

State Vs. Amit Sharma etc.

1

**IN THE COURT OF AJAY KUMAR, JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE
FIRST CLASS, (Unique ID Code No.HR0347), YAMUNA
NAGAR AT JAGADHRI**

Criminal case No.31-1 of 2019

Computerized No. CHI/31945/2014

CNR No.HRYN03-000566-2013

Date of institution: 26.03.2013/06.03.2019

Date of decision: 08.04.2019

State Versus 1. Amit Sharma son of Sh. Surinder Kumar
Sharma, resident of House No.129, Mohlan
Mhadev Ward No.4, Thaneshar, District
Kurukshetra.
2. Surender Kumar Sharma son of Shiv Kumar,
resident of House No.129, Mohlan Mhadev
Ward No.4, Thaneshar, District Kurukshetra.
3. Smt. Veena Rani wife of Surinder Kumar
Sharma, resident of House No.129, Mohlan
Mhadev Ward No.4, Thaneshar, District
Kurukshetra.

.....Accused

FIR No. 69 dated 05.02.2013

Under Sections: 193, 323, 406, 420, 498A & 506 IPC

Police Station: City Yamuna Nagar.

Present: Dr. Mukesh Kumar, APP for the State assisted by Mr.
Achhar Pal, Advocate for the defacto complainant.
Accused Amit Sharma, Surender Kumar Sharma and Smt.
Veena Rani on bail represented by Mr. B.S. Walia, Advocate.

JUDGMENT:-

The above named accused namely Amit Sharma, Surender
Kumar Sharma and Smt. Veena Rani were forwarded by the Officer In

Ajay Kumar,
JMIC/Jagadhri/08.04.2019
UID No.HR0347

State Vs. Amit Sharma etc.

2

charge of Police Station City Yamuna Nagar, to face trial for offenses punishable under Sections 193, 323, 406, 420, 498A & 506 of Indian Penal Code.

2. It is the case of prosecution that on dated 05.02.2013, a complaint No.30008 dated 05.02.2013 was received in the police station by post wherein it has been alleged that on dated 11.04.2010, complainant namely Ekta daughter of late Ved Parkash Sharma got married with accused No.1 namely Amit Sharma as per Hindu rites and ceremonies at Kurukshetra and as per their capacity, her family members gave handsome dowry articles. But after some time of marriage, her husband and his family members started to torture her physically and mentally for demand of dowry and demanded a Car as dowry. The husband of the complainant went to foreign country (Italy), alone. The accused persons took the jewelery articles of the complainant in their possession and demanded for more money to send her Italy. Her brother gave Rs.1,00,000/- to the accused persons but they did not send the complainant abroad and cheated the complainant. The accused persons tortured the complainant physically and mentally and sent her to natal home. A panchayat was also convened but all in vain. Complainant gave birth to a male child namely Chankya. The accused persons again demanded Rs.9 Lakhs as dowry. On refusal, they gave severe beatings to complainant and also threatened to kill her and her family members. On the basis of these allegations, FIR was registered.

Ajay Kumar,
JMJC/Jagadhri/08.04.2019
UID No.HR0347

State Vs. Amit Sharma etc.

3

3. Investigation was pressed into action. Statements of prosecution witnesses were recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. Accused persons were arrested. On completion of investigation, challan under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was prepared and submitted before the court.

4. On finding prima-facie case against the accused persons namely Amit Sharma, Surinder Kumar Sharma and Smt. Veena Rani, they were charge-sheeted for commission of offences punishable under Sections 498A, 406, 506 & 420 IPC vide order dated 08.09.2014, to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

5. Prosecution to prove its case examined in total fourteen witnesses namely ASI Balbir Singh as PW1, HC Rishi Pal as PW2, ASI Mahender Singh as PW3, Ravinder Kumar Clerk as PW4, Karan Singh (Retired Manager, Central Co-operative Bank, Thanesar) as PW5, SI Balraj as PW6, Balbir Singh Saini as PW7, Inspector Sandeep (I.O.) as PW8, HC Chandra Prakash as PW9, Karan Kumar as PW10, Ekta (complainant) as PW11, SI Zile Singh as PW12, Dr. Usha Diddi as PW12/A (wrongly written as PW12) and Parkash Singh Lathar as PW13 and tendered the following documents:-

Ex.PW1/A	:	Seizure memo joint account
Ex.PW1/B	:	Seizure memo Photostat documents passport
Ex.PW2/A	:	Seizure memo letter dated 22.03.2013

State Vs. Amit Sharma etc.

