10.2017, yet the FIR was lodged only on 16.10.2017. PW-1 attempted to explain this fatal delay by asserting that he lodged a written missing persons report at the police station on 13.10.2017. However, this assertion was completely demolished by the prosecution's own witness, Head Moharrir Bhupendra Singh (PW-10), who verified the police station records and explicitly stated that no missing report or complaint was received from the informant prior to 16.10.2017.
23. It is contrary to ordinary human behaviour that a father would wait for five days without notifying the law enforcement machinery about the mysterious disappearance of his minor daughter. This long, unexplained silence, coupled with the false assertion regarding the missing report, strongly indicates that the informant's family was deliberating, and upon the discovery of the body on 16.10.2017, named the accused based on mere suspicion.

D. Inadmissibility of Custodial Confession

24. The Investigating Officer (PW-9) stated in his evidence that during interrogation, the accused confessed to suffocating the deceased by pressing her mouth and nose. It is rudimentary criminal jurisprudence that any confession made to a police officer or while in police custody is absolutely barred under [Section 25](#) and [Section 26](#) of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872.
25. Such a confession could only be made admissible under [Section 27](#) of the Act if it led to the discovery of a distinct fact. However, in this case, the body had already been discovered by PW-4 and her daughter Anita at 07:00 AM, who then raised an alarm, gathering the entire village before the arrival of the police. Since the discovery of the corpus was already within the knowledge of the public and the police before any statement was made by the accused, Section 27 does not apply. The alleged confession is completely inadmissible and must be discarded.

E. Absence of Proved Motive

26. In a case entirely dependent on circumstantial evidence, the establishment of a motive holds immense significance. While the absence of motive may not be fatal where direct evidence exists, it becomes a crucial missing link in a purely circumstantial case. The prosecution has not placed on record an iota of evidence to explain why the accused, who was a close family friend of the informant's

son, would suddenly murder the deceased girl. In the north indian rural setting, honour killing is prevalent, but talking to a girl, friendship with or falling in love with a girl, does not *ipso facto* provide a motive for a boy to murder the girl. Amazingly, family members of the deceased could not detect the foul odour of a putrifying human body in very close vicinity. The chain of circumstances is broken, incomplete, and riddled with material deficits.

F. Abscondence of the Accused

27. In the case of *Matru Alias Girish Chandra vs State Of Uttar Pradesh on 3 March, 1971 (1971 AIR 1050)*, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held as under:

" The act of absconding is no doubt a relevant piece of evidence to be considered along with other evidence, but its value would always depend on the circumstances of each case. Normally, the courts are disinclined to attach much importance to the act of absconding, treating it as a very small item in the evidence for sustaining a conviction. It can scarcely be held as a determining link in completing the chain of circumstantial evidence which must admit of no other reasonable hypothesis than that of the guilt of the accused. In the present case, the appellant was with Ram Chandra till the FIR was lodged. If, thereafter, he felt that he was being wrongly suspected and he tried to keep out of the way, we do not think this circumstance can be considered to be necessarily evidence of a guilty mind attempting to evade justice. It is not inconsistent with his innocence."

IX. CONCLUSION AND FINDINGS

28. It is a foundational maxim of criminal law that the distance between "*may be true*" and "*must be true*" is long and divides vague suspicion from legal proof. The prosecution carries the unshifting burden to prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt. In the present trial:

1. The homicidal nature of death is unproven.
2. The cause of death is unknown due to the lack of a Viscera Report.
3. The "last seen together" theory is weak and separated by a long time gap.
4. The material witnesses have admitted that they named the accused out of mere suspicion.
5. The primary neighbour (PW-2) turned hostile.

29. Consequently, the prosecution has failed to produce an absolute, unbroken chain of circumstances that excludes every hypothesis of the innocence of the accused. The accused is fully entitled to the benefit of the doubt.

X. ORDER

29. For the reasons discussed above, the prosecution has failed to prove the charges under Sections 302 and 201 IPC against the accused beyond a reasonable doubt.

30. Accordingly, the accused, **Anil Kumar**, is hereby **ACQUITTED** of the charges framed against him under [Section 302](#) and [Section 201](#) of the Indian Penal Code.

31. The accused is on bail. The personal bonds and surety bonds of the accused are cancelled, and sureties are discharged. However, the accused shall comply with the mandates of [Section 437A](#) of the Cr.P.C. by executing a personal bond and a surety of like amount to the satisfaction of the court, undertaking to appear before the Hon'ble High Court as and when notice is issued in connection with any appeal filed against this acquittal.

32. The material objects and properties produced during the trial, if any, shall be disposed of in accordance with the rules after the expiry of the period of limitation prescribed for filing an appeal.

Judgment pronounced, signed, and dated in open court.

Date: May 18, 2026

Place: Ambedkar Nagar

(Chandroday Kumar)

Sessions Judge,

Ambedkar Nagar

JO Code: UP06553

In compliance with the mandate of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in [Manojbhai Jethabhai Parmar \(Rohit\) vs The State Of Gujarat \(2025 INSC 1433\)](#), which directs all criminal trial courts across the country to institutionalize a structured, uniform, and standardized practice of cataloging evidence to enhance the legibility and systematic appreciation of records, the mandatory compiled evidence tables for **Sessions Trial No. 19 of 2018 (State vs. Anil Kumar)** are structured below.

These tables form an essential concluding segment and appendix to the judgment of acquittal.

