

Naihar Sai Majhwar Vs State Of Chhattisgarh

Court: Chhattisgarh High Court

Date of Decision: Sept. 8, 2018

Acts Referred: Code Of Criminal Procedure, 1973 " Section 313
Indian Penal Code, 1860 " Section 302, 304

Hon'ble Judges: Pritinker Diwaker, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Hanuman Prasad Agrawal, M. Asha

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

Pritinker Diwaker, J

01. This appeal arises out of the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 23.03.2009 passed by Sessions Judge, Raigarh, District Raigarh,

in Sessions Trial No.108/08 convicting the accused/appellant under Section 304 Part-I IPC and sentencing him to undergo R.I. for ten years.

02. As per the prosecution case, on 24.06.2008 the accused/appellant killed his son Tilak Ram by causing several injuries to him by hands and fists.

The incident was witnessed by Chamru Ram (PW/4), brother-in-law of the accused/appellant. At the instance of Jhadu Ram (PW/3), brother of the

accused/appellant, FIR (Ex.P/6) was registered on 25.06.2008 at 8.30 AM under Section 302 IPC against the accused/appellant followed by merg

(Ex.P/8) at 8.40 AM. On the same day body of deceased was sent for postmortem examination to Govt. Hospital, Dharamjaigarh vide Ex.P/4-A

where Dr. B.L. Bhagat (PW/6) conducted postmortem on the body of deceased and gave his report Ex.P/4 noticing multiple minor scratch over the

left side of neck. No other internal injury was notice on body. The autopsy surgeon opined the cause of death of deceased to be shock due to

excessive internal bleeding caused by rapture of spleen and death was homicidal in nature.

03. After investigation, the charge sheet was filed against the accused/appellant under Section 302 IPC and accordingly charge was framed against

him by the trial Court.

04. So as to hold the accused/appellant guilty, prosecution examined as many as 8 witnesses in support of its case. Statement of the accused/appellant

was also recorded under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure in which he denied the circumstances appearing against him in the

prosecution case, pleaded innocence and false implication.

05. The trial Court after hearing counsel for the respective parties and considering the material available on record has convicted and sentenced the

accused/appellant as mentioned in para-1 of this judgment. Hence, this appeal.

06. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that he is not pressing this appeal on merit and would confine his argument to the sentence part thereof

only. He further submits that the accused/appellant has already undergone the sentence imposed upon him as his sentence was not suspended by this

Court.

07. On the other hand, supporting the impugned judgment it has been argued by the State counsel that conviction of the accused/appellant is in

accordance with law and there is no infirmity in the same.

08. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

09. Charmru Ram (PW/4), eye-witness to the incident, while supporting the prosecution case has stated that upon hearing the cries of deceased Tilak

Ram when he reached to the appellant's house, he saw the accused/appellant pressing the neck of the deceased and causing injuries to him on chest

by hands and fists. The accused/appellant was sitting on his chest. He has further stated that he tried to intervene the matter and pacify the dispute

but it could not be. He has also stated that thereafter the deceased died. In cross-examination, this witness remained firm and nothing could be elicited

from him to discredit his testimony. Kadar Khan (PW/1) and Jhadu Ram (PW/3) are the witnesses before whom extra-judicial confession was made

by the accused/appellant. Dr. B.L. Bhagat (PW/6) conducted postmortem examination on the body of deceased and gave his report (Ex.P/4) opining

the cause of death of deceased to be shock due to excessive bleeding caused by rupture of spleen. Jwakim Lakda (PW/8) - Investigating Officer has

duly supported the prosecution case.

10. Close scrutiny of the evidence makes it clear that on 24.06.2008 at 11.00 PM, the accused/appellant sat on the chest of deceased, pressed his

neck and gave fist blow on his chest resulting in his death. The incident has been witnessed by PW/4 who has categorically stated that it is the

accused/appellant who killed the deceased. That apart, the accused/appellant made extra-judicial confession before PW/1 and PW/3 that it is he who

killed the deceased. The evidence of these witnesses is well corroborated by the evidence of Doctor PW/6 who gave his report (Ex.P/4) noticing

multiple minor scratch on the left side of neck. The defence has cross-examined these witnesses at length but has not been able to elicit anything in

their cross-examination to discredit their testimonies especially to the fact that the accused/appellant has not killed the deceased. The statements of

PW/1, PW/3 and PW/4 inspire full confidence of this Court and I have no reason to disbelieve the statement of these witnesses.

11. For the reasons set out above, this Court is of the considered opinion that the findings of the Court below are strictly in conformity with the

material available on record and the Court below has not committed any error in passing the judgment impugned.

12. The appeal thus has no substance and it is liable to be dismissed. Dismissal recorded accordingly.