

Doc_id:1997.INSC.659.txt

Fact: 29/ The prosecution case was that on 1979 , at about 30 or 00 a.m. , while deceased Baburao and his son Sharanappa were proceeding from their house to their field carrying food for their father who was staying in the field and when they were passing through the field of Suleman, the appellants along with three others assaulted Baburao. Appellant no. 2 gave a blow with an axe on the neck of the deceased as a result of which he fell down and soon thereafter died. On seeing this assault on his father Sharanappa, who was then a child of about 5 years, ran away towards the village. P.W.4 Bhimashankar, who was returning from his field to the village, saw this assault on the deceased who was distantly related to him. He raised a cry whereupon the accused ran away. he went near Baburao and found that he was already dead. He started weeping and proceeded further towards the village. On the way he met Irappa (PW5). Irappa asked him why he was weeping P.W.4 told him that accused persons had killed Baburao. On the way he also met one Shivagondappa P.W. 6 and informed him also about the assault on the deceased by the accused. He thereafter went to the house of his uncle Guralingappa P.W.8 and informed him about the incident. He then along with other relatives went back to the place where Baburao was lying dead. P.W. 3 father of the deceased then requested P.W. 8 to go and lodge a complaint with the police. He reached Police Station at Indi situated 30 Km. away from that village and lodged his complaint. After completing the investigation the police charge sheeted all the five accused. F

Doc_id: 2008.INSC.11.txt

Fact: The facts necessary for deciding the appeal are as under: On 30th March, 1993 one Suresh Khateek informed Atma Ram (PW-1) that his daughter Shanti @ Gokul had died at her in-laws place. Upon this Atma Ram lodged First Information Report at Police Station Srimadhopur stating therein that his daughter Shanti @ Gokul was married to Jeevan Ram, son of Jagdish Balai (Jaggu Ram), resident of Nathusar about eighteen months ago; that he gave dowry according to his capacity; that immediately after the marriage, Jaggu Ram, his son Jeevan Ram and wife Nathi started harassing Shanti in connection with dowry; that after three days of marriage they left Radio, Press etc. and demanded watch and jewellery; that they with a view to save his daughter from harassment, he gave silver ornaments viz. Paizeb (anklet), Tagadi, Locket and Ear-rings apart from cash of rs. 10,000/- to her in-laws, but this did not satisfy them and after three months, they again started harassing her and left her at village Abhawas, where she stayed at his house for 8 months; that a meeting was held at village Abhawas which was attended by 22-25 people including Jaggu Ram (the respondent herein), Rameshwar Mali, Chhitar Kheteek and Bhagega Balai of village Nathusar. In that meeting Jaggu Ram assured that he will keep Gokul without creating any problem; that thereafter he went to Nathusar six to seven times to bring her daughter to Abhawas but her husband and in-laws did not send her and demanded colour television. They also threatened that if additional dowry is not brought, then his daughter will be finished. He told the villagers about the demand made by Jaggu Ram and his family and the threat given by them. Upon this, the villagers sent a message to Jaggu Ram that it was not proper. Jaggu Ram and his family members got annoyed by this development and they killed his daughter by burning with kerosene and cremated her

body at 00 a.m. on Thereupon, the police registered Criminal Case no.48/93 under Sections 498A, 304-B and 201 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

Doc_id: 2015.INSC.357.txt

Fact: A perusal of the averments in the complaint, sworn statement of the complainant and his witnesses go to show that the complainant was picked up from his garden land at about 00 a.m.on 6/6/2006 in the morning. Further averment reveals that this petitioner came to the police station later in the evening and detained him till 00 p.m.and also directed that he should not be let-out till he reveals or confesses that he is involved in the murder of one Sannamma. These allegations in the complaint are further corroborated in the sworn statement of the complainant which is further fortified from the sworn statement of his two witnesses, namely, PWs.2 and The Court at this stage is required to consider only the sworn statement of the complainant and his witnesses to come to a conclusion whether a prima facie case is made out for registering the case and issuing summons.