

**IN THE COURT OF SUB DIVISIONAL JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE AT  
MORIGAON**

**G.R. Case No.698/11**

**Under section468of the Indian Penal Code**

**State of Assam**

Versus

**1. Md. Azizul Hoque**

S/O – Nur Mohammad

R/O Vill: Borbori P.S- Laharighat, Dist.- Morigaon, Assam

**2. Musstt. Joygun Nessa**

W/O – Nur Mohammad

R/O Vill: Borbori P.S- Laharighat, Dist.- Morigaon, Assam

.....Accused persons

**Present: Lohit Kumar Sarma, SDJM(S), Morigaon**

For the Prosecution: Ms. B. Devi, Addl.P.P.

For the Defence: Mr. M. Islam, Advocate

Evidence recorded on: 20.5.2016, 7.10.2017, 22.11.2017, 4.1.2018, 27.3.2018,  
9.5.2018, 21.7.2018, 29.8.2018, 19.6.2019 and 26.9.2019

Argument heard on:14.11.2019

Judgment delivered on: 25.11.2019

**JUDGMENT**

1. The informant Md. Abdul Kasem, lodged an ejahar through Court before Laharighat Police Station on 9.6.11 against the accused Jaygun Nessa stating inter alia that the disputed landwas under possession of the informant from Late Haji Ilahi Box Sarkar. The accused prepared a forged deed bearing number 1225/77 and has been visiting various offices with the said deed showing that to

be genuine one. On being aware of the fact, the informant on 4.6.2011 took the certified copy of the deed 1225/77 which was not in the name of accused. The photocopy of the forged deed by the accused has been annexed with the complaint. Hence the informant had filed this case.

2. The ejahar was received and registered as Laharighat Police Station case No. 93/11 Under section 420/468/471 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. Police started investigation to trace the root of the case. The Investigating Officer after due investigation of the case submitted charge sheet under section 420/468/416 of the Indian Penal Code against the accused persons Jaygun Nessa and Azizul Haque.
4. The copies of the relevant documents were furnished to the accused persons in accordance with section 207 of the Cr.P.C.
5. During trial, formal charge under section 468 of the Indian Penal Code was framed which was read over and explained to the accused persons to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.
6. The prosecution has examined as many as ten witnesses. The examination of the accused persons under section 313 Cr.P.C. was recorded. The plea of the accused persons was in total denial and they have declined to adduce evidence in their defence.
7. I have heard arguments from the learned APP and the learned defence counsel and perused the records of the case in a meticulous manner. The points of determination in the case are:
  - i) Whether the accused persons on 11/6/1977 committed forgery of a sale deed bearing No. 1225/77 in respect of a land measuring 8 bigha 2 katha 17 lessas covered by Dag No. 152 of PP No. 41 of village Duamari in the office of the Deputy Registrar, Nagaon intending that the document forged shall be used for the purpose of cheating the informant and thereby committed an offence punishable under Sec. 468 of the Indian Penal Code?

#### **DISCUSSION, DECISION AND REASONS THEREOF:**

8. PW1- Md. Kasem Ali who is the informant deposed that he had filed this case vide Ext-1 where Ext-1(1) is his signature. PW1 had filed this case for a sale

deed being forged. The accused Joygun Nessa forged the deed. In the year 1981, PW1 and two of his siblings Tarab Ali and Abdul Khalek bought 7 bighas of land through registered sale deed from Haji Ilahi Box and since then they had been in possession of the said land. In the year 1977, Joygun Nessa prepared the forged deed bearing number 1225 for the said land. In the said forged deed the said land was shown as bought from Ilahi Box by Joygun Nessa. The said forged deed was seized by the police. PW1's sale deed was submitted in the civil case bearing no. TS.80/11. PW1 prepared his deed in the year 1981 whereas the accused in 1977 but she did not register the same deed. The name of accused persons were not entered in any volume book of registrar office but PW1's name is entered there, hence, PW1 had filed this case.

