



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRA-D-884-DB-2017
Reserved on :03.12.2025
Pronounced on: 11.12.2025

AJMER
Versus
STATE OF HARYANA

.... Appellant
.... Respondent

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL
HON’BLE MRS. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMARI

Present : Mr. Kewal Singh, Legal Aid Counsel for the appellant.

Mr. Munish Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

RAMESH KUMARI, J.

1. The instant appeal is filed by the appellant-Ajmer (hereinafter referred as ‘accused’) for setting aside the judgment of conviction dated 31.07.2017 and order of quantum of sentence dated 01.08.2017 in a case arising out of FIR No.136 dated 24.04.2016 registered under Section 302 of IPC at Police Station Pundari (Kaithal) vide which he has been held guilty for causing murder of his wife- Rajo Devi and has been sentenced as under:-

U/Section	Imprisonment	Fine	In default of payment
302 of IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for life	Rs. 30,000/-	To further undergo R.I. for six months

Fine of Rs.30,000/- as imposed upon the accused Ajmer was ordered to be paid as compensation to the legal heirs of deceased-Rajo Devi.

2. COMPLAINANT’S VERSION



CRA-D884-DB-2017

-2-

On 23.04.2016, a telephonic message was received at Police Station, Pundari from the Government Hospital Kaithal regarding death of Rajo Devi. On receipt of this information, PW8 SI Manish Kumar along with other Police officials reached at Government Hospital Kaithal and obtained medical *ruqa EX.PU* written by Dr. Ashmit Laler. Thereafter, PW-8 SI Manish Kumar recorded the statement of PW1-Suresh Kumar, complainant, brother of accused-Ajmer and brother-in-law of deceased Rajo Devi. PW-1 Suresh Kumar got recorded his statement as under:-

"I am resident of the above stated address and do labour work. We are three brothers Pritam is my eldest brother. Ajmer is my second elder brother and I am youngest. The marriage of my brother Ajmer Singh was solemnized with Rajo Devi, daughter of Raghbir Singh, resident of Dharar District Karnal at about 25/26 years ago. My brother Ajmer has two sons, one Ravinder age 20 years and second Balinder age about 17 years. My brother Ajmer used to drink liquor and other types of intoxication and he had doubt on the character of my Bhabhi, Rajo Devi. Yesterday on 23.04.2016 my brother Ajmer came home under the influence of liquor and started quarrelling and hurled bad words to my Bhabhi, Rajo Devi. My room is adjoining the room of Ajmer. After hearing the commotion, I went to the room of Ajmer. In the meantime Ajmer inflicted the injuries on chest, arm, stomach and body of my Bhabhi Rajo Devi with the vegetable cutter knife in my presence. On my alarm, my nephew Ravinder and my wife Reena also came at the spot. While we were attending to my Bhabhi Rajo, then my brother Ajmer,



CRA-D884-DB-2017

-3-

along with his knife, ran away from there. Then I along with my nephew Ravinder and my neighbor Rajesh son of Ramdhari took Rajo Devi for medical treatment at G.H. Kaithal after arranging private vehicle, where doctor declared Rajo Devi as dead. My brother Ajmer has murdered my Bhabhi with knife. Kindly take legal action against my brother Ajmer son of Ganeshi. I have got my statement recorded which has been read over to me and I admit it to be correct”.

3. POLICE INVESTIGATION

(a) After recording of statement Ex. PA, PW8 Inspector Munish Kumar made endorsement Ex. PN on the same and send *ruqa* through EASI Shishpal to Police Station on the basis of which FIR Ex.PA/1 was registered by PW5 ASI Mahipal.

PW8 Inspector Munish Kumar took photographs Exs. P1 to P7 of the dead body (in hospital). Dr. Bhira Ram reached at the mortuary and inspected the dead body.

PW8 Inspector Munish Kumar prepared inquest proceedings Ex. PO of the dead body. He handed over application Ex. PQ, dead body along with inquest papers Ex. PO to PW4 HC Shubhkaran for postmortem examination and postmortem was conducted by PW9 Dr. Vivek Sheoran, Medical Officer who prepared postmortem report Ex. PT.

PW9 Dr. Vivek Sheoran, after conducting post mortem examination and after signing the inquest papers Ex. PO and parcels containing the belongings of deceased (wearing clothes and bangles), handed over the dead body to PW4 HC Shubhkaran.