4

Ex.PW3/A	:	Seizure memo passport
Ex.PW4/A	:	Copy of plaint in case titled as Surender Kumar Vs. Ekta Sharma etc.
Ex.PW5/A	:	Letter dated 22.03.2013 to SHO, P.S. City Yamuna Nagar
Ex.PW6/A	:	Seizure memo Photostat passport of Ekta Sharma
Ex.PW7/A	:	Seizure memo of locker No.74, Cabinet No.1, joint account and locker of Surender Sharma and Veena Rani
Ex.PW7/A	:	Complaint
Ex.PW7/C	:	Endorsement
Ex.PW7/C	:	Application to Manager, Central Co-operative Bank Ltd. Thanesar regarding information of account No.SB-7551
Ex.PW7/D	:	Seizure memo of Wedding Card & photographs
Ex.PW7/E	:	Seizure memo dowry articles
Ex.PW7/F	:	Superdari application dated 16.02.2013

State Vs. Amit Sharma etc.

5

Ex.PW7/G	:	Letter to Bank Manager, State Bank of Patiala, Thanesar dated 18.02.2013
Ex.PW7/H	:	Copy of letter to Branch Manager State Bank of Patiala, Thanesar
Ex.PW7/I	:	Copy of application dated 31.07.2012
Ex.PW7/J	:	Seizure memo Photostat marriage certificate
Ex.PW7/X	:	Copy of passport of Ekta Sharma
Ex.PW7/Y	:	Copy of personal particulars form
Ex.PW7/YA	:	Copy of affidavit of Amit Sharma
Ex.PW10/A	:	Copy of statement of Karan Kumar
Ex.PW11/A	:	Complaint
Ex.PW12/A	:	Application dated 20.02.2013
Ex.PW13/A	:	Photographs
Mark-A	:	Copy of voter card
Mark-B	:	Copy of passport of Amit Sharma
Mark-C	:	Copy of matriculation certificate of Amit Sharma
Mark-A & B	:	Copy of newspapers
Mark-C	:	Copy of affidavit in name of Surender Kumar

State Vs. Amit Sharma etc.

6

Mark-D	:	Copy of passport of Ekta Sharma
Mark-E	:	Copy of passport of Ved Parkash Sharma
Mark-X	:	Copy of plaint in case titled as Surender Kumar Vs. Ekta Sharma etc.
Mark-Y	:	Application to SHO, Rampura Yamuna Nagar dated 25.07.2012
Ex.P1	:	Copy of affidavit of Amit Sharma dated 06.02.2013
Ex.P2	:	Copy of passport form
Ex.P4	:	Copy of police verification report
Ex.P5	:	Report dated 20.03.2013
Ex.P6	:	Personal particulars form

Thereafter, Mr. Bhagwant Singh, learned APP for the State has closed the prosecution evidence vide separately recorded statement dated 20.07.2018.

6. Afterwards, statements of accused under Section 313 Cr.P.C. were recorded, wherein all the accused denied the incriminating evidence available against them and asserted false implication. In their defence, accused have tendered the following documents:-

Ex.DA	:	Copy of statement of Smt. Usha Didi dated 10.03.2013
-------	---	--

State Vs. Amit Sharma etc.

7

Ex.DB(Mark DB) : Bill book dated 11.04.2010

Ex.D1 : Copy of joint account statement of
Ekta Sharma and Amit Sharma

Thereafter, defence evidence was closed by accused persons vide jointly recorded statement on dated 08.04.2019.

7. I have heard Dr. Mukesh Kumar, learned APP for the State duly assisted by Mr. Achhar Pal Sharma, Advocate for defacto complainant and learned Advocate Mr. B.S. Walia for accused persons at length.

8. At the cost of repetition, accused persons have been charge-sheeted vide order dated 08.09.2014 for commission of offences punishable under Sections 498-A, 406, 420 & 506 of Indian Penal Code.

9. For better judicial appreciation, this court would cite the arguments raised on either side under the different heads of discussion.

10. **As far as, commission of offence punishable under Section 420 of Indian Penal Code is concerned**, vide charge-sheet dated 08.09.2014, accused Amit Sharma has been indicted for commission of offence punishable under Section 420 of Indian Penal Code with the allegations that he dishonestly induced complainant to part with an amount of Rs.5 Lakhs under the pretext that he would take her to Italy. It has been further the allegation that accused Amit Sharma did not keep his promise and in that manner, cheating was committed. Mr. Achhar Pal Sharma, learned Advocate for complainant would argue that not only by

the evidence of defacto complainant, Ekta Sharma PW11 but also by the evidence of PW12 Dr. Usha Didi, whose bank account was debited, while making payment of Rs.5 Lakhs, it becomes crystal clear that Rs.5 Lakhs were misappropriated by accused Amit Sharma and that amount was taken by him under the pretext that complainant would be sent to Italy but admittedly that promise was never kept and in that manner cheating was committed.

