

INTHE COURT OF THE DISTRICT & SPECIAL JUDGE, KOPPAL
AT KOPPAL.

PRESENT: - Sri. **BASAVARAJ.S.SAPPANNAVAR**
B.A., LL.M.,
District & Special Judge, Koppal.

Dated this 30th day of January 2015

POCSO (S.C) No.5/2014

State of Karnataka through
Yelburga P.S

[Represented by Public Prosecutor]

Vs.

ACCUSED:

Sharanappa s/o. Maruteppa Bajantri, age
19 years, Korawar, Occ: Tam-Tam driver,
r/o. Linganabandi. Tq:Yelburga. Dist:
Koppal.

*(Represented by Shri. **U.A. Malekoppa. Adv.,**)*

1	Date of offence.	: 03.01.2014
2	Date of report of offence.	: 07.01.2014
3	Date of arrest of accused	: 03.01.2014
4	Date of release on bail	: 24.03.2014
5	Date of filing charge sheet	: 26.03.2014
6	Name of the complainant	: Ningappa @ Mise Ningappa s/o. Mallappa Hadapad, age:45 years r/o. Lingana bandi Tq:Yelburga Dist: Koppal.

7	Date of recording evidence	:	25.08.2014
8	Date of closing evidence	:	28.10.2014
9	Offences complained of	:	366-A, 376 of IPC and under section 4 of POCSO, Act 2012
10	Opinion of the Judge.	:	Accused found guilty.

:: JUDGMENT ::

This is a charge-sheet submitted by the C.P.I., Yelburga against the accused for the offences punishable under sections 366-A, 376 IPC and under section 4 of POCSO Act, 2012.

2. The allegations adumbrated in the complaint can be alluded thus;

That the complainant is having three daughters and two sons and that his elder daughter aged 16 years is the victim, who was studying in 10th standard at Hire-Aralhalli Higher Primary School and that she used to go to the school in a private vehicle and that the accused being the driver of Tam-Tam vehicle bearing No.KA-37/A-3471 used to pick up the victim to the school and since the accused used to behave with the victim with close intimacy, the complainant had warned the accused

and that on 3.1.2014 at 9.a.m., as usual the victim was proceeding in the Tam-Tam vehicle of the accused to go to school and that she did not turn up to the house in the evening and that on the search made by the complainant, PW-4 and another informed the complainant that at about 2-00 p.m., the accused eloped the victim in his Tam-Tam vehicle bearing No.KA-37/A-3471, which made the complainant to lodge the complaint and that a case came to be registered for the offence punishable under section 366-A of IPC by PW-22, who was the P.S.I. of Yelburga Police Station and he has done the part of investigation of the case and PW-19, who was the PSI of Traffic Police Station, also did the part of investigation and thereafter PW-20, who was the C.P.I., of Yelburga Circle, took up the case file for further investigation and after having completed the investigation, he submitted the charge-sheet against the accused for the offences stated supra.

3. The accused faced the trial through his counsel and the copies were furnished and after hearing, my learned Predecessor has framed the charge for the offences punishable under

sections 363, 366, 376 of IPC and under section 4 of POCSO Act, 2012 wherein the accused pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried and thereafter the prosecution has got examined PWs.1 to 22 and has got marked Ex.P-1 to Ex.P-24 and also has got marked M.Os 1 to 7 and closed its side and the defence has got marked Ex.D-1 and thereafter, my learned predecessor has recorded the statement under Sec.313 of Cr.P.C wherein the accused denied the evidence appearing against him and he did not choose to lead evidence on his behalf.

4. The points for my consideration are;

- 1) Does the prosecution prove to the hilt that as on the date of commission of the alleged offences, the victim was minor?
- 2) Does it further prove to the hilt that on 3.1.2014 at 2-00 p.m., the accused kidnapped the victim in his Tam-Tam vehicle bearing No. KA-37/A-3471 from her lawful guardian-ship knowing it to be likely that she may be seduced to illicit intercourse as alleged?
- 3) Does it further prove to the hilt that on the above said date, time and place, after having kidnapped

the victim the accused has committed rape upon her, who was then minor, as alleged?