**CRA-D884-DB-2017****-4-**

PW8 Inspector Munish Kumar also visited the spot of occurrence along with Dr. Bhira Ram and Ravinder and lifted blood stained soil from the spot which was converted into parcel and sealed with seal 'SS' and taken in police possession vide memo Ex. PC. One pair of blood stained chappal and one blood stained bed sheet were also recovered from the spot which too were separately sealed by him with seal 'SS' and taken in possession vide memo Ex. PD. Specimen of seal was prepared and sealed after use was handed over to EASI Suresh Kumar. Rough site plan of place of occurrence Ex. PR was also prepared.

The post mortem report Ex.PT, police papers (inquest report Ex. PO) and parcels containing the belongings of deceased were handed over by PW4 HC Shubhkaran to PW7 Inspector Mahavir Singh vide memo Ex.PF. The dead body was handed over to PW1-Suresh Kumar vide receipt PB.

(b) On the same day, PW7 Inspector Mahavir Singh along with PW5 ASI Mahipal went in search of accused at his house but he was not found there.

When PW7 Inspector Mahavir Singh reached at Brahmanand Chowk Pai gate, Pundari, Rajesh Kumar produced accused-Ajmer before him. He enquired from him and arrested him in this case.

On interrogation, accused-Ajmer suffered disclosure statement Ex.PF regarding his involvement in the present case and also disclosed that the knife used by him in the occurrence had been kept concealed by him on Pilni road Pundri and nobody else knew about it. Pursuant to his disclosure statement Ex. PF, accused-Ajmer led the Police party to his house and got demarcated the place where he had inflicted injuries to his wife Rajo Devi and demarcation



memo Ex. PJ was prepared which is signed by PW5 ASI Mahipal and EASI Surinder Singh. Thereafter, accused-Ajmer as per his disclosure statement got recovered knife Ex.MO/1 and sketch Ex. PG of knife was prepared and knife was taken into Police possession vide memo Ex.PH attested by both above named witnesses. Site plan Ex. PL of place of recovery of knife was also prepared by PW7 Inspector Mahavir Singh.

In due course, case property was deposited with PW11 HC Joginder Singh. The scaled site plan Ex. PK of place of recovery was also got prepared from PW6 Ram Niwas Draftsman. The case property was sent through PW3 Constable Ashok Kumar to FSL Madhuban.

4 PRESENTATION OF CHALLAN AND COMMITMENT OF PROCEEDINGS

- (i) After presentation of the challan in the Court of learned Illaqa Magistrate, Section 207 Cr. P.C. was complied with. The case was committed to Court of Sessions.
- (ii) The accused was charged under Section 302 of IPC to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

5. PROSECUTION EVIDENCE

(A) In order to prove its case, prosecution has examined as many as 12 witnesses.

The prosecution evidence can be discussed under the following heads:-

- (i)(a) **Statement of complainant and eye witness- PW1-Suresh Kumar,** complainant stepped into the witness box and proved the statement Ex.PA recorded by the Police on the basis of which FIR Ex.PA/1 was registered. He also stated about the manner of inflicting injuries by accused-Ajmer on the



fateful night of 23.04.2016 at 8 PM and memo/ receipt Ex. PB vide which after the post mortem the dead body was taken by him from Police.

(b) **PW 2 Ravinder Kumar**, son of deceased and accused-Ajmer also corroborated the testimony of PW1-Suresh Kumar regarding the manner of inflicting injuries by the accused-Ajmer on Rajo Devi.

6. INVESTIGATIVE EVIDENCE

(a) **PW8 Inspector Munish Kumar** had conducted initial investigation in this case. He deposed that on 23.04.2016 at about 10:55 PM, he received *ruqa* Ex. PU from Government Hospital Kaithal regarding the dead body of Rajo Devi and he reached at Government Hospital Kaithal where PW1-Suresh Kumar met him and he recorded statement Ex.PA of Suresh Kumar. He proved the following documents which were prepared by him in the course of investigation.

1. Ex. PN endorsement on PA.
2. Exs. P1 to P7 photographs of dead body (taken in hospital).
3. Ex. PO-inquest proceedings (Form No. 25:35 (1)(B))
4. Ex. PQ-application for conducting post mortem of dead body of Rajo Devi.
5. Ex. PC-memo regarding taking into possession parcel containing blood stained earth lifted from the spot of occurrence duly sealed with seal 'SS'.
6. Ex.PD memo regarding taking into possession parcel containing one pair of blood stained chappal and one blood stained bed sheet.
7. Ex. PR site plan of place of occurrence.