11. Mr. B.S. Walia would argue that **firstly** PW12 namely Dr. Usha Didi whose account allegedly debited with, while making payment of Rs.5 lakhs, has admitted during her cross-examination that copy of pass-book of her bank account was not placed/produced on file. While relying upon this deposition, Mr. Walia would argue that when the account and its statement, which allegedly debited with, have not been placed before this court, entire story of making payment of Rs.5 Lakhs is without any substance. He would further argue that, **secondly**, at the instance of accused, document Ex.D1 i.e. account statement of bank account standing in the name of accused Amit Sharma and complainant Ekta Sharma jointly have been placed on record and perusal of this document, would reveal that on dated 26.12.2011, defacto complainant Ekta had encashed the cheque of Rs.4,90,000/-. That means, it can not be said that amount was utilized by accused Amit Sharma, specifically when even as per the statement of account, defacto complainant Ekta had encashed the cheque amount. With these submissions, it has been argued

State Vs. Amit Sharma etc.

9

at the instance of accused that when the very delivery of Rs.5 Lakhs to accused Amit Sharma by defacto complainant has not been established, then, no question of commission of cheating arises.

12. In the humble opinion of this court, for proving commission of offence of cheating , prosecution was bound to prove that complainant was dishonestly induced by the accused persons and under that impression, she parted with Rs.5 Lakhs. In the present case, no evidence has been led by the prosecution that at the time when alleged promise of taking complainant to Italy was made at the instance of accused persons, they were not having intention to fulfill that promise. Therefore, even if, accused persons were not able to keep their promise that does not mean, offence of cheating has been committed. In the humble opinion of this court, merely because promise was not fulfilled or intention of accused persons turned dishonest subsequently, that will not be suffice to saddle the accused persons with the charge of Section 420 of Indian Penal Code.

13. Even otherwise, PW12 Dr. Usha Didi whose account had been allegedly debited with, has categorically deposed during her cross-examination that copy of pass-book of her bank account has not been placed on record, which can demonstrate that amount of Rs.4,90,000/- was actually paid from her bank account. Therefore, the very basis of story of prosecution has not been established. Further more, the perusal of document Ex.D1 i.e. bank statement of account number standing jointly in the name of accused Amit Sharma and defacto complainant Ekta would

reveal that amount of Rs.4,90,000/- on dated 26.12.2011 was obtained by defacto complainant Ekta. There is no categoric evidence led from the side of prosecution, which can prove that amount of Rs.4,90,000/- was later on handed over to accused persons by defacto complainant. Although, PW11 Ekta Sharma (defacto complainant) has deposed before the court that amount was later on took by accused persons but besides this bald statement, there is nothing on the file which can support the story of prosecution. Hence, the very delivery of amount of Rs.5 Lakhs has not been proved on file at the instance of prosecution. In totality, neither dishonest inducement (and dishonest intention at the very inception) on the part of accused persons nor delivery of any amount, have been established, therefore, by no stretch of imagination, it can be said that offence punishable under Section 420 of Indian Penal Code has been committed by the accused persons.

14. **As far as, commission of offence punishable under Section 406 of Indian Penal Code is concerned**, Mr. Achhar Pal Sharma would argue that accused persons had misappropriated the dowry articles as well as Istridhan. He would further argue that in the complaint Ex.PW7/A, it has been graphically set out by the defacto complainant, in what manner entrustment of dowry articles was made in favour of accused persons. He would further argue that by misappropriating the dowry articles as well as Istridhan, commission of offence punishable under Section 406 of Indian Penal Code has been clearly made out against

accused persons. He would further argue that the jewelery articles of complainant still have not been returned by the accused persons.