4) Does it further prove to the hilt that on the above said date, time and place, after having kidnapped the victim the accused committed penetrative sexual assault with the victim, who was then minor?

5) What order?

5. My answer to the above points is;

Point Nos.1 to 4 :- In the affirmative,

Point No.5: As per final order, for the following;

REASONS

6. **POINT No.1:-** I have a frugal vision on the oral and documentary evidence available on record. Having peeped into the case of the prosecution, I need to have a look as to the age of the victim at the time of the alleged incident first in point of time. PW-12, who was working as a Teacher in Government Lower Primary School during the year 1998-2007, has stated in his evidence that he has received an application for admission of the victim, which was filed by her parents and it is marked as Ex.P-2

and it spells out the fact that the same was submitted by the parents of the victim on 16.6.2004 while admitting the victim to the school and her date of birth was entered therein as she was born on 1.6.1997. PW-13, who was working as Assistant Teacher in the said school during the year from 2010 to 2014, speaks that at the request made by the C.P.I., he has issued the Birth Certificate of victim, which is marked as Ex.P-13 and it beckons the fact that the victim was born on 1.6.1997. PW-11, who was the Dentist of Community Health Centre, has stated in his evidence that on 22.1.2014 the Inspector of Yelburga with a woman Police Constable produced the victim before him for asserting her age and on her examination, the Doctor found 28 teeth in her mouth and there was exposure of third molar tooth. PW-11 has stated in the cross-examination that since birth there will be a root for development of third molar tooth and by developing it would expose up to 18 years and after 17 years, it starts visible. Hence, the evidence of PW-11 is specific that after completion of 17 years, the third molar tooth starts exposing and this is what PW-11 has not found the same in the victim, which will suffice to hold that at that time the victim had not completed

even the age of 17 years. Hence, Ex.P-2 and Ex.P-13 are well supported by the evidence of PW-11 and absolutely, nothing finds on record to refute the same. The learned counsel for the accused has relied upon the following decisions;

- 1) **2011 (1) Acquittal 67 (Chhatt.)** CHHATTISGARH HIGH COURT In the case of Bahorik @ Sant Ram vs. State of M.P.) Now State of Chattisgarh).
- 2) **2013 Cr.R. 481 (Kant.)** KARNATAKA HIGH COURT in the case of State by Hosakote Police vs. Ravi. N.
- 3) **(2010) 1 Supreme Court Cases (Cri) 1445** in the case of MUSSAUDDIN AHMED Vs. STATE OF ASSAM.
- 4) **2010 (1) KCCR 1 SUPREME COURT** in the case of Sunil vs. State of Haryana.
- 5) **2011 (2) KCCR SN 96 (SC)** SUPREME COURT OF INDIA in the case of Alamelu and Another vs. State, Represented by Inspector of Police.
- 6) **2013 Cr.R. 28 (Kant.)** KARNATAKA HIGH COURT in the case of State by Shidlaghatta Rural Police vs. Vijaya Kumar and others.

I have gone through the said decisions. The facts and the principles laid down therein are not applicable to the facts of the case on hand. Ex.P-21 is the affidavit filed by the victim showing the intention of the victim in order to get herself examined before

the Magistrate under section 164 Cr.P.C. Ex.P-5 is the statement of the victim recorded under section 164 Cr.P.C, by PW-21, who was the Judicial Magistrate First Class. In both the records, the age of the victim is shown as 19 years and basing on this, the defence has much accentuated that she was not minor. However, these documents indicate that the age as shown in Ex.P-5 Ex.P-21 was spoken by the victim without there being any supportive material. Hence, I do not give even a teeny-weeny importance of what the victim has deposed about her age in her statement recorded under section 164 Cr.P.C. It is very much pivotal to state that the exact age of the victim rightly finds the place in Ex.P-2 and Ex.P-13, which is coupled with the evidence of PW-11 and it is very arduous to accept the denial of the age of the victim made by the defence for the reason that the denial of the age of the victim made by the defence does not have any brace at all particularly when no contrary evidence is placed by the defence to refute the genuineness of Ex.P-2 and Ex.P-13 and the trustworthiness of the evidence of PW-11. Hence, in view of my findings given supra, I arrive at an irresistible conclusion that there is clinching evidence to hold that at the time of alleged

incident the victim was minor. Hence, I answer point No.1 in the affirmative.