APPENDIX – STRUCTURED EVIDENCE TABLES

(Prepared as per the guidelines laid down in Paras 81 to 91 of 2025 INSC 1433)

TABLE I: STANDARDIZED CHART OF PROSECUTION WITNESSES (PWs)

Serial No.	Witness Number	Name of the Witness	Brief Description / Role / Evidentiary Character of the Witness
1.	PW-1	Ram Bachan	Informant & Father of the Deceased: Lodged the written complaint (Ex. Ka-1); discovered the body in the soak-pit; set up the theory of suspicion.
2.	PW-2	Setu Ram	Hostile Witness / Immediate Neighbour: Turned completely hostile; denied seeing the occurrence, the body, or making statements under Sec 161 Cr.P.C.
3.	PW-3	Durgavati	Mother of the Deceased: Slept on the adjacent cot on the night of disappearance; testified to prior interactions between the accused and the deceased.
4.	PW-4	Phoolpatti	Neighbour & Discovery Witness: Witness who first noticed the foul smell and discovered the decomposed body in the latrine soak-pit alongside her daughter Anita.
5.	PW-5	Sharda Devi	Neighbour / Circumstantial Witness: Testified to seeing the accused walking towards the house of the informant on the night of the incident (9:00 PM - 10:00 PM).
6.	PW-6	Poonam alias Phoolan Devi	Sister-in-law of the Deceased (Hearsay Witness): Set up a speculative theory of attempted assault; admitted to residing far away (Kajpura) and having zero personal knowledge.

Serial No.	Witness Number	Name of the Witness	Brief Description / Role / Evidentiary Character of the Witness
7.	PW-7	Retired SI Ghanshyam Mishra	Inquest Police Officer: Conducted the inquest proceedings (<i>Panchayatnama</i>) and drew the necessary police forms (Ex. Ka-2 to Ex. Ka-7).
8.	PW-8	Dr Ravi Prakash Rajbhar	Medical Officer / Autopsy Surgeon: Conducted the post-mortem examination; confirmed severe decomposition to skeletal remains and an inconclusive cause of death.
9.	PW-9	Inspector Devi Charan Gupta	Investigating Officer (I.O.): Conducted the statutory investigation, prepared the site map, recorded statements, and submitted the charge sheet.
10.	PW-10	Head Moharrir Bhupendra Singh	Police Clerk / Registration Witness: Registered the Check FIR and GD Entry; explicitly refuted PW-1's claim regarding a prior missing report.

TABLE II: STANDARDIZED CHART OF DEFENCE WITNESSES (DWs)

Serial No.	Witness Number	Name of the Witness	Brief Description / Role / Evidentiary Character of the Witness
1.	DW-1	Chalaku alias Nanhelal	Defence Witness: Testified to disprove constant communication between the accused and the family; supported the plea of false implication due to local village factions.

TABLE III: STANDARDIZED CHART OF EXHIBITED DOCUMENTS

Exhibit Number	Description of the Exhibited Document	Proved By	Attested By / Marginal Witnesses (where applicable)
Ex. Ka-1	Written Complaint / Tehreer	PW-1 (Ram Bachan)	—
Ex. Ka-2	Inquest Report (<i>Panchayatnama</i>)	PW-7 (Retd. SI G. Mishra)	Inquest Witnesses / <i>Panchas</i>
Ex. Ka-3	Photo Nash (Chalan Nash)	PW-7 (Retd. SI G. Mishra)	—
Ex. Ka-4	Form No. 13 (Inquest Form)	PW-7 (Retd. SI G. Mishra)	—
Ex. Ka-5	Letter to Chief Medical Officer (CMO)	PW-7 (Retd. SI G. Mishra)	—
Ex. Ka-6	Sample Seal (Namoonah Mohar)	PW-7 (Retd. SI G. Mishra)	—
Ex. Ka-7	Police Form No. 379	PW-7 (Retd. SI G. Mishra)	—
Ex. Ka-8	Post-Mortem Examination Report	PW-8 (Dr. R.P. Rajbhar)	—
Ex. Ka-9	Site Map / Plan of Crime Scene (<i>Nazri Naksha</i>)	PW-9 (Insp. D.C. Gupta)	—
Ex. Ka-11	Charge-Sheet under Sec 302/201 IPC	PW-9 (Insp. D.C. Gupta)	—
Ex. Ka-12	Chick First Information Report (FIR)	PW-10 (HM B. Singh)	—
Ex. Ka-13	General Diary (GD) Entry No. 8	PW-10 (HM B. Singh)	—
Ex. Ka-14	Viscera Report	Tendered	—

TABLE IV: STANDARDIZED CHART OF MATERIAL OBJECTS

Material Object No.	Description of the Material Object	Proved / Marked By	FSL / Seizure Reference & Chain of Custody Remarks
M.O. 1	Decomposed Clothes recovered from the body of the deceased (Kumari Babita).	PW-1, PW-4, & PW-7	Seized during the inquest from the latrine soak-pit; Identified by the

Material Object No.	Description of the Material Object	Proved / Marked By	FSL / Seizure Reference & Chain of Custody Remarks
			informant's family by colour/texture.
M.O. 2	Sealed Plastic container containing skull/skeletal remnants (for autopsy dispatch).	PW-7 & PW-8	Dispatched via Police Line; No external marks of mechanical violence detected by Medical Jurist.

These structured matrices seamlessly trace the evidentiary gaps—namely, the lack of a medical cause of death and reliance on hostile/hearsay sources—demanding an inevitable judgment of acquittal.

Date: May 18, 2026

Place: Ambedkar Nagar

(Chandroday Kumar)

Sessions Judge,
Ambedkar Nagar
JO Code: UP06553