15. Mr. B.S. Walia, Advocate would argue that all the allegations regarding the commission of offence punishable under Section 406 of Indian Penal Code are without any substance. He would further argue that to prove the commission of offence punishable under Section 406 of Indian Penal Code, prosecution was bound **firstly**, to prove the ingredient of entrustment and **secondly**, prosecution was bound to prove that demand of return was made by defacto complainant and despite that demand, accused persons had misappropriated the dowry articles or Istridhan belonging to defacto complainant. Mr. Walia would further argue that present FIR was registered on dated 05.02.2013 whereas on dated 06.08.2012, a civil suit was already filed by accused Surender Kumar against defacto complainant as well as accused Amit Sharma, whereby, relief of Mandatory Injunction was sought, in which, not only, accused Amit Sharma and defacto complainant Ekta Sharma were asked to vacate the house owned by accused Surender Kumar, but also, defacto complainant was asked to remove her all belongings. Mr. Walia would argue that when accused Surender Kumar was before registration of FIR had asked the defacto complainant to remove her articles, no question arises that any denial was made by accused in pursuance of the demand of return of dowry articles/Istridhan raised by complainant. He would further argue while drawing the attention of this court towards deposition made

by PW8 Inspector Sandeep that this witness has deposed during his cross-examination that no recovery was effected from the house of accused persons and the recovery of articles which was made that was of those articles which were produced in the court itself, by the accused persons and their Advocate. Mr. Walia would further argue that this witness has admitted that no bills of ownership of those articles had been produced on behalf of defacto complainant to police. Mr. Walia would further argue that even the factum of entrustment as provided in the complaint, was not proved by way of the deposition made by PW11 Ekta Sharma. Ultimately, he would make prayer that no commission of offence punishable under Section 406 of Indian Penal Code has been made.

16. In the humble opinion of this court, for commission of offence punishable under Section 406 of Indian Penal Code, there are some requirements viz, **firstly**, there should be entrustment and **secondly**, accused persons should misappropriate the entrusted articles despite the demand raised by victim/complainant that articles should be returned to her. In the present case, **firstly**, it has been admitted by PW8 inspector Sandeep that no ownership bills of articles allegedly claimed by defacto complainant to be her, have been produced before the police. In absentia of such bills, the character of allegedly recovered articles to be dowry articles/Istridhan, can not be ascertained. Even otherwise, it has been admitted by PW8 that articles were produced by the accused and their Advocate in the court itself. Further, it has been admitted by this

witness that besides that seizure, no other articles were recovered. Further more, it has not been denied at the instance of defacto complainant that a civil suit was filed on dated 06.08.2012 in Civil Court, Kurukshetra, wherein accused Surender Kumar has asked the defacto complainant to remove her Istridhan articles. In totality of circumstances, it can not be gainsaid that most important ingredient of Section 406 of Indian Penal Code i.e. demand on behalf of complainant/owner and consequent misappropriation on behalf of accused persons (whom articles were entrusted) is missing in present case. Further more, although, in the original complaint Ex.PW7/A, entrustment of articles to different accused persons has been set out but this part of entrustment was not proved by prosecution when PW11 Ekta Sharma stepped into witness box. Therefore, even the part of entrustment has not been established on record. Regarding ownership of seized articles, explanation has been given by Mr. Achhar Pal Sharma, Advocate that original bills were given to accused persons only, so that, in future, same can be utilized, for proper maintenance of dowry articles. In the humble opinion of this court, even if, this explanation is taken to be true, even then, it can not be said that offence punishable under Section 406 of Indian Penal Code has been proved against accused persons, as neither entrustment nor denial on behalf of accused persons in returning of dowry articles has been made on behalf of accused persons.

17. **As far as, commission of offence punishable under**

Section 498-A of Indian Penal Code is concerned, there are allegations against accused persons that they had maltreated defacto complainant because she did not fulfill their demand of dowry. It has been further alleged as well as argued on behalf of prosecution that an amount of Rs.5 Lakhs was given to accused persons through cheque and Rs.1,00,000/- on their asking given in cash. It is also the case of prosecution that even at the time when marriage ceremonies were carried out, complainant and her family members, spent huge amount, only on the asking of accused persons. On behalf of accused persons, Mr. B.S. Walia would argue that **firstly**, delivery of Rs.1,00,000/- has not been proved on record. **Secondly**, even if, it is presumed that Rs.5 Lakhs and Rs.1,00,000/- allegedly given in cash, were given to accused persons for the purpose of sending defacto complainant to Italy with accused Amit Sharma, same by no stretch of imagination can be treated as dowry demand. Mr. Walia would further argue that there is no evidence on the file regarding the fact that defacto complainant was given beatings during the course of raising demand of more dowry. He would further argue that it is also not the case of prosecution that accused persons have driven the complainant in a situation, where she was thinking to commit suicide. Ultimately, he would argue that even the commission of offence punishable under Section 498-A of Indian Penal Code has not been established.

