

IN THE COURT OF DR.YADVENDER SINGH,
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-05, WEST,
TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.



CNR No. DLWT01-002256-2017
Sessions Case No. 171/2017
FIR No. 661/2016
PS – Punjabi Bagh
Under Section 498A/304B/34 IPC

State

Vs.

(1) Pawan Singh
S/o late Rajdev Singh
R/o Village Aadharpur,
Tehsil & PS Tegda,
District Begusarai, Bihar.

(2) Dheeraj Singh
S/o late Rajdev Singh
R/o Village Adharpur,
Teh & PS- Tegda,
District Begusarai, Bihar.
L/AA-820, Madipur,
J.J.Colony, Delhi.

(3) Usha Devi
W/o late Rajdev Singh
R/o Village Adharpur,
Teh & PS- Tegda,
District Begusarai, Bihar.

Date of Institution	27.01.2017 against accused Pawan Singh and 05.07.2017 supplementary charge sheet against co-accused Dheeraj Singh and Usha Devi.
Date of Committal	15.03.2017 against accused Pawan Singh and 19.07.2017 against accused Dheeraj Singh and Usha Devi.
Charge framed Under Section	498A/34 IPC & 304B IPC against accused Pawan Singh and Section 498A/34 IPC against accused Dheeraj Singh and Usha Devi.
Date of conclusion of final arguments and reserving Judgment	28.04.2026
Date of Pronouncement of Judgment	09.06.2026
Final Judgment	Accused persons namely Pawan Singh, Dheeraj Singh and Usha Devi are acquitted of the charges.

Index

1. Brief facts : Page No. 3-4
2. Registration of FIR, statement of the complainant and investigation conducted : Page No. 4-6
3. Charge : Page No. 6

4.	Prosecution Evidence	:	Page No. 6
5.	Statements of accused persons u/s 351 BNSS	:	Page No. 7-8
6.	Defence evidence	:	Page No. 8
7.	Final arguments	:	Page No. 9-11
8.	Appreciation of evidence and Analysis of deposition of witnesses	:	Page No.12-44
9.	Conclusion	:	Page No. 44-45
10.	Specimen Chart of witnesses examined	:	Page No. 45-47
11.	Specimen Chart for exhibited documents	:	Page No. 47-50
12.	Specimen Chart for material objects/Muddamals	:	Page No. 51

JUDGMENT

Brief Facts:

1. Accused persons namely Pawan Singh, Dheeraj Singh and Usha Devi have been facing trial for the offence under Section 498A/34 IPC; accused Pawan Singh has also been facing trial for the offence under Section 304B of Indian Penal Code (hereinafter referred to as 'IPC'), on the allegations that between the period of May, 2010 to 29.10.2016, all the accused persons, being husband, mother-in-law

and brother-in-law of deceased, in furtherance of their common intention, subjected the deceased Chanchal to cruelty/harassment for demands of dowry, due to which on 29.10.2016, deceased Chanchal committed suicide by hanging herself at A-398, 2nd Floor, J.J.Colony, Madipur, Delhi.

Registration of FIR, statement of the complainant and investigation conducted:

2. Facts leading to the Prosecution's case are that on 29.10.2016, a PCR call was received at PS Punjabi Bagh vide DD no. 44 PP at 09:25 PM, qua committing suicide of Bhabhi of caller. On receiving the call, ASI Balbir Singh reached at the spot, where it was revealed that Smt. Chanchal w/o Sh. Pawan had committed suicide by hanging herself. On the spot, he saw that the deceased was lying on the floor and one Aari blade, one cobbler hammer, one iron Jali, ligature material (one corner of which was tied with the neck of deceased and other with Iron Jaali) were also lying there. It was revealed that husband of deceased entered inside the room after breaking the grill of the door.

3. Since death of deceased allegedly took place within 07 years of marriage, so IO gave intimation to the concerned SDM. IO had informed the family members of the deceased, who were residing in Bihar. On the directions of Sh. Anil Choudhary, Tehsildar, IO conducted the further proceedings of this case. Crime team was called

at the spot, who inspected the spot and articles were taken into possession by the IO. No suicide note was recovered from the spot.

4. On 31.10.2016, family members of the deceased were produced before Sh. Anil Choudhary, Tehsildar, who recorded the statements of Sh. Ranjit Singh (father of deceased), Sh. Shyam Nandan Rai (uncle of Ranjit Singh), wherein they have levelled the allegations of dowry demand by the accused persons. Thereafter, postmortem on the dead body of deceased was conducted and after the postmortem the dead body of deceased was handed over to her relatives. Thereafter, on the directions of Sh. Anil Choudhary, Tehsildar, the present case was registered against all the accused persons and investigation was conducted. During investigation, Site plan of the place of incident was prepared by the IO. During investigation, father of deceased handed over the photographs of marriage of deceased with the accused to the IO, who took the same into his possession.

5. During investigation, statement of mother of deceased namely Smt. Mala Devi was also recorded, who also corroborated the allegations made by her husband Ranjit Singh in his statement. IO had also recorded statement of Sh. Sajjan Tiwari, Priest, who solemnized the marriage of accused and deceased. Exhibits were deposited in the FSL.

6. On 09.12.2016, Dr. Manoj Dhingra, HOD Forensic medicine, Sanja Gandhi hospital opined that ***“after going through the PM report***

and the ligature material i.e. Saari, hanging is possible by this Saari or similar such ligature material”.

7. After completion of investigation, Charge-sheet was filed against accused Pawan Singh and later on, supplementary charge sheet was also filed against co-accused Dheeraj Singh and Usha Devi, before the concerned Court of Ld. JMFC and thereafter, committed to the Sessions Court.

Charge:

8. On 16.08.2017, Charges for the offence Punishable U/s 498A IPC r/w Section 34 IPC against all the three accused persons and U/s 304B IPC against accused Pawan Singh were framed, to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

The Trial

Prosecution evidence.

9. To prove its case, the prosecution has examined total 27 witnesses i.e. PW-1 to PW-27.

10. Prosecution evidence was closed vide order dated 19.02.2025 on submissions of Ld. Addl. PP for the State that all the prosecution witnesses had been examined.

Statements of accused persons Under Section 351 of BNSS (earlier Section 313 Cr.P.C.)

11. On 01.09.2025, statements of accused persons namely Dheeraj Singh and Usha Devi were recorded and on 02.09.2025, statement of accused Pawan Singh was recorded, wherein they submitted that they were falsely implicated in the present case.

12. Accused Dheeraj submits that he never visited the house of Pawan and Chanchal at any point of time. He was residing separately at Madipur, Delhi. He went to Bihar on 28.10.2016 on the celebration of Diwali and Chhatth Pooja. He was not present at the time of occurrence on 29.10.2016.

13. Accused Pawan Singh submits that he was married with deceased Chanchal in May, 2009 and he was living happily at the house of Madipur, Delhi. His wife Chanchal was getting treatment from a lady doctor namely Dr. Meera Gupta at Paschim Vihar, Delhi for the last 2-3 years as she was not able to conceive due to some Gynae problem and due to which she remained under depression. Thereafter, in his absence, she committed suicide herself.

14. Accused Usha Devi submits that the deceased got married with her son Pawan in May, 2009 and she was residing at her native village Bihar for about 2-3 months only and at that time, she was happy there. Thereafter, her son Pawan took the deceased to Delhi and she never visited at the house of her son Pawan in Delhi. All the accused persons

wished to lead defence evidence and had examined DW-1 Sh. Vijay Kumar and DW-2 Dr. Meera Gupta in their defence.