7. POINT Nos.2 to 4:- It has come in the evidence of PW-1, who is the complainant, that his daughter viz., victim was studying in S.S.L.C in Hire-Aralahalli Village and she used to go to school every day in the Tam-Tam being driven by the accused and the accused used to tease her for which, he had warned the accused and on 3.1.2014, she did not turn up to the house and on enquiry, he came to know that she was eloped by the accused and he lodged the complaint. PW-2 speaks regarding Ex.P-3 i.e., the spot panchanama and also Ex.P-4 i.e., the seizure panchanama of the vehicle in question. PW-3, who is the victim, speaks that she was studying in SSLC at Higher Primary School at Hire-Aralihalli Village and she used to go to the school in the Autorickshaw being driven by the accused and on 3.1.2014 at about 8-30.a.m., when she was proceeding to school, the accused with force insisted her to get into his vehicle and inspite of the resistance made by the victim, the accused slapped on her cheek and took her in his vehicle and he took her to Hire-

Aralhalli and PW-4 advised the accused as not to take her for which, the accused did not heed to his words and he took her to Bangalore at Uttarahalli and kept her in the house of PW-14 for a week and during the said period, the accused had sexual intercourse with her. Further the way in which she has given the evidence spells out the fact that there was a penetrative sexual assault by the accused upon her, who was then minor. It has further come in her evidence that after one week the accused took her to Navalgund Village and the accused and his maternal uncle viz., Ravi took her to one Shri. Badiger, who is an advocate and she was tutored to give the statement before the Magistrate that she herself had taken the accused and accordingly, she deposed before the Magistrate.

8. PW-4 speaks that he found the accused eloping the victim. PW-5 and 17, who are the pancha witnesses for Ex.P-6 i.e., the panchanama drawn at Uttarahalli of Bangalore, have not supported the case of the prosecution. PW-6, in whose house the accused had kept the victim, has not supported the prosecution case. PW-8, PW-9 and PW-18, in whose houses the accused had

stayed along with the victim, have not supported the prosecution case. PW-14 and PW-15, who are the pancha witnesses for Ex.P-15 i.e., the panchanama drawn at the place shown by the victim, have not supported the prosecution case. Hence, the prosecution has treated PW-5, PW-6, PW-8, PW-9, PW-14, PW-15, PW-17 & PW-18 as hostile. PW-10, who was the Medical Officer, speaks regarding the examination of the victim and her evidence indicates that there was a rupture of hymen and the victim used to sexual intercourse in between the 7th day before being examined and one month. PW-16 speaks about the filing of the complaint by PW-1. PW-22, who was the PSI of Yelburga Police Station, speaks regarding the registration of the case and the part of investigation of the case. So also, PW-19, who was the PSI of Traffic Police Station, speaks regarding the part of investigation and PW-20, who was the C.P.I, speaks regarding the further investigation and filing of the charge-sheet.

9. It has come in the evidence of PW-21 that on 18.1.2014 the victim appeared before him with a request to record her statement and he asked her to come later and on 20.1.2014 the

victim appeared before him and he recorded her statement under section 164 Cr.P.C as per Ex.P-5. Ex.P-5 beckons the fact that she fell in love with the accused and since her parents had made the arrangements to get her married with somebody else, she forcibly took the accused and eloped with him and stayed in Uttarahalli at Bangalore for a week and the accused got her married in Maruti temple in Uttarahalli Village in the presence of his friends and her marriage with the accused is a love marriage and she has decided to reside along with him and on being learnt about the registration of the case against the accused, she came to the Court to give her statement. PW-21, has made very clear in his evidence that he has not obtained any certificate regarding the age of the victim and he has also not informed her to come with her parents and he came to know that the victim was in the house of the relatives of the accused from 18th to 20th i.e., before her statement as per Ex.P-5 being recorded.