18. The perusal of the judicial file would reveal that allegations

of dowry have been made in the form of two instances. **Firstly**, it has been deposed by PW11 Ekta Sharma that in the month of July, 2010, Rs.1,00,000/- were given on the asking of accused persons by the family members of complainant. It has been further deposed by PW11 Ekta Sharma that at the time of making payment of Rs.1,00,000/- in the month of July, 2010, complainant and her brother Jitender, accused Amit Sharma and his parents were present. It has been further deposed that payment was made in the house of accused Amit Sharma. It is further deposed that no written proof regarding the payment of Rs.1,00,000/- has been placed because cash amount was given to accused persons. Regarding the same amount, PW12 Dr. Usha Didi has deposed that amount of Rs.1,00,000/- was given to accused person in her presence and that amount was given by PW12 Dr. Usha Didi and her brother. PW12 Dr. Usha Didi admitted during her cross-examination that regarding demand of Rs.1,00,000/- and consequent payment, there is no mentioning in her statement recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. Besides above mentioned testimonies, there is nothing on record, which can prove the delivery of amount of Rs.1,00,000/- to accused persons by family members of defacto complainant. Therefore, this court has to determine the delivery of Rs.1,00,000/- to accused persons, on the basis of depositions made by PW11 Ekta Sharma and PW12 Dr. Usha Didi. First of all, PW11 Ekta Sharma did not mention, at all, that Rs.1,00,000/- were given in the presence of PW12 Dr. Usha Didi. This contradiction between the

testimonies of PW11 Ekta Sharma and PW12 Dr. Usha Didi is bound to visit the root of the matter, specifically when, it has been admitted by PW11 Ekta Sharma that she was having no documentary proof regarding the payment of Rs.1,00,000/- to accused persons. **Secondly**, it is the case of PW11 Ekta Sharma and PW12 Dr. Usha Didi that amount of Rs.1,00,000/- was given in the presence of their brother, but very interestingly, brother of complainant was not examined. Although, Mr. Achhar Pal Sharma, Advocate would argue that brother could not be examined, as he was having oral cancer. In the humble opinion of this court, in absentia of any medical proof to sustain that plea, explanation advanced from the side of Mr. Sharma, would not be enough to condone the non examination of brother of defacto complainant, in whose presence allegedly amount of Rs.1,00,000/- was given. **Thirdly**, prosecution could very well place on record the proof of source of Rs.1,00,000/- that means from where, it was given to accused persons but interestingly, even no such efforts were made. **Fourthly**, PW12 Dr. Usha Didi has admitted during her cross-examination that amount of Rs.1,00,000/- was given, for initiating the process, to send defacto complainant in Italy with accused Amit Sharma. In the humble opinion of this court, even if, for a moment, it is presumed that such delivery was made even then delivery made for the purpose of arranging the migration of defacto complainant in Italy, by no stretch of imagination can be treated as a dowry demand. Because, same was for the benefit of complainant only.

19. As far as, other demand of Rs.5 Lakhs and consequent delivery of it to accused persons, is concerned, **firstly**, as discussed above, delivery of Rs.5 Lakhs has not been established on file, on behalf of complainant in favour of accused persons. **Secondly**, even if, it is presumed that such delivery was made, admittedly, same was for the purpose of sending complainant to Italy, that by no stretch of imagination can be treated as a dowry demand.

20. While sailing through the deposition made by PW12 Dr. Usha Didi it is revealed that in her examination-in-chief, she has deposed that accused person gave beatings to complainant in her presence. In the humble opinion of this court, this deposition is not liable to be accepted on two grounds, **firstly**, there is no medical proof to sustain this plea. **Secondly**, there is no support regarding this deposition of PW12 Dr. Usha Didi from the side of PW11 Ekta Sharma i.e. defacto complainant. Therefore, even this allegation of commission of offence punishable under Section 498-A of Indian Penal Code is not worthy to be believed upon. Besides above mentioned allegations, there is one another allegation which have been levelled from the side of prosecution, to sustain the plea of cruelty i.e. complainant and her family members were exhorted to arrange a grand marriage function beyond their financial capacity. As far as, this allegation is concerned, PW11 Ekta Sharma has deposed during her examination-in-chief that on dated 11.04.2010, no demand of dowry **on face** was made. This witness further deposed that regarding the

payment for organizing marriage function in hotel, she was having no proof. PW12 Dr. Usha Didi would also depose during her cross-examination that the expenditure which came while arranging the ring ceremony in a Hotel in Kurukshetra was borne by complainant and her family members. But very interestingly, as per document Mark-DB, entire payment was made by accused persons. Although, explanation was given that payment was actually made by complainant and her family members but same was handed over to accused persons for delivering it to Hotel staff. In the humble opinion of this court, mere oral explanation can not belittle the value of document Mark-DB, which clearly transpires that payment was made by the accused persons. So even, this allegation of alleged cruelty while raising dowry demands have not been established on behalf of prosecution.