9. During cross-examination PW1 stated that the police did not seize the deed 1225/1977 in front of him. As the accused prepared the deed, hence PW1 thought that the police had seized the deed from the accused only. It was not a fact that police did not seize the deed from the accused. In the year 1986, the disputed land was registered (namjari) in the name of Joygun Nessa and hence PW1 had filed a civil case on which the final order has been passed. In the civil case, PW1 submitted the certified copy of deed no. 1225/1977 in the court but Joygun Nessa did not submit any deed before the court. The disputed land was not registered (namjari) in the name of PW1. The disputed land has two dag patta where in one part PW1 has 7 bighas of land and Amjod Ali has 3 bighas of land. Dag No. 28 has 3 bighas and 7 lessas of land and dag 152 has 3 bighas, 4 kotha and 13 lessas of land. PW1 filed this case when the accused registered the land under 152 dag in their names. Son of Intaz Ali bought 6 bighas of land from the disputed land patta. He could not say how much land was there in patta No. 152. PW1's registered sale deed no. 5086/1981. Vide this deed PW1 bought lands of both the dags but the boundary was given one. It was not a fact that hence they could not identify their actual land and so dispute arose between them. The family members of the accused also possess land in the disputed dag. When PW1 in the year 2011 went to register the land in his name then he came to know that the said land was already registered in the name of Joygun Nessa and so he had filed this case. PW1 for many years did not go to register the land in his name as the 1983 deed was lost. PW1 did not try to collect the certified copy of the same as he did not know the rule of the office. PW1 found his lost

deed in the year 2010. PW1 went to settle down in Lathialbori with his bag and baggage during "1983 Asom bohiragoto andolan". Presently PW1 is 50 years old and his younger brother is about 35 years old. The disputed land was bought by PW1, his younger brother, Turab Ali and Abul Khalek vide deed no.5086/1981. It was not a fact that as his deed was forged so he could not register the land in his name and that his brother Abdul Khalek`s age in 1981 was 6 years. PW1 does not remember accurately whether he collected the deed 1225/1977 from the police station or the DC office but on the case filed in the DC office the accused submitted the deed there but not in the Munsif court. Prior to filing this case PW1 had filed another case in the police station but he does not know the status of that case. It was not a fact that the accused persons had not executed any registered sale deed but they have been in possession of the land on the strength of Chita Namjari. He did not file any document of the case filed before the DC and they submitted the disputed deed executing it by forgery and submitted before the court. PW1 is not aware if the accused also had filed any case against him.

10. PW2- Md. Abdul Kadir who deposed that the informant is his elder brother and he knew the accused. Accused Joygun Nessa by way of forgery got namjari of the land bought by them. Regarding this PW2 filed a civil case TS.80/2011 where the order was passed in favour of PW2. PW2 filed this case as Joygun Nessa committed cheating. When PW2, in the year 2010, went to register the land in their names then he came to know that the said land was already registered (namjari) in the name of accused.
11. During cross-examination PW2 stated that Kasem Ali, Turab Ali and Abdul Khalek are his siblings. PW2 has 7 siblings. Abdul Khalek is his younger brother whose present age is about 39 years. Police did not seize the deed through which PW2 bought the land. The said deed was prepared in 1981. PW2`s father bought the disputed land in the name of PW2, Kasem Ali, Turab Ali and Abdul Khalek. At the time of execution of the said deed Abdul Khalek was around 12 years old. The original pattadar of the disputed land was Ilahi Box and he had no conflict with anyone. PW2 does not remember deed 1225 belongs to whom. In the TS.80/11 case, PW2 was plaintiff. In the said civil case, PW2 is not aware if the registration (namjari) of Joygun Nessa was declared to be not forged. PW2 does not remember the sale deed number executed by them. In the disputed land Ilahi

Box has 17 bighas of land in two dags bearing no.28 and 152.PW2 claimed that he vide his sale deed bought 3 bighas of land under 28 dag and 3 bighas, 4 kothas and 7 lessas of land under 152 dag and the boundary of the lands is same and one. PW2 does not remember whether he submitted the trace map and jamabandi to the police or not. It was not a fact that Ilahi Box sold 4 bigha 2 katha 17 lessas of land to Joygun Nessa and so there was no dispute between them. It was not a fact that his sale deed was forged. PW2 went for namjari of their names after 25 years from the date of buying but cause of delay was shown. PW2 left his house due to Bohiragoto Andolon when the deed was lost and later they found the same in their trunk. PW2 does not know when he found the deed but his father knows that. It was not a fact that sale deed No. 1225/77 was not executed by Joygun Nessa but she got Chitha Namjari only. He did not submit Jamabandi copy of the land. It was not a fact that Joygun Nessa did not know anything about the deed No. 1225.

