* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

Reserved on: 15.10.2026
Date of Decision: 30.10.2026
Uploaded on: 30.10.2026

\# **CNR No. DLHC010663782025**
\+ **CRL.A. 1262/2025 & CRL.M.(BAIL) 1879/2025**

MR. RANA PRATAP .....Appellant
Through: Ms. Kamlesh Kumar, Ms. Tripta, Advs.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Raghuvinder Verma, APP for the State.
SI, Rajesh Kumar, PS Vijay Vihar.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

JUDGMENT

MADHU JAIN, J.

1. The present criminal appeal has been filed under Section 415 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as the "BNSS"), assailing the judgment dated 26.05.2025 and the order on sentence dated 14.07.2025 passed by the learned ASJ, North District, Rohini Courts, Delhi, in ***FIR No. 439/2010,*** registered at P.S. Vijay Vihar under Sections 186, 353, 332, 333, 308 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter referred to as *"IPC")* whereby the appellant

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:BHARTI
Signing Date:30.10.2026
17:00:46

was convicted and sentenced for the offences for which he was charged.

The brief facts of the case, as emerging from the impugned order, are as follows:

2. In brief, the case of the prosecution is that on 29.12.2010, DD No. 76-B was received telephonically at PS Vijay Vihar. Upon receipt thereof, SI Ramesh Thakur (PW-12), along with Ct. Surinder, Ct. Hari Narayan (PW-4), Ct. Pramod, Ct. Satbir (PW-6), Ct. Ravinder (PW-5), and ASI K.N. Goud (PW-10), reached the spot, where Ct. Karambir (PW-2), Ct. Ravinder (PW-5), and Ct. Joginder (PW-9) were found in an injured condition. On the identification of Ct. Karambir, accused Anand, Amit, Surender Singh S/o Narayan Singh, and Rana Pratap Singh were apprehended. It was also revealed that the aforesaid accused had sustained injuries due to beatings inflicted by members of the public. The three constables were medically examined at BSA Hospital vide MLCs Ex. PW-3/A, Ex. PW-3/B, and Ex. PW-3/C, respectively. Thereafter, the complaint of Ct. Karambir (Ex. PW-2/A) was recorded to the effect that on 29.12.2010, he, along with the two constables were on patrolling duty in Sector-5, Rohini, Delhi; at around 10:15 PM, they reached Pocket B-9, near Chaurasia Paan Bhandar, where a secret informer met him and informed him that illicit liquor was being sold at House No. 109 and that an immediate raid could lead to its seizure.

3. Upon receiving the aforesaid information, Ct. Karambir, along with the other two constables, reached Chaurasia Paan Bhandar and began verifying the information while keeping watch over the said house. A person emerged from the house, and upon his random search, a plastic quarter bottle of liquor bearing the label *'Sikandar Santara'* was found. At that point, accused Anand @ Saansi, whom Ct. Karambir already knew, emerged from the house and

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:BHARTI
Signing Date:30.10.2026
17:00:46

questioned him as to why he was troubling his customer. Ct. Karambir thereupon showed his identity card and those of the accompanying police officials. Upon learning their identity, accused Anand called his associates, namely, co-accused Surender, Amit, Rana Pratap, and Santosh, addressing them by their names. All the accused challenged the police party for stopping their customer and began assaulting the police officials, with accused Anand punching Ct. Karambir on the nose. Ct. Karambir further stated that when Ct. Ravinder and Ct. Joginder attempted to intervene, one of the accused caught Ct. Joginder. At the instance of accused Anand @ Saansi, accused Surender inflicted injuries on Ct. Joginder's head and other parts of his body with a baseball bat. Two of the accused caught hold of Ct. Ravinder, while accused Rana Pratap and Amit, at the instigation of accused Surender (who was the brother-in-law of accused Anand and whom he knew already as he supplied illicit liquor at Sector-5, Rohini), picked up bricks lying on the ground and inflicted injuries to Ct. Ravinder on the head. As per the complaint further, at this point, other associates of Anand @ Saansi reached the spot and they also gave beatings to the police officials. Out of them, accused Anand @ Saansi was referring to one accused as Santosh; the accused also got the customer released whom the police officials had apprehended with a quarter of illicit liquor Seeing the above quarrel, public gathered at the spot and supported the police officials. The public also challenged the accused persons; gave beatings to them and rescued the above police officials. At this point, all the accused went to the house of accused Anand @Saansi.