Defence evidence :

15. DW-1 Sh. Vijay Kumar has deposed that accused persons known to him since long as he was residing near the village of accused persons at a distance of 400-500 metres. He knew accused Pawan Singh since his birth. The marriage of Pawan Singh was solemnized in May, 2009 at Village Durgapur, District Khagaria, Bihar. He was invited in the said marriage by Pawan Singh and his family. Thereafter, he went at village Aadharpur, District Begusarai, Bihar for attending the function of marriage of Pawan Singh. He *voluntarily* deposed that he did not accompanied in 'Baraat' which was going to village Durgapur due to some urgent work at home.

16. DW-2 Dr. Meera Gupta, Gynecologist, Gupta Medical Centre, Paschim Vihar, Delhi had deposed that she had treated the patient namely Smt. Chanchal w/o Sh. Pawan Singh, who had visited at her clinic on 22.07.2015, regarding the infertility and she had examined the patient and copy of her ultrasound scan was marked as Mark DX.1. the report of folical study of dated 22.07.2015 and 29.07.2015 was also prepared on examination of patient Smt.Chanchal, Ex. DW-2/A. Thereafter, she again visited at her aforesaid clinic on 28.09.2015 for having fever. She had examined her vide her prescription slip Ex. DW-2/B.

Final Arguments :

17. The Court has heard the final arguments as advanced by Ld. Addl. P.P. for the State and Ld. defence Counsel for accused persons and have gone through the entire material available on record including written submissions.

Arguments on behalf of the Prosecution Ld.Addl. P.P. for the State :

18. At the thresh-hold, it is argued by the Ld. Addl. P.P. for the State that the present matter is based upon the direct evidence of eye witnesses and the prosecution has been able to prove on record, the connection of accused persons with the present crime and their guilt beyond reasonable doubt, with the help of **ocular evidence and medical evidence.**

Arguments addressed on behalf of accused persons :

19. It is argued that the prosecution has completely failed to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt; the prosecution had failed to shift the onus upon the defence, there were several doubts in the story of prosecution which clearly showed that the story of the prosecution was based on concocted story. It is further argued that there are several contradictions in the depositions of the witnesses. It is further argued that the statements of witnesses was neither trustworthy nor had any sanctity in the eye of law, same might be discarded and accused persons might be acquitted.

20. Ld. defence counsel has relied upon the Judgment titled as *Hansraj Sharma and others v. State Govt. of NCT of Delhi*,¹ passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, in CRL.Appeal No. 339-41/2005. The Hon'ble High Court has held in the abovesaid Judgment as under :

“12. Coming to the charge under Section 304-B of IPC, before a person can be convicted under this Section, which deals with what is described as “dowry death”, the prosecution must necessarily prove the following ingredients:-

i. The death of a woman must have been caused by burn or bodily injury or otherwise than under normal circumstance;

ii. Such death must have occurred within seven years of her marriage;

iii. Soon before her death, the woman must have been subjected to cruelty or harassment by her husband or by relatives of her husband;

iv. Such cruelty or harassment must be for or in connection with demand for dowry;

1. Hansraj Sharma and others v. State Govt. of NCT of Delhi, 175(2010) DLT 446, decided on 02.03.2010

v. Such cruelty or harassment is when to have been meted out to the woman soon before her death.

21. Ld. Counsel for the accused persons has further relied upon the Judgment in case titled as ***Surinder Kaur & Anr. v. State of Haryana***², wherein it has been observed that :

“We have noticed neither PW-6 nor PW-7 or for that matter the complaint does give the particulars of the time and date when the alleged harassment was meted out by the appellants. As noticed by us hereinabove, these statements are omnibus in nature. The specific allegations of harassment made only involves A-1 and his father with whose case we are not concerned now. The appellants are neither parties to the demand for a buffalo or Rs.25,000 which seems to be the proximate cause of Baljit Kaur committing suicide. The courts below in appreciating the evidence have failed to appreciate the material on record properly nor have they applied the required standard of proof necessary to base a conviction on the appellants. We have already noticed that if at all the prosecution case against these appellants is to be accepted it would only show that soon after the marriage i.e. about 2 years prior to the death of the deceased, there was some alleged harassment for lack of dowry which, in our opinion, is not a sufficient ground to hold the appellants guilty for the offence charged, since these allegations are not proximate to the death of the deceased.

2. Surinder Kaur & Anr. v. State of Haryana (2004) 4SCC 109

Appreciation of evidences on record :

Circumstantial evidence :

22. All the material public witnesses are relatives of the deceased, therefore, chances of their deposing falsely cannot be ruled out. Be that as it may, when the offence is said to have been committed and the circumstantial evidence is made the basis for establishing the charge against the accused persons, indisputably all the links must be completed to form the basis for their conviction.

23. The Hon'ble Apex Court in *Sharad Birdhichand Sharda v. State of Maharashtra (1984) 4SCC 1163* has laid down the parameters for arriving on opinion with regard to prove the prosecution case on the basis of circumstantial evidence while stating as under :

“152. A close analysis of this decision would show that the following conditions must be fulfilled before a case against an accused can be said to be fully established:

(1) the circumstances from which the conclusion of guilt is to be drawn should be fully established. It may be noted here that this Court indicated that the circumstances concerned 'must or should' and not 'may be' established. There is not only a grammatical but a legal distinction between 'may be proved' and 'must be or

should be proved as was held by this Court in Shivaji Sahebrao Bobade v. State of Maharashtra where the following observations were made:

certainly, it is a primary principle that the accused must be and not merely may be guilty before a Court can convict, and the mental distance between 'may be' and 'must be' is long and divides vague conjectures from sure conclusions.

(2) the facts so established should be consistent only with the hypothesis of the guilt of the accused, that is to say, they should not be explainable on any other hypothesis except that the accused is guilty.

(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 and must show that in all human probability the act must have been done by the accused. These five golden principles, if we may say so, constitute the panchsheel of the proof of a case based on circumstantial evidence.

Evidences to prove necessary ingredients of Section 304B IPC and 498A IPC :

24. To prove the cruelty and harassment by the accused persons, being husband and In-laws of deceased Chanchal for demand of dowry soon before death of Chanchal, the prosecution examined PW-1, PW-2 and PW-4 being her father, mother and her father's uncle (foofa). The relevant depositions of these witnesses are as under :

Deposition of PW-1 pertaining to material facts:

During his examination-in-chief, PW-1 Sh. Ranjit Singh deposed as under:

25. (i) That **deceased Chanchal was his daughter who married with accused Pawan Singh in May 2010**, according to Hindu customs at his village Durgapur, District Khagaria, Bihar.
- (ii) That **after some days of marriage, accused Pawan Singh and his brother co-accused Dheeraj Singh (Jeth of deceased) started demanding motorcycle and giving beatings to his daughter**. He further

deposed that his daughter had stated to him telephonically that after consuming liquor both the said accused persons used to beat her. He also deposed that his daughter had stated to his wife telephonically that since she could not get pregnancy for a long period, so both the accused persons had used to harass her in this regard and use to demand motorcycle by stating that “इसके बच्चा नहीं हो रहा है pulsar motorcycle चाहिए”.