6.(b) PW7 Inspector Mahavir Singh stated that he took over investigation of this case from PW-8 SI Munish Kumar on 24.04.2016 along with two sealed parcels (one containing blood stained soil and the other containing blood stained chappal and bed sheet). He also took into possession the parcel containing the belongings of deceased from PW4 HC Shubhkaran vide memo



Ex.PF (after postmortem). Thereafter, he arrested the accused and in furtherance of disclosure statement Ex.PF, the accused demarcated the place of occurrence and memo Ex.PJ was prepared. The accused in furtherance of disclosure statement Ex.PF, also got recovered knife Ex.MO/1, the sketch of which was prepared vide memo Ex.PG and taken into Police possession vide Ex.PH. Site plan of the place of recovery of knife PL was prepared.

7 MEDICAL EVIDENCE

PW9 Dr. Vivek Sheoran conducted post mortem on the dead body of Rajo Devi and he in support of his examination-in-chief tendered affidavit Ex. PS. He proved the following documents:

- (i) Ex.PQ-application for conducting the post mortem of dead body of deceased Rajo Devi.
- (ii) Ex.PT-post mortem report.
- (iii) Ex.PU-ruqa (initially sent to the Police regarding death of Rajo Devi in **Civil/Government** Hospital).
- (iv) Ex.PO-inquest report on which he identified his signatures.

The parcel containing the belongings of Rajo Devi and weapon of offence were produced in the Court at the time of recording his statement and exhibited vide Ex.MO/5 (salwar) Ex. MO/6 (shirt) and Ex. MO/7 (bangles), Ex.MO/1 (knife).

7.(b) PW 10 Dr. Surjit, Senior Scientific Officer in his statement deposed that sealed parcels were received in FSL, Madhuban which were examined in the laboratory and he prepared reports Exs. PV and PV/1.

8. LINK EVIDENCE



(a) **PW4 HC Shubhkaran** stated about getting the post mortem examination conducted on the dead body of Rajo Devi and that after post mortem, he handed over the post mortem's report, Police papers, dead body and sealed parcels to PW7 Inspector Mahavir Singh vide memo Ex.PF and dead body to legal heirs of Rajo Devi vide receipt Ex.PB.

8.(b) PW6 Ram Niwas Draftsman prepared scaled site plan Ex.PK on 11.05.2016.

8.(c) PW11 HC Joginder Singh in his examination-in-chief tendered affidavit Ex.PW11/A and as per averments of this affidavit, on 24.04.2016, PW7 Inspector Mahavir Singh deposited case property of this case with him. On 03.05.2016, he handed over the case property to PW3 Constable Ashok Kumar for its deposit in the office of FSL. He is specific that case property remained in intact condition till it was in his custody.

8.(d) PW3 Constable Ashok Kumar tendered his affidavit Ex. PE, which is corresponding to the affidavit Ex.PW11/A of PW11 HC Joginder Singh regarding taking of case property from him and depositing the same in the office of FSL, Madhuban and handing over the receipt to PW11 HC Joginder Singh. He also deposed about the integrity of the case property.

8(e) PW 12 Inspector Angrej, during the course of investigation, recorded the statements of PW11 HC Joginder Singh, PW3 Constable Ashok Kumar under Section 161 Cr.P.C and he got prepared scaled site plan from, PW6 Ram Niwas Draftsman and prepared report under Section 173 Cr.P.C.

9 STATEMENT OF ACCUSED UNDER SECTION 313 Cr. P.C AND HIS

PLEA



After closure of prosecution evidence, statement of accused-Ajmer was recorded under Section 313 Cr.P.C. He again pleaded innocence and claimed false implication. He took the plea that no recovery was effected from him. He never suffered any disclosure statement before the Police. Police obtained his signatures on blank papers in Police custody. Opportunity was granted to the accused to lead evidence but without examining any witness in defence, he closed his defence evidence.

10. The learned trial Court framed following issues for determination in this case:-

(i) Whether on 23.04.2016, accused committed murder of his wife Rajo Devi and thereby committed an offence punishable under Section 302 IPC?

11. After hearing of arguments of learned APP, defence counsel and on perusal of oral and documentary evidence, learned trial Court determined the issue in favour of prosecution and against the accused-Ajmer, rendered the judgment of conviction and order of sentence as stated in para No.1 of this judgment.