10. The learned counsel for the accused has made a suggestion to the victim during the course of cross-examination that she has voluntarily stated before PW-21 as per Ex.P-5, which establishes

the fact that what she has given the statement before PW-21 is not denied by the defence. As I have earlier stated, her statement given before PW-21 spells out to the extent that she had gone along with the accused and the accused had got her married and they had stayed together under the same roof. Since the same is not disputed by the defence, I accentuate that kidnapping of the victim, who was then minor, from her lawful guardianship and seducing her to illicit intercourse is prima-facia proved as in view of my findings given on point No.1, I have already come to the conclusion that at the time of alleged incident the victim was a minor. On having peaked into the entire portion of the cross-examination of the victim made by the counsel for the accused, it beckons the fact that the victim had an ample opportunity of raising the hue and cry as she was openly taken by the accused and she had an occasion to wander from one place to another place in the public place and in the public transportation with the accused and she was at free will to make a complaint against the accused, if she had intended to do so and she could have openly come out against the accused if she had been really eloped by the accused against her will and

still she did keep mum and she did maintain a very good silence. As could be seen from the definition of child as given under Sec.2 of the POCSO Act, the child means any person below the age of 18 years. This apart, in view of the amendment brought to Sec.375 of IPC, the minor means the person is under the age of 18 years.

11. In view of the unequivocal evidence as discussed while giving my findings on point No.1, the victim at the time of the alleged incident was a minor. Hence, even if take it as granted for the sake of discussion that the victim had eloped with the accused voluntarily and the accused had an intercourse with her consent, still it amounts to penetrative sexual assault as the victim was then minor. The learned counsel for the accused has made his efforts to nit-pick in the case of the prosecution in not examining the friends of the victim, who used to be accompanied by the victim at the time of proceeding to the school. He has also tried to accentuate that there are some contradictions in the evidence of PW-4 as to how he had an occasion to see the victim with the accused. Further he tried to draw the attention of the

Court regarding the correction made in Ex.P-10 i.e., the Medical Certificate pertaining to the victim. Further he tried to draw my attention to the contradictions in the evidence of victim. However, in all prospective the evidence on record places a clear picture to hold that the victim was subjected to sexual intercourse amounting to penetrative sexual assault as defined under the provisions of POCSO Act and the evidence of PW-10 gestures the fact that the hymen of the victim was ruptured and it was a recent one and the wound was healed and from 7th day within one month at the time of her examination she was subjected to sexual intercourse. Further Ex.P-20, which is the medical certificate pertaining to the accused, speaks that the accused is capable of performing the sexual intercourse. Further the evidence of victim is just like a mirror to hold that she had gone along with the accused and she had stayed along with him during which, she had a physical contact with the accused, who used to have the sexual intercourse with her and in my opinion, the evidence of victim itself is suffice to have a conclusion that the victim while staying with the accused was subjected to sexual intercourse by the accused and any number of contradictions, in

my opinion, are not the material contradictions, which could cut the very root of the case of the prosecution. Hence, in order to encapsulate there is a cogent, unshakable and acceptable evidence so far as the fact that the victim being a minor had gone along with the accused and got him married and stayed with him and subjected to sexual intercourse by him, which fulfills the ingredients as envisaged under the provisions of Sec, 363, 366, 376 of IPC and under Sec.4 of POCSO Act, 2012.