(iii) That on **29.10.2016**, at around 7.00 PM, accused Pawan Singh had made a call to him on telephone and stated that Chanchal (deceased) was not opening the door of her room and when he asked to break the same, then on that accused Pawan Singh replied that how he could brake the door as it was more valuable than Chanchal and on the same day, **at around 9.00 PM, accused Pawan again called him and informed that Chanchal had committed suicide.**

(iv) That his daughter had also stated on phone to him that both the said accused persons were living together in a room and after consuming liquor, they used to beat her on demand of dowry and accused Dheeraj used to keep bad eyes on her.

(v) That he had given nine photographs of marriage of his daughter with accused Pawan to the IO, who seized the same vide seizure memo Ex. PW1/E. He also identified photographs and the same were exhibited as Ex. PW1/F1 to Ex. PW1/F9.

(vi) **That two to four days prior to the death of his daughter, she had informed him telephonically that accused Pawan and Dheeraj were**

harassing her and giving beatings to her for the demand of motorcycle and dowry.

(vii) That mother-in-law of his daughter (co-accused Usha) also used to harass and beat his daughter for the demand of dowry at the matrimonial home of his daughter at Bihar, where his daughter resided for around two years after marriage.

(viii) That he identified all the three accused persons who were present in the Court on that day.

Cross examination of PW-1:

During his cross-examination, he answered as under:

26. (i) That he did not have any document in his possession to show that the marriage of deceased Chanchal was solemnized in May, 2010.

(ii) That he could neither admit nor deny that marriage of deceased Chanchal with accused Pawan was a simple marriage or that neither any demand was made from the side of the accused nor any dowry articles were given from their side. However, he voluntarily answered that all the arrangement and the expenses were borne by his father and his father was no more.

(iii) That photographs were taken by his relative namely Ranjan Kumar in the marriage.

(iv) That after marriage of his daughter, he visited her matrimonial house in Bihar on two occasions. On one occasion, he had gone to

bring her daughter to her parental home. The second visit was made to attend the marriage of his daughter's sister in law (Nanad) after around two and half years of the marriage of his daughter (since deceased) and at that time, his son had accompanied him. He admitted the suggestion that accused Usha Devi was a widow.

(v) That he had not provided any mobile phone to his daughter. He further answered that during the period when the deceased resided at her matrimonial house in Bihar, she had called his wife for four to five times from different numbers. He answered that he did not remember the said mobile numbers but the mobile number on which his daughter used to call his wife was 7631247422 and it was in the name of his wife.

(vi) That his daughter visited her parental house twice, when she was residing at her matrimonial house in Bihar. On first occasion, she stayed for 15 days and on second occasion, she stayed for two days. He further answered that on both the occasions, neither he nor his wife nor his father (since deceased) made any complaint in the Police Station against the accused persons on the ground that she was unhappy in her matrimonial house. He voluntarily answered that she used to inform his father and request him to look into the matter. He further voluntarily answered that in their society no complaint was made against in laws immediately as the same might spoil the possibility of reconciliation. He further answered that after around one

month of marriage, his father and uncle (Foofa) had visited the matrimonial house of his daughter for the purpose of reconciliation.

(vii) That after shifting to Delhi, his daughter never told them about her new address. That she stayed at Delhi with accused Pawan for around two and half years before her death.

(viii) He admitted the suggestion that he had never visited the house of his deceased daughter in Delhi during her lifetime. He further answered that she came to his house only once while living in Delhi but he did not remember the date, month or year of the said visit and on the said visit, she stayed for two days. He further answered that no complaint was made in the PS against her in laws during the said visit also.

(ix) **He admitted the suggestion that his daughter (since deceased) had never talked to him while living in Delhi.** He further answered that she used to talk to his wife on his mobile phone. He answered that he did not remember the mobile number from which she used to contact his wife and she used to call his wife when he was on his duty.

(x) **He answered that he had told the police in his statement that the accused Dheeraj and Pawan were residing together. However, he was confronted with the statement Ex. PW1/A wherein it was not so recorded.**

(xi) That he did not know if the accused Pawan was getting his daughter treated in Delhi as she was not able to conceive. However, he also admitted the suggestion that they never got his daughter treated at

their village but he voluntarily answered that, since she was residing in Delhi so it was not possible for them to come to Delhi and get her treated. He also voluntarily answered that accused persons never allowed his daughter to come to her parental house.

Deposition of PW-2 pertaining to material facts:

During his examination-in-chief, PW-2 Smt. Mala deposed as under:

27. (i) That deceased Chanchal was her daughter and she was married with accused Pawan Singh according to Hindu customs and rights in May, 2010, who resided alongwith accused Pawan and his family members for around 02 years in her matrimonial house at Village Aadhar Pur, Bihar and thereafter, she alongwith her husband and co-accused Dheeraj came to Delhi.

(ii) That her daughter lived happily at her matrimonial home in Bihar for around 01 year after her marriage.

(iii) That her daughter used to call her telephonically from Delhi and she used to tell that her husband and Jeth used to beat her after consuming liquor and make the demand of motorcycle. The said accused persons also used to harass her on the issue of not giving birth to a child from a long time.

(iv) That accused Pawan and Dheeraj used to demand motorcycle from them. The said demand was disclosed to her by the deceased on phone. She also told her on phone that the said accused persons used to beat her for demand of dowry, money and motorcycle after

consuming liquor. Accused Pawan used to tell her “आपको बच्चा नहीं होता है तो हम आप को रख कर क्या करेंगे”.

She further deposed that her daughter also told her on phone that during her stay at her matrimonial home at Bihar, co-accused Usha used to demand dowry.

(v) That prior to 2-4 days of her death, she made a call to her and stated that accused Pawan and Dheeraj were harassing and torturing her after consuming liquor for demand of dowry, money and motorcycle.

Cross-examination of PW-2 :

During her cross-examination, PW-2 has answered as under :

28. (i) That she did not have any document such as an invitation card of marriage etc. to show the marriage of deceased Chanchal in May, 2010.

(ii) That at the time of marriage, they had given jewelery, bed and trunk to their daughter and ear rings, nose pin and Mangal Sutra were made of gold and anklets were of silver. She further answered that she had not provided the receipts/bills in respect to the said jewelery articles to the IO as this jewelery was received by her from her parents.

(iii) She further answered that her daughter visited to her parental house twice while residing at her matrimonial house in Bihar. For the

second time, she visited to attend Mundan ceremony of her (PW-2) son.

(iv) That she never visited the matrimonial house of her daughter in Bihar. She voluntarily answered that her father-in-law and uncle of her husband (Foofa) namely Sham Nandan Rai used to visit Aadhar Pur, Bihar and they visited on 3-4 occasions for the purpose of reconciliation. She also answered that her husband visited her daughters' matrimonial house in Bihar only once to attend marriage ceremony of her daughter's sister-in-law.

(vi) That the deceased had called only once from village Aadhar Pur in Bihar on mobile phone of her husband. She answered that **she was not having personal mobile phone and she did not remember the mobile number of her husband. She further answered that the said call was attended by her husband.**

(vii) That her daughter had informed her that she was going to shift to Delhi alongwith accused Pawan and during her stay in Delhi, **her daughter used to call her once or twice in month on the mobile phone of her husband as she was not having any personal mobile phone.**

(viii) **She further voluntarily answered that when her husband used to return home, she also used to talk to her daughter from the mobile phone of her husband.** She further answered that she could not tell any specific date on which a call from her daughter was received by her husband on his mobile phone. She also answered that she could not

tell any specific date and month on which she had talked to her daughter using the mobile phone of her husband.