12 SUBMISSION OF LEARNED COUNSEL FOR THE ACCUSED

Learned counsel for the accused-appellant contended;

(i) that the investigation is not proper and as it is conducted in a hasty manner.

While the injuries are alleged to have been caused on 23.04.2016 at 8:00 p.m., the FIR Ex.PA/1 was registered on 24.04.2016, and accused-Ajmer was arrested on the same day and confessional statement and recovery of alleged weapon have also been made on the same day and that such promptness in the investigation creates doubt in the investigation itself;



- (ii) that PW1-Suresh Kumar, complainant stated that accused was allegedly drunk and that PW 2 Ravinder Kumar was also present but no efforts having been made by these witnesses to save Rajo Devi from the accused-Ajmer;
- (iii) that there are discrepancies in the statements of the witnesses inasmuch as while PW7 Inspector Mahavir Singh stated that they first reached at the place of occurrence and thereafter the place of recovery whereas, PW5 ASI Mahipal stated that firstly the weapon was recovered and thereafter they went to place of occurrence. PW7 Inspector Mahavir Singh stated that entire proceedings were conducted while sitting in vehicle whereas other witnesses stated otherwise;
- (iv) that PW1-Suresh Kumar, complainant and PW 2 Ravinder Kumar eye witness are interested witnesses. There is no independent corroboration. PW 2 Ravinder Kumar stated that he and Reena Devi, his aunt reached at the place of occurrence after the accused-appellant had stabbed the deceased and they had not seen the occurrence, and that there is no eye witness to the occurrence;
- (v) that false recovery of knife has been implanted upon the accused and that no independent witness was joined at the time of alleged recovery of knife from the possession of the accused-Ajmer. There is contradiction in the medical and ocular version regarding injuries on the body of Rajo Devi and as such he vehemently prayed for setting aside the judgment of conviction and order of sentence by way of acceptance of appeal.

13. SUBMISSION OF LEARNED STATE COUNSEL



Learned State counsel while relying upon the statements of the prosecution witnesses examined during the trial and the documentary evidence brought on record, prayed for dismissal of the appeal.

14. DISCUSSION

- (i) In the present case, the relationship of the deceased-Rajo Devi and accused-Ajmer is not in dispute i.e. deceased-Rajo Devi being the wife of accused-Ajmer. PW 2 Ravinder Kumar is none but son of deceased and accused. PW1-Suresh Kumar, complainant is brother of accused-Ajmer on whose statement Ex.PA/1 against his own brother i.e. accused-Ajmer, the FIR was lodged.
- (ii) Allegations by PW1-Suresh Kumar, complainant and PW 2 Ravinder Kumar are that accused-Ajmer inflicted knife blows on the person of Rajo Devi under the influence of liquor on 23.04.2016 at about 8 PM and she was taken to hospital where she succumbed to her injuries.
- (iii) The post mortem on the dead body of Rajo Devi was conducted by PW9 Dr. Vivek Sheoran on the basis of application Ex. PQ. Post mortem report Ex. PT and testimony of PW9 Dr. Vivek Sheoran, Medical Officer proved that following injuries were found on the body of deceased Rajo Devi :-

1. An incised wound near right areola with clotted further blood with dimension 3x.05x8 cm (Bone deep) present anterior lateral to right nipple. On further dissection 2nd and 3rd rib are fractured. On further dissection right middle lobe of lung is punctured with hemithorax of approximately 1.2-1.5 liters of clotted blood present.



2. *Another Lacerated wound medial and lower to left areola of size 3x.6 cm x 7.5cm bone deep present on the left areola on further dissection 2nd and 3rd ribs are fractured on the left side. On further dissection left middle lobe is punctured with approximately 1.5 liter hecmothorax present.*
3. *Lacerated wound 2cm x.2 cm present just lateral to angle lewis.*
4. *A lacerated wound 5cm x2.5 cm present over anterio lateral aspect of left leg middle 1/3rd portion.*
5. *Two similar wounds with joint lower margins of size 8.5x2.5x3.5 cm bone deep present proximal to 4.*

Regarding the cause of death of Rajo Devi, PW9 Dr. Vivek Sheoran, Medical Officer in his affidavit Ex. PS and post mortem report Ex. PT specifically stated that *“the cause of death in this case is due to shock and hemorrhage due to injury to vital organs like lungs which is antemortem in nature and is sufficient to cause death in ordinary course of life.”* As noticed above, injury No.1 and 2 are deep injuries which resulted into the death of Rajo Devi.