12. The Learned Public Prosecutor has relied upon a decision reported in **1969 Cri.L.J. 1282 (V.75, C.N.382)** in the case of Shabir Rashid v. The State. I have gone through the said decision. In the said case, the victim was a minor. The principles laid down by His Lordship in the said decision are applicable to the facts of the case on hand. The Learned Public Prosecutor has relied upon another decision reported in **2004 CRI.L.J. 595** (SUPREME COURT) in the case of Prakash v. State of Haryana. I have gone through the said decision. Their Lordships were pleased to observe that the consent of the minor is immaterial and this is what the defence in the case on hand much relies

upon. Hence, absolutely there is no volatility in any manner in the evidence of the victim coupled with the medical evidence as well discussed supra and the same appeases to me in holding that the prosecution has well established the guilt levelled against the accused to the hilt. Hence, I answer point Nos.2 to 4 in the affirmative.

13. POINT No.5: Hence, In view of my above findings, I unhesitatingly hold that the accused is found guilty for the offences punishable under sections 363, 366, 376 of IPC and under section 4 of POCSO Act, 2012.

In the result, I proceed to pass the following;

ORDER

The accused is hereby convicted under section 235 (2) of Cr.P.C, for the offences punishable under sections 363, 366, 376 of IPC and under section 4 of Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012.

The order dated 20.1.2014 regarding the interim release of the vehicle bearing No.KA-

37/A-3471 stands confirmed after the appeal period is over and if the appeal is filed, it is subject to the decision of the Hon'ble Appellate Court.

M.O.1, which is one under wear and M.Os.2 to 7 being worthless are ordered to be destroyed after the appeal period is over and if the appeal is filed, it is subject to the decision of the Hon'ble Appellate Court.

(Dictated to J.Wr, transcript computerized by him is corrected by me and then pronounced in the open court on this 30th day of January 2015)

(BASAVARAJ.S.SAPPANAVAR)
Sessions/Special Judge, Koppal.

Dt/31.1.2015

ORDER REGARDING SENTENCE

The learned counsel for the accused submits that the accused is having the old parents and hence, he requests the Court to impose the minimum sentence of imprisonment. Simultaneously, he makes a submission that the accused hails from a poor family and hence, the imposing of fine may be dispensed with.

The Learned Special Public Prosecutor submits that the maximum punishment may be awarded and in addition to this, he has drawn my attention to the provisions of sub-section 1 of section 357-A of Cr.P.C and also Rule-7 of Protection of Children From sexual Offences Rules, 2012 and he submits that in the light of the provisions stated supra, there may be a recommendation by the Court for payment of compensation to the victim.

The case of the prosecution transpires that the accused is a driver of Tam-Tam, which places a clear picture to hold that the accused hails from a poor family. However, having peeped into the provisions of Section 363, 366, 376 of I.P.C and under section 4 of Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 in respect of which, the accused has been found guilty, it becomes crystal clear that in addition to imposing of the sentence of imprisonment, the sentence of fine also requires to be imposed. Further I accept the submissions made by the Learned Special Public Prosecutor for recommending to the State Government by exercising the powers vested under sub-section 2 of Section 357-A of Cr.P.C for payment of compensation payable by the State Government as provided under sub-section 1 of Section 357-A of Cr.P.C.

Hence, considering the gravity of the offences in respect of which, the accused is found guilty and keeping in mind the financial status of the accused coupled with the other facts and circumstances of the case on hand, I unhesitatingly hold that the accused may be sentenced to under go Rigorous Imprisonment for **03** years with fine of Rs.**2,000/-** for the offence punishable under section **363** of IPC and further he may be sentenced to under go Rigorous Imprisonment for **03** years with fine of Rs.**2,000/-**, for the offence punishable under section **366** of IPC and further the accused may be sentenced to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for **07** years with fine of Rs.**2,000/-** for the offence punishable under section **376** of IPC and so also, the accused may be sentenced to under go Rigorous Imprisonment for **07** years with fine of Rs.**2,000/-** for the offence punishable under section **4** of Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, which will suffice the ends of justice.