12. PW3- Md. Turab Aliwho deposed that he knows the accused and the informant. Joygun Nessa forged and registered the land of PW3 in her name. PW3 filed a civil case regarding this which is still in progress. Hence PW3 had filed this case.
13. During cross-examination PW3 stated that the informant is his younger brother. The original owner of the disputed land is Late Ilahi Box. PW3's father Kudrat Ali bought the land from Ilahi Box. PW3 is aware of this case where his name was put as a witness. PW3 is not aware if any deed in support to the purchase of the land was submitted at the time of filing this case.The disputed land's patta no. Is 41; dag nos. are 152 and 128. PW3 is not aware if the said patta was submitted in this case or not. PW3 is not aware if the said land was already registered (namjari) in the name of Joygun Nessa in the year 1986. The said land has not yet been registered in their names. PW3 in 1981 bought the said land vide register deed. The said deed was executed in the name of Kasem Ali, Turab Ali (himself) and Abdul Khalek. In the year 1981 PW3 was around 11/12 years old. It was not a fact that their sale deed was forged and so their names were not recorded in the revenue records. PW3 cannot say the quantity of land consisted under the two dags. Ilahi Box did not file any case against PW3 and Joygun Nessa regarding namjari. Names of any son of Ilahi Box wasnot given as witness in this case. PW3 could not say anything about deed 1225/1977, his elder brother knows about that.There was no registration in the name of Joygun Nessa

in the year 1986 because they inquired in the office then. In 1986 neither PW3 nor his father filed for registering the land in their names. Ilahi Box Sarkar was alive in 1986. Later said that he cannot say whether he was alive or not. PW3 could not say the boundary as shown in the deed made in 1981. PW3 does not know if the police seized any deed from anyone.

14. PW4- Md. Abdul Khaleque who deposed that he knew the accused and the informant. His father Kudrat Ali bought the land from Ilahi Box when PW4's age was 3/4 years. Since he started growing old, he saw that the said land was under his father's possession. Accused Joygun Nessa filed a civil case against the land by preparing a forged deed around 7/8 years prior to his deposition. Order was passed in the said civil case after around 6/7 years in favour of PW4. At present, PW4 had been in possession of the land. After filing the civil case, PW4 came to know that forgery was committed. After that this case was filed.
15. During cross-examination PW4 stated that he has 7 siblings. PW4 has submitted their sale deed in this case. PW4 does not know the quantity of land under the disputed dag. PW4 and his siblings have filed the civil case against Joygun Nessa. After how many months from filing the civil case; this case was filed he did not know. PW4 does not know about the civil case. The deed was executed in the name of PW4, Abul Kasem and Turab Ali. PW4 does not know if Joygun Nessa had filed a case to cancel the deed of PW4. PW4 does not know the quantity of land in his deed. Both the parties have conflicts regarding the boundary of their lands. PW4's land was under 28 and 152 dags but he did not know the quantity of land. Between the parties whose share was how much in the 28 and 152 dags he did not know. PW4 could not say regarding the possession of the land. PW4 does not know if his elder brother had submitted the deed 1225/1977 to the police. The rest are just some suggestions to which PW4 denied.
16. PW5- Md. Nurul Islam who deposed that he knows the accused and the informant. There have been some conflicts between the parties regarding land matter.
17. During cross-examination PW5 stated that he recognizes the disputed land. The said land has been under possession of Joygun Nessa for the last 25/30 years.
18. PW6- Md. Nur Mohammad who deposed that he knows the accused and the informant. He does not know anything about the incident. He did not put any

signature before the police. The signature which is there in the seizure list is not the signature of PW6 as he does not know how to write.