4. On 30.10.2010, an FIR was registered vide ***FIR No. 439/2010*** at P.S. Vijay Vihar under Sections 186, 353, 332, 308 read with Section 34 of the IPC.

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:BHARTI
Signing Date:30.10.2026
17:00:46

5. On 15.07.2013, a formal charge for the commission of offences u/s 186, 353, 332, 333, 308, and 34 IPC against accused persons namely Anand, Amit, Surender Singh S/o Narayan Singh, Rana Pratap Singh and Surender Singh S/o Chaman Lal, to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed trial. Vide order dated 01.06.2019, charge for the above offences was also framed against accused Santosh Kumar Chaurasia, to which he also pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

6. To prove its case against the accused and discharge its burden, the prosecution examined thirteen witnesses before the learned Trial Court, whose testimonies have been discussed in the impugned judgment as under:

> *"10. **PW-2** Ct. **Karambir** deposed on the same lines as his complaint Ex. PW-2/A referred to above and also identified all the accused correctly in the court. PW-5 HC Ravinder and PW-9 Ct. Joginder also corroborated his testimony and also correctly identified all the accused persons in the court. It also emerged during their testimonies that Alto car in which co accused reached the spot on the asking of accused Anand @ Saasi was seized by the IO vide seizure memo Ex. PW-2/H; ten brick stones used by the accused Amit and Rana Pratap in assaulting Ct. Ravinder were also seized vide seizure memo Ex. PW-2/I. the baseball bat was recovered from the house of accused Anand at the instance of accused Surender S/o Narayan Singh vide seizure memo Ex. PW-2/J. Blood stained clothes of Ct. Ravinder i.e orange and white colour shirt were also seized. The same were produced during the testimony of PW-2 Ct. Karambir and were identified by him correctly as Ex. P-1. Inner wear and handkerchief belonging to PW-5 HC Ravinder were similarly seized by the IO and were correctly identified by PW-2 as Ex. PW2 (colly). PW-5 HC Ravinder and PW-9 Ct.*

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:BHARTI
Signing Date:30.10.2026
17:00:46

Joginder also deposed on the same lines.

11. PW-2 further deposed thaat four accused persons also namely Anand, Surender S/o Narayan Singh, Amit and Rana Pratap were arrested from the spot on the same day. Two brick stones recovered from the spot were also correctly identified by him as Ex. P3 (colly) and the baseball bast was correctly identified as Ex. P-4.

12. The testimonies of the above injured constables are clear, cogent, truthful and inspire confidence of the court. They corroborate each other and are also corroborated by other PWs. All the above witnesses were subjected to cross examination on behalf of the defence but nothing material emerged therefrom to be of any help to the defence.

13. ***PW-3 Ms. Deepti Bhall, CMO BSA Hospital****, who examined Ct. Karambir, Ct. Joginder and Ct. Ravinder Kumar on 29.12.2010, proved their MLC as Ex. PW-3/A, Ex. PW-3/B and Ex. PW-3/C respectively as per which the nature of injury suffered by Ct. Karambir was opined as grievous and he also suffered fracture of the nasal bone. Nature of injuries suffered by Ct. Joginder and Ct. Ravinder were opined to be simple. She further deposed that on 30.12.2010, she also examined accused Surender Singh S/o Narayan Singh (vide MLC No. Ex. PW-3/D), accused Rana Pratap Singh (vide MLC Ex. PW-3/E), accused Amit (vide MLC Ex. 3/F) and accused Anand (vide MLC Ex. PW-3/G).*

14. ***PW-7 Dr. Deepika Sethi****, ENT Specialist, Dr. BSA Hospital deposed on behalf of the Dr. Sushil, Sr. Resident of the said hospital who had left its services and proved expert opinion on the MLCs of Ct. Karambir and Ct. Joginder.*

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:BHARTI
Signing Date:30.10.2026
17:00:46

> *15. **PW-12 Retired Inspector Ramesh Thakur**, who was IO of the case deposed about the investigation carried out by him and also proved arrest memo of accused Surender S/o Chaman Lal as Ex. PW-12/8. He also identified all the accused persons in the court.*
>
> *16. **PW-13 A.K. Lall**, who was ACP Rohini Sub Division on the date of the incident, proved complaint Ex. PW-13/A made by him u/s 195 Cr. PC in respect of the offence u/s 186/353/34 IPC."*

7. On the completion of prosecution evidence, statements of accused persons u/s 313 Cr.P.C. were recorded thereafter, during which accused Surender Singh S/o Narayan Singh submitted that on 29.12.2010, Ct. Ravinder and Ct. Joginder entered the house of co-accused Anand under the influence of liquor in his absence; they misbehaved with his daughter, namely Archana. When she raised an alarm, the neighbours and general public gathered there and, hearing her noise, the public persons and neighbours beat the above said police officials. In order to avoid the consequences of offences committed by them, they implicated him and other co-accused in the present case in order to put undue pressure upon him. Accused Rana Pratap, Amit and Anand also took similar pleas. Accused Santosh and Surender Singh S/o Chaman Lal pleaded innocence. Accused Anand examined himself as DW-1.