In the result, I proceed to pass following;

ORDER

The accused is hereby sentenced to under go Rigorous Imprisonment for **03** years with fine of Rs.**2,000/-** for the offence punishable under section **363** of IPC and he is further sentenced to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for **03** years with fine of Rs.**2,000/-** for the offence punishable under section **366** of IPC and he is further sentenced to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for **07** years with fine of Rs.**2,000/-** for the offence punishable under section **376** of IPC and he is further sentenced to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for **07** years with fine of Rs.**2,000/-** for the offence punishable under section **4** of Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012.

In default of payment of fine, the accused shall under go Simple Imprisonment for **06** months.

All the sentences shall run concurrently.

The accused is entitled for set-off as provided under section 428 of Cr.P.C.

So far as the award of compensation is concerned, I recommend for grant of compensation in favour of PW-3 i.e., victim by exercising the

powers vested with the Court in the light of the provisions of sub-section 2 of Sec.357-A of Cr.P.C, which is payable by the Government as provided under sub-section 1 of Section 357-A of Cr.P.C.

The copy of this judgment be furnished to the accused forthwith, with free of cost.

Further the office is directed to send the copy of this judgment to District Legal Services Authority in order to decide the quantum of compensation to be awarded to the victim under sub-section 1 of Section 357-A of Cr.P.C.

(Dictated to J.Wr, in open court transcript computerized by him is corrected by me and signed on this 31st day of January 2015)

(BASAVARAJ.S.SAPPANAVAR)
Sessions/Special Judge, Koppal.

ANNEXURE

1. LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED FOR PROSECUTION.

PW-1	CW-1	:	Ningappa @ Misa Ningappa s/o. Hire Mallappa Hadapad r/o. Linganabandi.
PW-2	CW-2	:	Nagaraj s/o. Holiyappa Huded r/o. Linganabandi.
PW-3	CW-4	:	Victim aged: 17 years, r/o.Linganabandi.
PW-4	CW-8	:	Prabhugouda s/o. Malegouda Malipatil

			r/o.Linganabandi.
PW-5	CW-11	:	Adivappa s/o.Basavaraj Angadi, r/o.Bandi.
PW-6	CW-13	:	Muttappa s/o.Neelakantappa Shakapur r/o.Kengeri at present at Bank Colony, Ward No.180 Uttarahalli Bangalore.
PW-7	CW-20	:	Govindappa s/o.Hanumappa Hosur r/o. Hitnal.
PW-8	CW-22	:	Ramappa s/o. Basappa Bajantri r/o.Mudhol. At present at Hitnal.
PW-9	CW-16	:	Ramappa s/o.Neelakantappa Bajantri r/o. Halakeri.
PW-10	CW-28	:	Dr.Sayida Ayesha Nagma d/o. Syed Mustafa Madina Medical Officer, r/o. Yelburga
PW-11	CW-30	:	Dr.Vasant s/o.Kasturi Kattimani, Dentist r/o.Bangalore.
PW-12	CW-25	:	Mallanna s/o.Gundappa Hulige, B.E.O r/o. Kushtagi
PW-13	CW-26	:	Nagaraj s/o.Basappa Nadavalakeri Asstt. Teacher, r/o.Mudhol.Tq: Yelburga
PW-14	CW-14	:	Muttanna s/o.Mudakappa Kadiyal r/o. Halakeri.
PW-15	CW-15	:	Basavaraj s/o.Sangappa Ganigera r/o. Halakeri.
PW-16	CW-23	:	Shivaputrappa s/o.Balappa Palled r/o. Jakkali.Tq:Ron.
PW-17	CW-12	:	Mallesha s/o. Hanumanthappa Agadi r/o.