21. In totality of the circumstances, by no stretch of imagination, it can be concluded that offence punishable under Section 498-A of Indian Penal Code has been committed by accused persons.

22. As far as, commission of offence punishable under Section 506 of Indian Penal Code is concerned, firstly, the minute examination of the deposition made by PW11 Ekta Sharam would reveal that there is no smack of allegations, regarding the fact that she was threatened or criminal intimidated by the accused persons. **Secondly**, there is nothing in the testimony of PW11 Ekta Sharma which can demonstrate that even if, any such threat was raised on behalf of accused

persons, same caused any alarm in her mind. In absentia of such evidence, it can not be said that prosecution is able to prove the commission of offence punishable under Section 506 of Indian Penal Code.

23. In this view of matter, it is trite to say that prosecution miserably failed to prove the commission of any offence by way of which accused persons have been charge-sheeted. Before parting, this court would like to again refer the deposition made by PW11 Ekta Sharma, wherein this witness has deposed that accused persons have committed the offence punishable under Section 420 of Indian Penal Code by two acts namely **firstly**, they tried to get prepared the Ration Card by excluding the name of complainant and **secondly**, accused Amit Sharma forwarded an affidavit to the passport authorities, with the averments that he did not ever visit a foreign country. It has been further deposed that such affidavit was submitted by accused Amit Sharma, only because he wanted to flee away from the proceedings of this court. It has been further deposed that by these two acts, commission of offence punishable under Section 420 of Indian Penal Code can be determined. In the humble opinion of this court, in both the two acts, there is no dishonest inducement which was made towards complainant. There is nothing in the allegations that she was parted with some property or she did or omit to do something because of that act. Therefore, beyond any cavil, no cheating was committed vide these two acts by accused Amit Sharma. Even if, any false assertion was made by accused Amit Sharma in the

State Vs. Amit Sharma etc.

20

affidavit which was submitted to passport authorities, even then, the locus-standi to initiate proceedings against accused Amit was lying with those passport authorities. Here, this court would make a reference to the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court titled as **Mohd. Ibrahim & other Vs. State of Bihar and another, (2009) 8 SCC 751.**

24. In the end, prosecution is not able to prove its case against the accused persons, **therefore, accused persons namely Amit Sharma, Surender Kumar Sharma and Smt. Veena Rani are hereby acquitted.** Their bail bonds alongwith surety bonds would remain in force for next six months for proper compliance of Section 437-A Cr.P.C. Case property if any be disposed off as per rules. File be consigned to record room after due compliance.

Pronounced in open Court:
08.04.2019

(Ajay Kumar)
Judicial Magistrate 1st Class,
Yamuna Nagar at Jagadhri.
(UID No. HR-0347),

Note. This judgment contains 20 pages and each page has been signed by me.

(Ajay Kumar)
Judicial Magistrate Ist Class,
Yamuna Nagar at Jagadhri.
(UID No. HR-0347),

Typed by : Raj Kumar, J.W.

State Vs. Amit Sharma etc.

21

Present: Dr. Mukesh Kumar, APP for the State assisted by Mr. Achhar Pal, Advocate for the defacto complainant.
Accused Amit Sharma, Surender Kumar Sharma and Smt. Veena Rani on bail represented by Mr. B.S. Walia, Advocate.

No defence evidence led. By way of jointly recorded statement of accused persons, defence evidence was closed. Final arguments heard. Vide separate detailed judgment of even date, accused persons namely Amit Sharma, Surender Kumar Sharma and Smt. Veena Rani have been acquitted. Their bail bonds alongwith surety bonds would remain in force for next six months for proper compliance of Section 437-A Cr.P.C. Case property if any be disposed off as per rules. File be consigned to record room after due compliance.

Pronounced in open Court:	(Ajay Kumar)
08.04.2019	Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Yamuna Nagar at Jagadhri. (UID No. HR-0347),

Typed by
Raj Kumar,
J.W.