(ix) She admitted the suggestion that her daughter had visited her parental house to attend the last rights of her grand father, while she was staying in Delhi.

(x) She answered that she had stated to the police in her statement recorded u/s 161 Cr.P.C. that her daughter had told on phone that during her stay in Bihar, co-accused Usha used to demand dowry however, she was confronted with her statement u/s 161 Cr.P.C. Ex.PW-2/D1, wherein it was not so recorded.

Deposition of PW-4 pertaining to material facts:

During his examination-in-chief, PW-4 Sh. Shyam Nandan Rai deposed as under:

29. (i) That deceased Chanchal was daughter of his brother-in-law's son and she got married with accused Pawan in May, 2010 and thereafter, she resided in her matrimonial house in Village Aadhar Pur, Bihar and after three years of their marriage, they came to Delhi.

(ii) That after marriage when deceased came to her parental house for the first time, she stated to her parents and him that accused Usha Devi, Dheeraj and Pawan were demanding Pulsar motorcycle and some money and for the said demand, they also used to abuse and beat her.

(iii) That after around one month, deceased's father received information from her on his mobile phone that accused persons were still beating and abusing her for demand of motorcycle and money. He further deposed that thereafter, he alongwith grand father of the deceased went to matrimonial house of the deceased in Bihar and met with accused Usha Devi and told her that father of deceased was a poor person and was unable to fulfill the demand. The accused persons had assured them that no such incident would repeat in future and thereafter, they returned back.

(iv) That thereafter also the complaints from Chanchal were received against the accused persons for the said demand and after around six months, he alongwith grand father of deceased Chanchal again visited the deceased's matrimonial house in Bihar. He further deposed that at that time, accused Dheeraj was in drunk condition and he stated that "जब मैं अपनी patni को जला सकता हूँ तो आपकी पोती को क्यों जिदा रखेंगे नहीं तो Pulsar motorcycle दे दीजिए". When accused Usha Devi was asked to make understand Dheeraj then she also replied "जब ये दारु पी लेता है तो हमारी भी नहीं मानता, motorcycle दे दीजिए". Thereafter, for one more time, they visited matrimonial house of the deceased for the same purpose. Thereafter, accused Dheeraj, Pawan and deceased Chanchal came to Delhi.

(v) He further deposed that thereafter also he was receiving the information from father of deceased that accused persons were still harassing and causing cruelty to Chanchal for demand of motorcycle

and money. Accused Usha Devi was living in Bihar but she used to live in Delhi at the matrimonial house of deceased Chanchal.

(vi) That around three days prior to the incident, deceased's father informed him on his mobile phone that the deceased had informed him that accused persons would kill her. He further deposed that when he met the deceased's father at his request, then he informed him that Chanchal was under fear and she stated to him that "ये लोग मुझे मार देंगे". He also informed him that accused persons were not providing him their Delhi address.

Cross-examination of PW-4 :

During his cross-examination, PW-4 has answered as under :

30. (i) That he was matric pass and LIC agent. The invitation card of the marriage was not got printed by the father of deceased.
- (ii) That he did not have any documentary proof regarding the solemnization of marriage of deceased Chanchal with accused Pawan in May, 2010.
- (iii) **He was confronted with his statements given to SDM and to the police on a number of material facts, which he deposed during his examination-in-chief** as above stated including alleged information given by the deceased to her parents and to him regarding demand of dowry, regarding reconciliation efforts with accused persons, regarding visiting the matrimonial house of deceased Chanchal in Delhi by co-accused Usha Devi, regarding telephonic information to

him by deceased's father regarding cruelty on deceased by the accused persons 3-4 days prior to the incident. These statements recorded by the SDM and by the IO are Ex.PW-4/A and Ex.PW-4/DA respectively.

(iv) **When during his cross-examination, he was asked about many other material facts except above stated in the previous point that if he had stated the same to the SDM, while giving his statement to him, then he answered that he did not remember if he stated so to the SDM.**

(v) He further answered that he did not remember the date and day of the week on which deceased Chanchal had visited her parental house for the first time after her marriage, however, he further answered that it was around 15 days after the marriage and at that time, accused Pawan was not accompanying her and thereafter, after around 15 days, accused Pawan came to take Chanchal back to her matrimonial house.

(vi) That he and the parents of deceased as well as Chanchal did not make any complaint to the police regarding demand of motorcycle and money during her said stay.

(vii) That he did not remember the date of their visit to Aadhar Pur (deceased's matrimonial house).

(viii) He admitted the suggestion that accused persons were residing in a residential area in Aadhar Pur but they did not call any Panchayat at Aadhar Pur to complain about the accused persons regarding demand of motorcycle and money.

(ix) He further answered that they also did not disclose the said fact regarding said demand to the Sarpanch of the area.

(x) That deceased Chanchal never called him telephonically during her stay at Aadhar Pur, Bihar.

(xi) He further answered that she was using the mobile phone of her husband while calling to her parents.

(xii) He further answered that deceased had visited her parental house for four time as per his knowledge.

(xiii) That no police complaint was made by them against the accused persons. That deceased's father had called him several time after the marriage of deceased and he had also visited several times to Durga Pur (parental house of deceased) after marriage of the deceased.

(xiv) That he did not remember the mobile number of deceased's father.

(xv) That deceased's mother was not having mobile phone, however, she was using the mobile phone of her husband and the deceased Chanchal used to call on the mobile phone of her father in the night time.

(xvi) He admitted the suggestion that acused Pawan and deceased Chanchal attended the last rites of grand father of Chanchal. He further answered that they had shifted to Delhi after death of deceased's grand father. He also answered that after shifting to Delhi, Chanchal did not visit her parental house even once.

(xvii) That Chanchal contacted her parents during the said three years on number of occasions as the same was told to him by deceased's

father but he never tried to contact the deceased on the number from which she used to contact her parents from Delhi.

(xviii) That neither he nor deceased's father made any complaint to the local police regarding the call received from Chanchal or the threat extended by accused Pawan.

(xix) That they did not try to trace out the location/address of accused Pawan on the basis of mobile number on which they had talked to him.

31. PW-5 Sh. Sajjan Tiwari was Priest who performed the marriage of deceased with accused Pawan. In order to ascertain the veracity of PW-1, PW-2 and PW-4 regarding alleged date of marriage of deceased, it will also be useful to analyse the testimony of PW-5.

Deposition of PW-5 pertaining to material facts:

32. During his examination-in-chief, PW-5 Sh. Sajjan Tiwari deposed that he was priest by profession and got performed the marriage of deceased Chanchal with co-accused Pawan in May, 2010 at Village Durga Pur, Bihar according to Hindu customs and rites.

During his cross-examination, he answered as under :

33. (i) That he was not maintaining any register of marriages performed by him.

(ii) That he did not remember the date of marriage of deceased Chanchal and accused Pawan. However he denied the suggestion that the same was performed in the year of 2009.

(iii) That he did not have any documentary proof to prove that he performed their marriage in May, 2010.

(iv) That he did not remember the date and month on which the *lagan patri* was prepared on their marriage.

(v) That he did not know as to what articles/gifts were exchanged between the parties at the time of marriage.

(vi) That a photographer had been called to click the photographs of marriage but he did not know from which side the photographer had been engaged and he also did not know the name of the photographer.

(vii) That he did not remember whether any invitation card of the marriage was got printed by any of the parties.