			Madikeri.Tq:Kushtagi
PW-18	CW-19	:	Jakkappa s/o.Bheemappa Bajantri, Musician r/o.Navalagund.
PW-19	CW-31	:	Netravathi w/o. Prakash Pujar P.I. Traffic P.S. Koppal.
PW-20	CW-33	:	Nagaraj s/o. Mouneshappa Kammar CPI, Yelburga
PW-21		:	Kirankumar s/o. Devendrappa Vadageri, C.J. & JMFC Yelburga
PW-22	CW-32	:	Narayan s/o. Durgappa Dandeen PSI Yelburga

2. LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED FOR DEFENCE.

- NIL-

3. LIST OF DOCUMENTS MARKED FOR PROSECUTION

Ex.P-1		:	Complaint
Ex.P-1	(a)	:	Signature of CW-1=PW-1Mise Ningappa
Ex.P-1	(b)	:	Signature of PW-16=CW-23 Shivaputrappa
Ex.P-1	(c)	:	Signature of PW-22=CW-32 Narayan Dandin
Ex.P-2		:	School Admission application
Ex.P-3		:	Spot panchanama.
Ex.P-3	(a)	:	Signature of CW-2=PW-2 Nagaraj.
Ex.P-3	(b)	:	Signature of CW-32=PW-22
Ex.P-4	:	:	Vehicle Seizure Panchanama
Ex.P-4	(a)	:	Signature of CW-2=PW-2
Ex.P-4	(b)	:	Signature of CW-32=PW-22
Ex.P-5		:	Statement recorded under Sec.164 Cr.P.C
Ex.P-5	(a)	:	Signature of PW-21
Ex.P-6		:	Spot panchanama (conducted at Uttarahalli)
Ex.P-6	(a)	:	Signature of CW-11=PW-15
Ex.P-6	(b)	:	Signature of CW-12=PW-17
Ex.P-6	(c)	:	Signature of CW-31=PW-19

Ex.P-7		:	Signature of PW-6=CW-12
Ex.P-8		:	Residence spot panchanama (conducted at Hitnal Village)
Ex.P-8	(a)	:	Signature of CW-20=PW-7
Ex.P-8	(b)	:	Signature of PW-19=CW-31
Ex.P-9		:	Portion of statement of PW-8=CW-22
Ex.P-10		:	Medical examination report of victim
Ex.P-10	(a)	:	Signature of PW-10=CW-28
Ex.P-11		:	Examination of Rape certificate of accused
Ex.P-12		:	Certificate issued by dentist.
Ex.P-12	(a)	:	Signature of PW-11=CW-30
Ex.P-13		:	School Certificate issued by H.M. Govt. Primary School Matarangi.
Ex.P-13	(a)	:	Signature of PW-13=CW-26
Ex.P-14		:	Xerox copy of Admission Register
Ex.P-15		:	Panchanama conducted in Halakeri village.
Ex.P-15	(a)	:	Signature of PW-14=CW-14
Ex.P-15	(b)	:	Signature of PW-15=CW-15
Ex.P-15	(c)	:	Signature of PW-19=CW-31
Ex.P-16		:	Statement of CW-19=PW-18
Ex.P-17		:	Spot Panchanama conducted at Navalgund
Ex.P-17	(a)	:	Signature of PW-19=CW-31
Ex.P-18		:	FSL report.
Ex.P-19		:	Final opinion of Doctor.
Ex.P-20		:	Medical Certificate issued by Doctor in respect of accused.
Ex.P-21		:	Certificate for having produced victim dt.18.1.14
Ex.P-22		:	F.I.R.
Ex.P-22	(a)	:	Signature of CW-32=PW-22
Ex.P-23		:	Age certificate of accused issued by school authority.
Ex.P-24		:	Certificate issued by school authority in respect of victim.

4. LIST OF MATERIAL OBJECT PRODUCED.

M.O.1		:	One Tata Appe vehicle bearing No.KA-37/A-3471.
M.O.1		:	One underwear.
M.O.2		:	One shirt.
M.O.3		:	One slip.
M.O.4		:	Pubic hairs.
M.O.5		:	Vaginal swab.
M.O.6		:	Pubic hairs of accused
M.O.7		:	Nails.

5. LIST OF DOCUMENTS MARKED FOR DEFENCE.

Ex.D-1		:	Statement of CW-8=PW-4
--------	--	---	------------------------

Place: Koppal.

Date: 31.1.2015.

Sessions/Special Judge,
Koppal.

#####