

Babulal Vs State Of Chhattisgarh

Court: Chhattisgarh High Court

Date of Decision: Sept. 25, 2018

Acts Referred: Indian Penal Code, 1860 " Section 34, 302, 304

Hon'ble Judges: Sharad Kumar Gupta, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: S.C. Verma, Vinod Tekam

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

Sharad Kumar Gupta, J

1. In this criminal appeal the challenge is levied to the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 14-5-2002 passed by Fourth Additional

Sessions Judge, FTC Janjgir Sessions Division Bilaspur in ST No. 210/2001 whereby and whereunder he convicted appellant u/s 304 part II of the

Indian Penal Code (hereafter called as 'IPC') and sentenced him to undergo RI for 5 years and fine Rs. 1,000/-, in default of payment of fine, to

further undergo RI for 3 months.

2. In brief the prosecution story is that deceased Bhuri Bai was the resident of village Baksara. On 03-05-2001 at about 10 am a dispute was arisen

between appellant, coaccused Dashelal, Gendulal, Jhapelhin Bai and deceased Bhuri Bai regarding cutting of mango bow which fell on the roof of the

house of deceased Bhuri Bai. Appellant and said coaccused caused injuries to deceased Bhuri Bai by pelting stones. As a result of injuries deceased

Bhuri Bai died. After completion of the investigation, a charge-sheet was filed against the appellant and said co-accused. Trial Court framed charges

against the appellant and said coaccused u/s 302 alternatively 302 r/w 34 IPC. After conclusion of the trial, Trial Court convicted and sentenced

appellant as aforesaid and acquitted the said co-accused from the offence punishable under Section 302 r/w 34 IPC.

3. Being aggrieved, the appellant has preferred this Criminal appeal.

4. Counsel for the appellant argued that Trial Court has not appreciated the evidence in proper perspective. Thus, the conviction and sentence of the

appellant are bad in eyes of law. Hence, appellant may be acquitted of the aforesaid charge.

5. Counsel for the State argued that the conviction and sentence of the appellant is based on clinching evidence. The conviction and sentence of the

appellant do not call for interference by this Court.

6. As per the alleged post mortem report Ex. P 10, PW10 Dr. Arvind R. Dwivedi had conducted the autopsy on the dead-body of the deceased Bhuri

Bai. He opined that deceased Bhuri Bai had died of Syncope due to laceration in the heart. The nature of the death was homicidal.

7. There is no such evidence on record on strength of which it can be said that Ex. P10 is not believable. Thus, this Court believes on Ex. P10.

8. PW13 Amrit Bai says in para 1 of her statement given on oath that appellant was beating deceased Bhuri Bai by stone and brick.

9. PW14 Horil Bai says para 1 of her statement given on oath that appellant was beating Bhuri Bai by bricks and stones.

10. PW16 Mahettar says in para 1 of his statement given on oath that Horil Bai had told him that appellant had killed deceased Bhuri Bai by bricks

and stones.

11. There is no such evidence on record on strength of which it can be said that aforesaid statements of PW13 Amrit Bai, PW13 Horil Bai, PW16

Mahettar are not believable.

12. Looking to above mentioned facts and circumstances of the case, this Court finds that prosecution has succeeded to prove the charge punishable

under Section 304 part II IPC against the appellant. Thus the trial Court has not committed any illegality in convicting and sentencing the appellant as

aforesaid. Hence, the appeal is dismissed and aforesaid conviction and sentence of the appellant are hereby affirmed.

13. As per the report of Central Jail, Bilaspur, the appellant has been released from jail on 13-08-2004 on completion of jail sentence extending him

benefit of remission and he has already deposited the fine amount in jail, thus no further order is required.