(viii) That he came to Delhi for the first time with mother of deceased on 01.11.2016 and he stayed in Delhi for around two days.

Probative force of deposition of PW-1, PW-2 and PW-4 :

34. On careful perusal of examinations of PW-1, PW-2 and PW-4, many contradictions and missing links are found in their testimonies to prove the harassment or cruelty on the deceased for demand of dowry by the accused persons, which are as follows :

(I) So far as the allegation of the prosecution that the unnatural death of deceased occurred within seven years of marriage and to prove the

same, it examined the said family members i.e. PW-1, PW-2 and PW-4, these witnesses failed to mention the exact date of marriage. All these witnesses only stated that the marriage was performed in May, 2010. No other documentary evidence including the invitation card of the marriage was produced by these witnesses despite specific question put to them by the Id. Defence counsel during their cross-examination.

(II) So far as evidence of PW-4 is concerned, before relying on his evidence, it has also to be considered that during his deposition before the Court, there was improvement on abovesaid most of the material facts and accordingly, during his cross-examination, almost his complete deposition was confronted with his previous statements made before the SDM and IO.

Discrepancies between the witnesses's statements, whether in initial deposition or police statements or Court testimonies, can raise questions about reliability. However, normal discrepancies are bound to occur in the deposition of witnesses due to errors of observations or memory. Normal discrepancies are minor variations in a witness's account that Courts generally accept as inevitable.

In contrast, material discrepancies are abnormal and these go beyond minor errors and touch on core facts of the case, potentially undermining the witness's credibility entirely. Such deviations create serious doubts about truthfulness.

Similarly, where the omissions amount to a contradictions, it create a serious doubt about the truthfulness of the witness. When witness makes material improvement while deposing in the Court, such evidence cannot be safe to rely upon. This principle underscores that material issues, warrant scrutiny and may lead to acquittal if they erode trust in the testimony.

In the present case, there were material improvements in the testimony of PW-4 regarding demand of dowry, reconciliation efforts by deceased's family with accused persons, visiting matrimonial house of deceased Chanchal in Delhi by co-accused Usha Devi, regarding telephonic information to PW-4 by deceased's father regarding cruelty on deceased 3-4 days prior to the incident by the accused persons. Accordingly, evidence of PW-4 cannot be safely relied upon.

(III) During his cross-examination, PW-1 answered that he could neither admit nor deny that the marriage of deceased Chanchal with accused Pawan was a simple marriage or that neither any demand was made from the side of accused nor any dowry articles were given from parental side of the deceased. Thereafter, he voluntarily answered that all the arrangements and expenses were borne by his father. The grand father of the deceased is stated to be expired before her death.

Otherwise also, PW-4 deposed during his examination-in-chief that when he alongwith grand father of deceased went to matrimonial house of deceased in Bihar and met with accused Usha Devi to apprise

her that the paternal side of deceased shall not be able to fulfill the demand, then they also told her that there was no demand from accused side at earlier stage.

The said depositions of PW-1 and PW-4 and also absence of any other evidence on behalf of the prosecution regarding demand of dowry at the time of marriage by the accused persons, are sufficient to conclude that there was no dowry demand by the accused persons from the family of deceased at the time of marriage.

(IV) During her cross-examination, PW-2 was confronted with her statement u/s 161 Cr.P.C., Ex. PW-2/D1 when she answered that she had stated to the police in her said statement that her daughter had told her on phone that during her stay in Bihar, accused Usha used to demand dowry. This omission is a material contradiction and accordingly, testimony of PW-2 on allegations against co-accused Usha for dowry demand cannot be relied upon.

(V) PW-1, PW-2 and PW-4 alleged that accused Dheeraj was residing with accused Pawan and deceased in Delhi and he alongwith accused Pawan used to harass the deceased for demand of dowry. However, some prosecution witnesses itself disputed this fact.

During his cross-examination by Ld. Defence counsel, PW-3 Sh. Puran, who was landlord of rented accommodation where deceased committed suicide, admitted the suggestion that he never found accused Dheeraj at the said rented room whenever he visited

there. He also admitted the suggestion that accused Dheeraj was residing separately from accused Pawan and deceased.

PW-18 Sh. Vikram/brother-in-law of deceased (Devar) answered during his cross-examination that he never seen Dheeraj in the house of his brother Pawan and he was residing in other place.

PW-26 Sh. Kaushal Kumar deposed that accused Dheeraj took one room on rent on his top floor in March, 2016 and his brother namely Pawan and his bhabhi used to reside in the same neighbourhood and he used to visit their house. In the month of October, 2016, accused Dheeraj went to his village and after some days, he came to know that his bhabhi had committed suicide.

The depositions of PW-3, PW-18 and PW-26 are contrary to the depositions of PW-1, PW-2 and PW-4 on the fact that accused Dheeraj Singh, Pawan Singh were living together in a room. Accordingly, the deposition of PW-1, PW-2 and PW-4 cannot be relied upon on this fact of living the said accused persons together in a room with deceased in Delhi. It further shakes credit of PW-1, PW-2 and PW-4. (VI) On the one hand, PW-1 deposed that around 2-4 days prior to her death, her daughter informed him on phone that accused Pawan and Dheeraj were harassing her and given beatings to her for the demand of motorcycle and dowry. However, per contra, during his cross-examination dated 19.02.2018, he admitted the suggestion that the deceased had never talked to him on telephone while living in Delhi.

He also answered that his daughter used to talk to his wife on

his mobile phone, however, he further answered that his daughter used to call his wife usually when he was on his duty. Both these situations cannot exist simultaneously. In absence of any explanation that whether PW-1 used to leave the house without his mobile phone, there cannot be any possibility that his daughter was able to talk to his wife on his mobile phone when he was on his duty.

These contrary depositions of PW-1 create doubt on truthfulness of his deposition regarding phone calls of the deceased to him and his wife.

(VII) On the one hand, PW-4 answered during his cross-examination dated 03.04.2018 that deceased never called him telephonically as she was not having his mobile number but she was using the mobile phone of her husband while calling to her parents. However, PW-1 answered in his cross-examination dated 19.02.2018 that he did not remember the mobile number from which the deceased used to contact his wife. It was not explained by any of the prosecution witness including PW-4 that who informed him that deceased called to her parents from mobile of his husband. Accordingly, the alleged phone calls made by deceased to communicate with her parents for informing them about alleged harassment and cruelty on her in relation to demand of dowry could not be proved by the prosecution and testimonies of these witnesses pertaining to this fact remains suspicious due to abovesaid contradictions.

(VIII) On the one hand, PW-1 answered during his cross-examination dated 19.02.2018 that mobile number 7631247422 was in the name of his wife, however, per contra, PW-4 answered during his cross-examination dated 03.04.2018 that mother of deceased was not having mobile phone and she was using the mobile phone of her husband and deceased Chanchal used to call on the mobile phone of her father in the night time as her father used to return home in the late night and used to stay back with his employer due to the nature of work i.e. driving.

(IX) On the one hand, as per PW-1, his daughter came to his house only once while living in Delhi and she stayed for two days, however, per contra, as per PW-4 after shifting to Delhi, deceased Chanchal did not visit her parental house even once.

(X) All the allegations of PW-1, PW-2 and PW-4 during their depositions against the accused persons remained general in nature without mentioning any specific date and time of the alleged incident of cruelty and demand of dowry against the deceased.