The place of crime is the house inhabited by accused-Ajmer from where PW8 Inspector Munish Kumar lifted blood stained soil besides a pair of blood stained chappal and one blood stained bed sheet which were separately sealed and in due course, deposited with PW11 HC Joginder Singh who sent the same through PW3 Constable Ashok Kumar to the office of FSL, Madhuban. The accused was also arrested on the same day i.e. 24.04.2016, when FIR Ex.PA/1 was lodged on the basis of statement Ex.PA of PW-1 Suresh Kumar and



recovery of knife Ex. MO/1 was also effected from accused. Report PV proved that total 4 parcels were deposited in the office of FSL which are as under:-

Parcel No.	No. & Seal Impression	Description of parcel(s)
1	2-SS	It contained exhibit-1. Exhibit-1. Flakes of earth and loose earth (approx 50 gm.) described as blood stained earth
2	1-SS	It contained exhibit 2a and 2b. Exhibit-2a. One multicoloured stripped bed sheet stained with brownish stains. Exhibit-2b. One pair of black hawai chappal stained with dark brown stains.
3	1-Doctor	It contained exhibit 3a to 3d. Exhibit 3a. One multicoloured cut and torn printed lady's shirt stained with dark brown stains. Exhibit 3b. One multicoloured printed salwar stained with dark brown stains. Exhibit 3c. One yellow/saffron dupatta stained with dark brown stains. Exhibit 3d. Few broken red glass bangles stained with a metallic kada.
4.	2-MS	It contained exhibit-4. Exhibit-4. One knife (approx 19 cm.) having rusty metallic blade and wooden handgrip.

As per report Ex. PV/1, human blood was found on all the articles except bangles which were found broken/disintegrated. This report coupled with postmortem report Ex.PT proved that the death of Rajo Devi was not natural or suicidal but homicidal.

(iv) PW1-Suresh Kumar in his statement specifically stated on oath that accused-Ajmer under the influence of liquor used to quarrel with wife and children. He had doubt on the character of Rajo Devi. He also specifically stated that on 23.04.2016 at about 8 PM he was present in his room which is adjacent to room of his brother-Ajmer and at that time his nephews, his wife and his children were also present. Accused-Ajmer came to house and started

**CRA-D884-DB-2017****-14-**

quarreling with his wife Rajo Devi. On hearing the noise of quarrel, he went to room of accused-Ajmer and he was followed by his wife Reena Devi and nephew Ravinder. He saw that accused-Ajmer gave various knife blows to his sister-in-law Rajo Devi on various parts of body. They raised alarm and his brother-Ajmer left Rajo Devi and they started looking after her. Accused-Ajmer absconded from the spot and Rajo Devi was got admitted in Government hospital, Kaithal where she was checked by the doctors and declared dead.

PW 2 Ravinder Kumar, also deposed to the same effect. The age of PW 2 Ravinder Kumar was 20 years at the time of recording of his statement in the Court on 25.07.2017. Thus, he was not minor when his statement was recorded in the Court on the said date. The occurrence is dated 23.04.2016, meaning thereby, PW 2 Ravinder Kumar was about 19 years of age at that time and in a position to understand the gravity of situation. PW 2 Ravinder Kumar in his testimony specifically stated that after hearing the noise of quarrel, his uncle Suresh went to the room occupied with them. He along with his aunt followed his uncle, where he saw his father inflicting injuries to his mother with knife on various parts of body including chest. They raised alarm. In the meantime, accused-Ajmer absconded from the spot along with knife.