19. During cross-examination PW6 stated that the police did not inquire him and he did not go to school for study.
20. PW7- Md. Abu Shahid who deposed that he knew the accused and the informant. The incident took place in the year 2011. The elder son of Joygun Nessa namely Majibur Rahman came to PW7's house and told him that someone had made some conflicts in the mutation of their land. Then on reaching the Circle Office PW7 saw that case no.156 does not belong to Duamari Kisaam. The case no.156 was sought by two Hindus namely Bina Rani Das and Turulata Paul of Moirabari Kisaam. The case no.156 was mutated under Duamari Kisaam instead of Moirabari Kisaam. Later Kasem took a copy of the case no.156 from the Circle Officer in which it was mentioned that Joygun Nessa did not want case no.156. Joygun Nessa showed in 1225/1977 deed that she bought the land from Ilahi Box against Rs.99/-. However, during the case between Joygun Nessa and Abdul Kasem when the Court called the volume book of land registration from the Nagaon Registrar Office then it was clear that Joygun Nessa did not have any relation with deed 1225/1977. In fact, deed 1225/1977 was executed between Deba Kanta Kalita and Mahiram Bora. Joygun Nessa is PW7's own sister-in-law hence he knew that she never purchased any land.
21. During cross-examination PW7 stated that Amjat Ali and the father of Abul Kasem namely Kudrat Ali were known to him. Abit Siddika was the wife of PW7. PW7 had sold one bigha of land to his wife of Dag no.28. PW7 did not have any relation with Joygun Nessa in Dag no.28. PW7 has relation with Abul Kasem in Dag no.28. PW7 does not know where Abul Kasem found deed 1225/1977. PW7 has not seen the mutation case no.156 in the Court while deposing. A clash is still ongoing since 2011 regarding a portion of disputed land in dag no.152 with the accused persons Joygun Nessa and Azizul Hoque. The dag no.152 is to the west of PW7's house. Joygun Nessa's house is to the south of PW7's house. On the dag no.152, Joygun Nessa has already constructed three houses. To evict the possession PW7 had not filed any case against Joygun Nessa. 6 bighas of land was mutated in his name under dag no.28 but he does not know what portion of land Abul Kasem had in the same dag. Presently, the sons of Kudrat Ali had been possessing the land under dag no.28, as PW7 does not have any land under dag

no.28 hence he has been exchanging their land with Sons of Kudrat Ali. In the year 1971 PW7 was not even born. The deed of 1971 is under the name of Kasem Ali and Abul Hasen. Abul Hasem and Abul Kasem are about 15 years and 10/12 years older to PW7, respectively. PW7's father purchased the land and divided between siblings. PW7 had seen the deeds but the words like "sabalak/nabalak" were not mentioned there. PW7 does not know from whom the police seized the deed no.1225. Joygun Nessa's husband was not set as an accused in this case. PW7 had not contested in the civil case filed by the sons of Kudrat Ali. Both PW7 and the sons of Kudrat Ali have disputes with Joygun Nessa regarding possession of land. Earlier the dispute was regarding mutation and deeds but now the dispute is regarding possession. PW7 has not filed any case yet regarding possession. PW7 has not deposited any land documents regarding this case. The rest are just some suggestions to which he denied.

22. PW8- Md. Abul Kasem who deposed that he knew the accused as his family members and the informant as his neighbour. The disputed land was purchased by PW7, Abdul Hasen, Rofik and Abu Sahed all together. Joygun Nessa forged and mutated the said land into her name as Myadi patta and Abul Kasem also bought land in the said dag. Hence Abul Kasem filed case against Joygun Nessa.
23. During cross-examination PW8 stated that he filed a case before the Deputy Commissioner regarding house construction by Joygun Nessa in the disputed land illegally. He did not know if the civil case was filed separately due to adverse finding in the case filed in the DC office, his younger brother Abu Sahed might know. He did not know if the disputed land was mutated under Joygun Nessa in the year 1986. The said mutation was not done through sale deed but it was a Chitha mutation. The said disputed land was of Ilahi Box. If the deeds of PW8 were submitted in this case he does not know. There is a total 12 bighas of land in the said dag of PW8 and informant. The dag no. of the disputed land is 152 and in that dag if there are 8 bighas, 2 kotha 17 lessas of land then PW8 is not aware. The rest are just some suggestions to which PW8 denied.
24. PW9- Md. Abdul Monnas who deposed that he knew the accused and the informant. Ilahi Box sold his land under 152 no. dag of Duamari kisam in the year 1981 to Abdul Khalek, Abul Kasem and Turab Ali who all had been possessing the land for 30 years. Joygun Nessa in the year 2011 showed a deed and mutated the said land in her name. Abul Kasem filed a case in the Munsiff

Court against Joygun Nessa and in the said case the order was passed in favour of Abul Kasem. Abul Kasem had filed this case for cheating him by the accused persons. The police took his statements.