35. Considering these material contradictions and lacunas in the testimonies of PW-1, PW-2 and PW-4, their respective depositions are neither sufficient nor trustworthy in order to prove charges against the accused persons in this case.

Other lacunas in the prosecution's case :

36. (I) No other proof regarding date of marriage to show that the unnatural death occurred within seven years of marriage was produced by the prosecution. It was only claimed by the prosecution witnesses that the marriage was performed in May, 2010 but similarly, the claim of defence remained that the marriage was performed in the year of 2009 and the defence disputed the fact that the death occurred after expiry of seven years of marriage. DW-1 was examined in defence, whereby the witness stated that the marriage of accused Pawan Singh was solemnized in May, 2009 at Village Durga Pur, District Khagria, Bihar.

PW-1 answered during his cross-examination that they did not hire any professional photographer and the photographs were taken by their relative Ranjan Kumar in the marriage. However, the said Ranjan Kumar was not examined and cited as a witness by the IO and further also not examined by the prosecution. The said Ranjan Kumar could be material witness to prove the date of marriage as allegedly he was the photographer in the marriage.

In my considered opinion, without any cogent evidence regarding the exact date of marriage and in view of abovesaid discussion, it cannot be said that prosecution discharged its burden of proof successfully in proving the fact that death of Chanchal (since deceased) occurred within seven years of marriage. Accordingly, in

absence of proof of unnatural death within seven years of marriage, the accused cannot be convicted u/s 304B IPC.

(II) In order to establish the fact that deceased used to contact her parents telephonically and informed them about alleged harassment/cruelty on her for demand of dowry, the prosecution failed to produce the CDR and CAF of the said phone numbers. The IO could easily inquire about the relevant mobile numbers from the CDR of alleged mobile number 7631247422, which was allegedly in the name of wife of PW-1 as stated by PW-1 during his cross-examination dated 19.02.2018. This lacuna weakens the circumstantial chain to prove the prosecution story.

(III) No cogent evidence was led on behalf of the prosecution to prove the exact dates when the deceased was harassed for demand of dowry by the accused persons.

(IV) Absence of any prior complaint by the deceased or her parents regarding any harassment or cruelty for demand of dowry by the accused persons against her, when the allegations were that such cruelty was started by the accused persons against the deceased within a short span of her marriage and at the time of her death atleast around six to seven years had passed since marriage, further weakens the prosecution story of alleged cruelty.

(V) Any medical document for treatment of any injury to deceased caused by accused persons was also not produced during trial by the prosecution. Even any injury to the deceased from alleged beatings by

the accused persons was not described by any of the prosecution witness.

Testimonies of remaining Prosecution witnesses :

37. (I) PW-3 was landlord of the rented accommodation where deceased last resided with her husband. During his examination-in-chief, he turned hostile.

(II) PW-5 was Priest who performed the marriage of deceased with the accused Pawan. However, during his examination-in-chief, he failed to disclose the exact date of marriage and also could not produce any documentary evidence pertaining to the marriage on the alleged date. However, he was not merely a Priest who performed the marriage but as per PW-1, he was also a mediator of the marriage and probably, he was close to the parental side of the deceased as he came to Delhi alongwith deceased's mother on her death.

Considering these facts, he was supposed to have some extra information about the marriage but his testimony remained general in nature without giving any specific date of the marriage.

(III) PW-6 was Tehsildar, who recorded the statement of deceased's father as per the instructions of the SDM, Punjabi Bagh and issued the necessary directions regarding the postmortem of the deceased. However, during his cross-examination, he admitted the suggestion that he was not authorised by the SDM in writing to record the

statements of family members of the deceased. Otherwise also, he is a witness of procedure and not witness of incident.

(IV) PW-7 is the person in whose name mobile number 7827234707 was issued and who allegedly handed over this mobile number to his friend Vikram (devar of deceased). From this mobile number, a call was made to the police regarding suicide of deceased. This witness is also formal in nature.

(V) PW-8 is doctor who conducted the postmortem and prepared PM report Ex. PW-8/A in which the cause of death was opined as asphyxia as a result of antemortem hanging. He also deposed that after going through the PM report and the ligature material i.e. *Saree*, he gave subsequent opinion Ex. PW-8/B that the hanging was possible with the *Saree* produced or similar such ligature material.

(VI) PW-9 Ms. Chandni was neighbour of deceased in Delhi, who answered during her cross-examination that she and the deceased used to visit each other's house around 5-6 times in a week and the deceased was residing happily with her husband and during her stay in her neighbourhood, she had not heard any quarrel between them. She further answered that on the date of incident, the deceased was perfectly normal as she met with the deceased on that day when deceased had come to the roof of the building. She further admitted the suggestion that deceased never complaint against her husband to her.

This deposition of PW-9 is more in favour of the accused persons than the prosecution.

(VII) PW-10 was Incharge of Mobile Crime team, which visited the spot. He prepared the crime scene report Ex. PW-10/A.

(VIII) PW-11 was draftsman and he prepared site plan Ex. PW-11/A.

(IX) PW-12 was the photographer in the mobile crime team who took the photographs of the dead body and the articles lying at the spot.

(X) PW-13 was duty officer who recorded the FIR.

(XI) PW-14 went alongwith IO/ASI Balbir to SGM hospital on 31.10.2016 for getting the postmortem conducted on the body of deceased Chanchal.

(XII) PW-15 was the MHC(M) who received the case properties from the IO in the malkhana PS Punjabi Bagh.

(XIII) PW-16 is Nodal Officer, who brought customer application form pertaining to the abovesaid mobile number 7827234707 issued in the name of Raj Pal.

(XIV) PW-17 was Nodal officer from Police head Quarter, ITO, Delhi who brought certificate u/s 65B of I.E.Act pertaining to the PCR form, Ex. PW-17/B regarding recording in the control room, PHQ, Delhi by the operator concerned on 29.10.2016 at around 21:18:22 hours on the basis of message received from the caller of mobile number 7827234707 regarding committal of suicide by bhabhi of caller.

(XV) PW-18 was brother-in-law (devar) of deceased, who made the abovesaid call to the police control room regarding her suicide and

who also entered in the room through the window after broken grill of the window after noticing that deceased committed suicide.

During his cross-examination, he answered that he used to visit Delhi at the house of his brother and never seen accused Dheeraj in the house of his brother. He also answered that accused Dheeraj resided at other place. He further answered that his bhabhi used to remain disturb without any issue and she was got treated by accused Pawan. He further answered that he had not seen any quarrel or any dispute between Pawan and deceased and they resided cordially.

Testimony of this witness regarding relations between the accused Pawan and deceased and about residence of accused Dheeraj is more in favour of accused persons than the prosecution.

(XVI) PW-19 is police witness who deposited the sealed parcel in FSL, Rohini after receiving the same from MHC(M).

(XVII) PW-20 recorded DD no. 44PP regarding suicide by bhabhi of informant.

(XVIII) PW-21 remained alongwith IO/SI Ajay on 31.10.2016 and accused Pawan was arrested by the IO in his presence.

(XIX) PW-22 on receiving DD no. 44A, PP Madipur on 29.10.2016, reached at the spot alongwith Ct. Siya Ram. He called crime team. He also informed the parents of the deceased and SDM concerned about the same. On 31.10.2016, he went to the office of SDM alongwith parents of the deceased and followed the directions of the Executing

Magistrate concerned. After registration of FIR, site plan was prepared by SI Ajay at his instance.