Thus, both of them i.e. PW-1 Suresh Kumar and PW-2 Ravinder Kumar had witnessed the occurrence. They had no reason to falsely implicate the accused and to save real culprit, had there been any, who allegedly inflicted fatal injuries on the person of Rajo Devi. The reason for inflicting injuries on Rajo Devi is also specifically stated by PW1-Suresh Kumar, complainant and by



PW2 Ravinder Kumar that accused-Ajmer was having doubt about the character of Rajo Devi and under the influence of liquor, he used to quarrel and beat her. The contention of learned defence counsel that had PW1-Suresh Kumar, complainant and PW 2 Ravinder Kumar been present on the spot, they would have saved Rajo Devi or would have intervened has no merit because 5 injuries were given by the accused-Ajmer in a couple of seconds and when they intervened, accused-Ajmer absconded from the spot. The primary concern of PW1-Suresh Kumar and PW 2 Ravinder Kumar and other family members was to save Rajo Devi and provide her medical treatment and for this reason, they did not follow the accused to catch him and rather, took Rajo Devi to the hospital. The occurrence took place at 8 PM on 23.04.2016 and she was taken on the hospital immediately and declared dead at 10:55 (as per inquest report Ex.PO). This shows the promptness on part of PW1-Suresh Kumar and PW 2 Ravinder Kumar to provide medical assistance to Rajo Devi.

(v) The contention of learned defence counsel that one witness stated that writing work was done while sitting in the vehicle and another Police official stated that it was done at another place, has no merit because human memories are susceptible to forgetfulness with the passage of time. Moreover, Police officials are involved in the multifarious duties and under the pressure of their official duties, they can miss out the narration of the minute nitty gritty of the proceedings of investigation. No major discrepancy in the statements of Police officials or in that of PW1-Suresh Kumar, complainant and PW 2 Ravinder Kumar could be pointed out by the learned counsel.



(vi) The contention of learned defence counsel that no independent witness was joined at the time of recovery of knife MO/1 from the possession of accused-Ajmer is also without any merit because it is not imperative for PW7 Inspector Mahavir Singh to join independent witness at the time of effecting recovery. The recovery of knife Ex. MO/1 is effected from the place as disclosed by accused-Ajmer and PW7 Inspector Mahavir Singh and other Police officials had no reason to falsely implicate the accused-Ajmer in the commission of offence. Moreover, had the accused-Ajmer been falsely implicated in this case, PW1-Suresh Kumar would have been the first person to raise finger about Police investigation to save his real brother.

(vii) The contention of learned defence counsel that the accused-Ajmer is falsely implicated by PW1-Suresh Kumar, complainant and PW 2 Ravinder Kumar because of property dispute also cannot be accepted because no particulars of any property worth the name is brought on record which would have been a bone of contention between accused on one hand and PW1-Suresh Kumar, complainant and PW 2 Ravinder Kumar on the other hand.

(viii) The accused inflicted deep injuries by means of knife on the body of his wife Rajo Devi. The act done by the accused-Ajmer comes within the definition of Clause thirdly of Section 300 of IPC. Section 300 of IPC reads as under:-

"300. Murder. Except in the cases hereinafter excepted, culpable homicide is murder, if the act by which the death is caused is done with the intention of causing death, or-



Secondly-If it is done with the intention of causing such bodily injury as the offender knows to be likely to cause the death of the person to whom the harm is caused, or-

Thirdly- If it is done with the intention of causing bodily injury to any person and the bodily injury intended to be inflicted is sufficient in the ordinary course of nature to cause death, or-

Fourthly-If the person committing the act knows that it is so imminently dangerous that it must, in all probability, cause death or such bodily injury as is likely to cause death, and commits such act without any excuse for incurring the risk of causing death or such injury as aforesaid.

xxx

xxx

xxx”

The accused inflicted five injuries on the body of his wife by means of knife Ex.MO/1, which proves that his intention was to cause bodily injury to his wife Rajo Devi and these bodily injuries, which he intended to be caused were sufficient in the ordinary course of nature to cause the death of Rajo Devi because as per postmortem report Ex.PT and affidavit Ex.PS of PW-9 Dr. Vivek Sheoran, out of five injuries, three injuries were found on the chest puncturing the lungs with fractured ribs. These injuries are on vital part of the body inflicted with sharp weapon i.e. knife Ex.MO/1, with the intention of inflicting injuries likely to cause death in the ordinary course of nature. Thus the prosecution has duly proved that accused committed the offence of murder of his wife which falls within Clause ‘thirdly’ of Section 300 IPC. The learned trial Court rightly appreciated the evidence and rightly determined the issue



regarding culpability of accused in the murder of his wife. There is no infirmity, illegality or irregularity in the impugned judgment. Consequently, the appeal in hand is dismissed.

Copy of the judgment be sent to the quarter concerned for compliance.

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

(RAMESH KUMARI)
JUDGE

11.12.2025
Jyoti-IV

Whether speaking/reasoned	√Yes/No
Whether reportable	√Yes/No