25. During cross-examination PW9 stated that accused Azizul Hoque was his niece. He did not remember how many years it had passed that the order was passed in favour of Abul Kasem. In dag no.152, PW9 had 3 bighas, 3 kothas and 10 lessas of land in their deed but did not know how much the informant had. His younger brother had filed a case in the DC office against the accused persons regarding construction of house in dag no.152 illegally. He did not know for how long the civil case ran. He did not know whether the police seized or not the deeds where the names of PW9 and informant were mentioned. The mutation under Joygun Nessa's name might be done in the year 1986. He did not know if the accused persons had done Chitha mutation. There is no mutation of informant and PW9 in dag no.152. The rest are just some suggestions to which he denied.
26. PW10- SI Bakul Bora who is the investigating officer deposed that on 1.8.2011 he was working as Sub-Inspector at Laharighat PS. On that day Md. Abul Kasem filed an ejahar which was received and registered by the then Officer-in-Charge under Laharighat PS Case No.93/11 u/s 420/468/471 of IPC and he was entrusted with the investigation of the case. He recorded the statement of the informant in the police station. He visited the place of occurrence, prepared the sketch map and recorded the statements of witnesses. He seized photocopies of an agreement vide Ext-3 where Ext-3(1) is his signature. He arrested Md. Azizul Hoque. On being transferred he handed over the case diary to the then OC. Later on Rebat Ch. Baruah filed charge sheet u/s 420/468/460 IPC. Ext-2 is the sketch map and Ext- 2(1) is his signature. Ext-4 is the charge sheet and Ext-4(1) is the signature of Rebat Ch. Baruah.
27. During cross-examination PW10 stated that accused Azizul Hoque is not an FIR named accused. He does not know the seizure witnesses personally. The copy of the agreement was not seized from the accused persons. He did not find that the accused used the agreement for any official purpose. The ejahar was filed after two months of the date of occurrence. The cause of delay was not mentioned in the ejahar. He seized the copy of the agreement as submitted by the informant.

The related documents of the said agreement were not seized from concerned office. It is not a fact that the investigation was perfunctory and casual.

28. **Let me produce here the provisions of Section 468 of Indian Penal Code which reads as** "Whoever commits forgery, intending that the document or electronic record forged shall be used for the purpose of cheating shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to seven years, and shall also be liable to fine."
29. Let me first analyse the basis of the prosecution story, that is, the ejahar. The incident was occurred on 11/6/1977 and the ejahar was filed on 9/6/11. The informant stated that during 1983 BOHIRAGATA ANDOLAN they had to leave their place and to settle at Lathialbor and since then the sale deed vide which they bought the said land was missing and in 2010 the same was recovered. After recovery of the document when he went to mutate his name, he came to know that the land has already been mutated in the name of Joygun Nessa. But no evidence has been adduced in proof of such contention by the informant. The explanation of the cause of delay in filing the ejahar does not seem plausible. Hence, the court must be cautious while weighing the evidences of the prosecution.
30. Regarding the offence under section 468 of the Indian Penal Code, the informant alleged that the accused prepared a forged deed bearing number 1225/77 and has been visiting various offices with the said deed showing that to be genuine one. During deposition as PW1, the informant stated that in the year 1981, PW1 and two of his siblings Tarab Ali and Abdul Khalek bought 7 bighas of land through registered sale deed from Haji Ilahi Box and since then they had been in possession of the said land. In the year 1977, Joygun Nessa prepared the forged deed bearing number 1225 for the said land. In the said forged deed the said land was shown as bought from Ilahi Box by Joygun Nessa. The name of accused persons were not entered in any volume book of registrar office but PW1's name is entered there. The informant did not produce any document vide which he had bought the disputed land and as such he could not establish the ownership over the said disputed land. Hence the allegation of the informant itself is incomplete. Let me analyse the depositions of other witnesses. PW2- Md. Abdul Kadir deposed that Joygun Nessa by way of forgery got namjari of the land bought by them. Regarding this PW2 filed a civil case TS.80/2011 where the order was