(XX) PW-23 is IO/Insp. Ajay Kumar who prepared site plan at the instance of ASI Balbir, arrested accused Pawan Kumar on 01.11.2016, seized the alleged photographs of marriage produced by father of deceased on 04.11.2016 and recorded statements u/s 161 Cr.P.C. of family members of deceased.

(XXI) PW-24 received the present case file on 05.01.2017 for further investigation and he prepared the draft charge sheet and sent the same to the prosecution.

(XXII) PW-25 was last IO who recorded the statement of Tehsildar Sh. Anil Chaudhary u/s 161 Cr.P.C., collected the PCR form, prepared charge sheet against accused Pawan and filed supplementary charge sheet against accused Dheeraj and Usha Devi.

During his cross-examination, he answered that he did not remember whether he collected the marriage card of deceased with accused Pawan. He further answered that he had not collected any document related to date of marriage of deceased with accused Pawan.

(XXIII) PW-26 was landlord of the rented accommodation of accused Dheeraj. As per his deposition, accused Dheeraj resided separately and not alongwith accused Pawan and deceased so his deposition also of no use for the prosecution to prove the alleged fact that accused Dheeraj, accused Pawan and the deceased resided together.

(XXIV) PW-27 is witness of formal arrest of accused Dheeraj.

38. Accordingly, most of the said witnesses are either formal in nature or some of the remaining prosecution witnesses as above stated deposed in favour of accused persons. None of the said witnesses can be considered to be a witness to prove the alleged incident of harassment/cruelty on the deceased by the accused persons.

39. In order to bring home conviction u/s 304B, it will not be sufficient to only lead evidence showing that cruelty and harassment had been meted out to the victim, but that such treatment was in connection with demand of dowry.

40. After arguments and careful perusal of the record, observations, preceding discussions and testimonies of PWs, it is clear that PW-1, PW-2 and PW-4, who are family members of the deceased have made only general allegations upon all the accused persons and none of the PWs including PW-1, PW-2 and PW-4 could disclose the date of demand of dowry on record and further they could not tell the dates or time regarding the torture, harassment or cruelty against deceased committed by accused persons in connection with demand of dowry. Allegations levelled by PWs appear to be vague. Even PW-4 is a hearsay witness about most of the alleged material facts whose testimony cannot be relied upon pertaining to these facts otherwise also in the given facts & circumstances.

41. Even soon before death, no circumstances have been proved by the prosecution connecting the accused persons subjected to cruelty or harassment upon deceased on account of demand of dowry as no

physical injury has been suggested in her postmortem report. In terms of 113B of Evidence Act, the term “*soon before death*” lead to presumption that accused persons had caused dowry death. In the present case, ingredients of Section 304B IPC have not been fulfilled. The Hon’ble Apex Court in State of *Rajasthan v. Teg Bahadur, 2004(8) J.T.116* , has held that prosecution has to prove (1) the death of married woman was within seven years of marriage; (2) a little prior to her death, her husband or relative on point of demand of dowry subjected cruelty to her or harassed her; (3) prosecution has to rule out the possibility of natural or accidental death so as to bring within purview of death occurring otherwise than in normal circumstances.

42. On the careful scrutiny of aforesaid witnesses, there is no corroboration about the statements of prosecution witnesses. Under these circumstances, I am of the considered opinion that there is lack of evidence to prove the demand of dowry and that the evidence led by the prosecution bristles with discrepancies and contradictions. On the basis of evidence, it cannot be treated to have been proved that actually accused had made a demand of dowry and that was made soon before the death and due to this, the deceased was harassed.

43. Since it is confirmed that at the time of marriage, there was no demand of dowry at any point of time and also considering that none of the PWs stated that complaints were made to any authority regarding demand of dowry against the accused and there are mere

general allegations and there is no definite evidence about the ill treatment to the deceased at any time having immediate proximity to the death of deceased by the accused to attach culpability under section 304B IPC, the basic requirement of cruelty or harassment soon before death to bring application of section 304B IPC is absent.

Section 498A IPC proved or not :

44. Further question is whether a case u/s 498A IPC is made out even when accusation u/s 304B IPC fails.

45. In reference to Section 498A IPC, no circumstance has been shown by the prosecution indicating any willful conduct on part of any of the accused persons. Mere general allegations cannot be put as willful conduct towards demand of dowry or cruelty by the accused persons.

Conclusion :

46. From the testimonies of witnesses and circumstances and facts of this case, at this stage, this Court comes to the conclusion that the case of the prosecution does not inspire the confidence of this Court as prosecution has failed to prove the guilt of accused persons beyond the reasonable doubt.

47. With this background, the prosecution has miserably failed to prove the complicity of accused persons namely Pawan Singh, Dheeraj and Usha Devi for the commission of crime beyond shadow

of all reasonable doubts and has not been able to prove all the ingredients of the offences u/s 498A/34 IPC, for which accused persons have been charged and faced trial. Further, the prosecution has miserably failed to prove the charge for the offence punishable u/s 304B IPC against accused Pawan Singh. Accordingly, all the accused persons namely Pawan Singh, Dheeraj and Usha Devi are acquitted of the Charges

48. Accused persons have been directed to furnish bail bonds in view of Section 481 of BNSS which have been furnished and accepted for the period of six months from today.

49. File be consigned to record room.

50. In view of the Judgment titled as *Manojbhai Jethabhai Parmar (Rohit) v. State of Gujarat*,³ passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, the specimen chart of witnesses examined, specimen chart of exhibited documents and Specimen Chart for material objects/Muddamals are as follows :

Specimen Chart of witnesses examined

Prosecution witnesses No.	Name of witnesses	Description
PW-1	Sh. Ranjit Singh	Father of deceased
PW-2	Smt. Mala	Mother of deceased
PW-3	Sh. Puran	Owner of the house, where accused Pawan was residing alongwith the

3. Manojbhai Jethabhai Parmar (Rohit) v. State of Gujarat, in Criminal Appeal No. 2973 of 2023, decided on 15.12.2025.

		deceased at Madipur.
PW-4	Sh. Shyam Nandan Rai	Grand father/Fufa of deceased
PW-5	Sh. Sajjan Tiwari	Priest, who got performed the marriage of deceased with accused Pawan Singh.
PW-6	Sh. Anil Chaudhary	Tehsildar and recorded statements of father and grand father of deceased.
PW-7	Sh.Rajpal	Public witness
PW-8	Dr. Manoj Dhingra	Conducted the postmortem on the body of deceased.
PW-9	Ms. Chandna	Public witness, who resided on the fourth floor of the house in which accused Pawan Singh and deceased were residing at third floor.
PW-10	SI Ajit Sing	Incharge Mobile Crime Team and proved his report Ex. PW-10/A.
PW-11	ASI Om Prakash	Draftsman and prepared site plan Ex. PW-11/A.
PW-12	HC Amit	Photographer, Mobile Crime Team and proved the photographs ex. Ex. PW-12/P1 to Ex. PW-12/P11.
PW-13	ASI Kailash Chandra	Duty officer
PW-14	Ct. Mahender	Witness of investigation
PW-15	HC Sunil Kumar	MHC(M)
PW-16	Sh. Anil Kumar Sharma	Alternate Nodal Officer, Reliance Communication Ltd.
PW-17	SI Harish Chander Pathak	Nodal Officer and proved the certificate u/s 65B of the Indian Evidence Act as Ex. PW-17/A.
PW-18	Sh.Vikram	Brother-in-law of deceased
PW-19	Ct.Dinesh Kumar	Deposited the exhibits in FSL,Rohini.
PW-20	Ct. Umer	Recorded DD no. 44PP, copy of

		the same is proved as Ex. PW-20/A.
PW-21	Ct. Ravi	Witness of investigation
PW-22	ASI Balbir Singh	Witness of investigation
PW-23	Insp. Ajay Kumar	1 st Investigating Officer
PW-24	Insp. Pravesh Kaushik	2 nd Investigating Officer
PW-25	Insp. Sanjay Bhatt	3 rd Investigating Officer
PW-26	Sh. Kaushal Kumar @ Chikku Singh	Public witness
PW-27	HC Amit	Witness of investigation
DW-1	Sh. Vijay Kumar	Known to the accused persons being resident of same village.
DW-2	Dr. Meera Gupta, Gynecologist, Medical Centre	Examined the patient regarding the infertility.

Specimen Chart for Exhibited Documents

Exhibit No.	Description of the Exhibit	Proved by/attested by
Ex.PW-1/A	Statement of father of deceased namely Sh. Ranjit Singh recorded before the SDM.	PW-1 Sh. Ranjit Singh
Ex.PW-1/B	Statement of father of deceased namely Sh. Ranjit Singh recorded before the Police.	PW-1 Sh. Ranjit Singh
Ex.PW-1/C	Receipt of handing over the dead body to PW-1.	PW-1 Sh. Ranjit Singh
Ex.PW-1/D	Supplementary statement of PW-1	PW-1 Sh. Ranjit Singh
Ex.PW-1/E	Seizure memo of nine photographs of marriage	PW-1 Sh. Ranjit Singh

	of deceased and accused Pawan Singh.	
Ex.PW-1/F1 to F9	09 photographs of marriage of deceased and accused.	PW-1 Sh.Ranjit Singh
Ex.PW-3/A	Statement of witness Puran	PW-3 Sh. Puran
Ex.PW-4/A	Statement of witness Sh. Shyam Nandan Rai, recorded before the concerned SDM.	PW-4 Sh. Shyam Nandan Rai
Ex.PW-4/B	Identification statement of PW-4 qua the identification of dead body of deceased Chanchal.	PW-4 Sh. Shyam Nandan Rai
Ex.PW-4/DA	Statement of PW-4 recorded before the police.	PW-4 Sh. Shyam Nandan Rai
Ex.PW-6/A	Letter written to the Mortuary Incharge by PW-6	PW-6 Sh.Anil Choudhary, Tehsildar, Punjabi Bagh, Delhi.
Ex.PW-6/B	Letter of PW-6 for getting conduct the postmortem o the body of deceased from SGM hospital	PW-6 Sh. Anil Choudhary, Tehsildar, Punjabi Bagh, Delhi.
Ex.PW-8/A	Postmortem report of deceased, prepared by PW-8	PW-8 Dr. Manoj Dhingra
Ex.PW-8/B	Subsequent opinion given by PW-8.	PW-8 Dr. Manoj Dhingra
Ex.PW-10/A	Scene of crime report	PW-10 SI Ajit Singh
Ex.PW-11/A	Site Plan	PW-11 ASI Om Prakash
Ex.PW-12/P1 to P11	11 Photographs of the dead body ad articles	PW-12 HC Amit

	lying at the spot.	
Ex.PW-12/ PA1 to PA11	Negatives of abovesaid photographs	PW-12 HC Amit
Ex.PW-13/A	Copy of FIR	PW-13 ASI Kailash Chandra
Ex.PW-13/B	Endorsement on the rukka	PW-13 ASI Kailash Chandra
Ex.PW-13/C	Certificate u/s 65B of the Indian Evidence Act	PW-13 ASI Kailash Chandra
Ex.PW-14/A	Seizure memo of sealed parcel, handed over to PW-14 by the doctor alongwith viscera petty and sample seal	PW-14 Ct. Mahender
Ex.PW-15/A (colly.)	Copy of entry at srl.o. 3643 and 3665, made in register no.10 by PW-15	PW-15 HC Sunil Kumar
Ex.PW-15/B (colly.)	Copy of RC	PW-15 HC Sunil Kumar
Ex.PW-16/A	CDR pertaining to mobile number 7827234707	PW-16 Sh.Amit Kumar Sharma
Ex.PW-16/B	Certificate u/s 65B of the Indian Evidence Act	PW-16 Sh. Amit Kumar Sharma
Ex.PW-16/C	Letter regarding non availability of original CAF of mobile number 7827234707	PW-16 Sh. Amit Kumar Sharma
Mark PW-16/P1	Copy of letter mentioning regarding stopping of mobile operation business in November, 2017 by the Reliance Communication Ltd.	PW-16 Sh.Amit Kumar Sharma
Mark PW-16/P2	Copy of Aadhar Card of subscriber Raj Kumar	PW-16 Sh. Amit Kumar Sharma

Ex.PW-17/A	Certificate u/s 65B of Indian Evidence Act	PW-17 SI Harish Chander Pathak
Ex.PW-17/B	Certificate pertaining to PCR form Ex.PW-17/B	PW-17 SI Harish Chander Pathak
Ex.PW-20/A	DD no. 44PP	PW-20 Ct. Umer
Ex.PW-21/A, B & C	Arrest memo, personal search memo and disclosure statement of accused	PW-21 Ct. Ravi
Ex.PW-22/A	Seizure memo of articles i.e. One Aari blade, hammer, one broke window grill and two pieces of Saree	PW-22 ASI Balbir Singh
Ex.PW-22/B & C	Application and documents for getting conduct the postmortem examination	PW-22 ASI Balbir Singh
Ex. PW-22/D	Letter written to the CMO for getting preserve the dead body of deceased	PW-22 ASI Balbir Singh
Ex.PW-23/A	Site plan prepared at the instance of ASI Balbir	PW-23 Insp. Ajay Kumar
Ex.PW-25/A and B	Arrest memo and personal search memo of co-accused Dheeraj	PW-25 Insp.Sanjay Bhatt
Ex.PW-25/C	Arrest memo of accused Usha Devi	PW-25 Insp. Sanjay Bhatt
Ex.DW-2/A	Report of DW-2 Dr. Meera Gupta of folical study of deceased	DW-2 Dr. Meera Gupta
Ex.DW-2/B	Prescription slip of deceased	DW-2 Dr. Meera Gupta

Specimen Chart for material objects/Muddamals

Material Object No.	Description of the Exhibit	Proved by/Attested by
Ex.PW-18/A1	One grill of window	PW-18 Sh. Vikram, PW-22 ASI Balbir Singh
Ex.PW-18/A2 (colly.)	One Aaree blade and instrument of shoemaker like hammer	PW-18 Sh. Vikram, PW-22 ASI Balbir Singh
Ex.PW-18/A3 (colly.)	Two pieces of saree and one piece of saree having knot.	PW-18 Sh. Vikram, PW-22 ASI Balbir Singh

**Pronounced in the open
Court on 09.06.2026**

**(Dr. Yadvender Singh)
Additional Sessions Judge -05,
(West) Tis Hazari Courts Delhi**

(It is to certify that all 51 Pages of the judgment are duly signed.)

**(Dr. Yadvender Singh)
Additional Sessions Judge -05,
(West) Tis Hazari Courts Delhi**