passed in favour of PW2. PW2 filed this case as Joygun Nessa committed cheating. When PW2, in the year 2010, went to register the land in their names then he came to know that the said land was already registered (namjari) in the name of accused. No document has been exhibited by the prosecution showing that the accused Joygun Nessa had mutated her name in the revenue records against the disputed land. PW3- Md. Turab Ali deposed that Joygun Nessa forged document and mutated the land of PW3 in her name. There is no reference in the deposition of the PW3 of any land owned by him. It is not clear as to which document had been forged by the accused and how. PW4- Md. Abdul Khaleque deposed that his father Kudrat Ali bought the land from Ilahi Box when PW4's age was 3/4 years. Accused Joygun Nessa filed a civil case against the land by preparing a forged deed around 7/8 years prior to his deposition. After filing the civil case, PW4 came to know that forgery was committed. PW4 also did not mention clearly as to what had been forged by the accused persons and how. PW5- Md. Nurul Islam deposed that there have been some conflicts between the parties regarding land matter. During cross-examination PW5 stated that the disputed land has been under possession of Joygun Nessa for the last 25/30 years. Thus PW5 being an independent witness deposed in favour of the accused Joygun Nessa. PW6- Md. Nur Mohammad deposed that he does not know anything about the incident. He did not put any signature before the police. The signature which is there in the seizure list is not the signature of PW6 as he does not know how to write. Thus the only seizure witness examined by the prosecution did not support the prosecution version and denied the seizure of any document vide exhibit 3. PW7 deposed that Joygun Nessa had nothing to do with the deed No. 1225/77 as because the said deed was executed in the name of two Hindu persons. He also stated that Joygun Nessa never bought any land vide the impugned sale deed. Thus PW7 did not implicate the accused persons in his deposition. PW8 Abul Kasem and PW9 Abdul Mannas stated that the accused Joygun Nessa by way of forgery prepared a sale deed and mutated her name against the disputed land which was purchased by PW8 in 1981. If we analyse the evidences adduced by the prosecution we find that there is no proper description of the land which was alleged to have been mutated in her name by Joygun Nessa. No Jamabandi copy or else has been adduced showing the mutation of the name of the accused persons against the said land. Further the

alleged forged document in original was not seized by the police. Police seized one photocopy of the alleged deed but not from the possession of the accused but as provided by the informant of this case. There is no iota of evidence showing that the accused mutated their names by using the alleged forged deed. The original document which is alleged to have been forged has not been produced before the court. The signature of the executants on the sale deed have not been sent to FSL for comparison of the signatures. There is no document showing that the informant had bought the disputed land in 1981 as alleged. No volume book of the register office where the name of the informant was mentioned against the disputed land was produced nor was any official witness examined by the prosecution. Further some of the witnesses stated that the disputed land has been in possession of the informant and some others stated that the same has been possessed by the accused and if that is the case the dispute can only be resolved by approaching a civil court. So far as the criminal offence of forgery is concerned the prosecution failed to prove which document was forged and how. Therefore, prosecution is failed to prove any of the ingredients of the offence under section 468 of the Indian Penal Code beyond reasonable doubt against the accused persons.

31. Therefore the point for determination is decided in negative and in favour of the accused persons.
32. In view of the above, it is held that the prosecution has failed to establish the charges under section 468 of the Indian Penal Code against the accused persons Joygun Nessa and Azizul Haque. Accordingly the accused persons are acquitted of the alleged offences labelled against them and they are set at liberty forthwith.
33. Bail bond furnished by the accused persons is hereby extended for a period of 6 (six) months.
34. The case is disposed of on contest.

Given under my hand and seal of this court on this the 25<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2019 at Morigaon.

**( Lohit Kumar Sarma )**

**Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate(S),**

**Morigaon**

## **APPENDIX**

### **Prosecution witnesses:**

PW1-Md. Kasem Ali (informant-cum-victim)

PW2- Md. Abdul Kadir

PW3- Md. Turab Ali

PW4- Md. Abdul Khaleque

PW5- Md. Nur Islam

PW6- Md. Nur Mohammad

PW7- Md. Abu Shahid

PW8- Md. Abul Kasem

PW9- Md. Abdul Monnas

PW10- SI Bakul Bora (I.O.)

### **Exhibits for the prosecution:**

Ext.1- Ejahar

Ext.2- Sketch Map

Ext.3- Seizure list

Ext.4- Charge Sheet

**Defence witness :Nil**

**Exhibits for defence:Nil**

Lohit Kumar  
Sarma  
SDJM(S), MORIGAON.