8. The learned Trial Court, vide the impugned judgment dated 26th May 2025, convicted the appellant and held as under:

> ***31.** In view of the above discussion, in the considered opinion of this Court, the prosecution has been able to prove its case beyond reasonable doubts against accused Anand, Amit, Surender Singh S/o Narayan Singh and Rana Pratap Singh. Accordingly, they are convicted for the offence u/s*

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:BHARTI
Signing Date:30.10.2026
17:00:46

186/353/332/333/308/34 IPC. As against accused Surender Singh S/o Chaman Lal and Santosh Kumar Chaurasia, however, in the considered opinion of this Court, the prosecution has failed to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt. Accordingly, the said accused are acquitted of the charged offences.

9. Consequent upon the judgment of conviction, the learned Trial Court, vide Order on Sentence dated 14th July 2025, imposed the following sentence upon the present appellant:

"Accused Rana Pratap S/o Narayan Singh
(i) To undergo rigorous imprisonment for two months for the offence punishable u/s 186 IPC and also to pay a fine of Rs.500/- (Rupees Five Hundred only); in default of which the convicts shall undergo further simple imprisonment for ten days;
(ii) To undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year and four months for the offence punishable u/s 353 IPC and also to pay a fine of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Hundred only); in default of which the convicts shall undergo further simple imprisonment for one month;
(iii) To undergo rigorous imprisonment for six years for the offence punishable u/s 333 IPC and also to pay a fine of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Hundred only); in default of which the convicts shall undergo further simple imprisonment for one month;
(iv) As the ingredients of offence punishable u/s 332 IPC are included in the offence punishable u/s 333 IPC being graver offence, the convicts are not being separately sentenced for the said offence in terms of Sec. 71 IPC.
(v) To undergo rigorous imprisonment for four years and six months for the offence punishable u/s 308 IPC and also to pay a fine of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Hundred only); in default of which the

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:BHARTI
Signing Date:30.10.2026
17:00:46

convicts shall undergo further ***simple imprisonment for one month;***
(vi) All the above sentences are for the above offences r/w Sec. 34 IPC;
(vii) All the above sentences to run concurrently;
(viii) Benefit of period already undergone in custody is given to the convict in terms of Section 428 Cr.PC."

10. Aggrieved by the aforesaid impugned judgment and order on sentence, the appellant has challenged both before this Court.

Submissions on Behalf of the Appellant

11. Learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the learned Trial Court had failed to appreciate the material contradictions and procedural irregularities in the prosecution's case. It was contended that the impugned judgment suffered from material errors in the appreciation of evidence and that the prosecution had failed to establish its case beyond reasonable doubt.

12. Learned counsel further submitted that the cognizance of the offence under Section 186 IPC was barred in the absence of a written complaint by the concerned public servant, as required under Section 195(1)(a)(i) CrPC. It was contended that neither the FIR nor the charge-sheet could substitute the complaint mandated by law. Reliance was placed on ***Daulat Ram v. State of Punjab, AIR 1962 SC 1206***, and ***C. Muniappan v. State of Tamil Nadu, (2010) 9 SCC 567***.

13. It was further submitted that the MLCs of Constables Karambir, Joginder and Ravinder attributed their injuries to the public, whereas their in-court testimony implicated the appellant and others. In particular, PW-2, Constable Karambir, allegedly attributed his injury to the appellant but his

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:BHARTI
Signing Date:30.10.2026
17:00:46

MLC recorded that the injury had been caused by the public. Similar contradictions were stated to exist in the MLCs of Constables Joginder and Ravinder. It was contended that these inconsistencies cast serious doubt on the prosecution's version and indicated the possibility of false implication. Learned counsel further submitted that two of the six accused had been acquitted on the same evidence, thereby highlighting the inconsistencies in the prosecution's case and the absence of corroboration from independent witnesses.

14. Learned counsel also submitted that the alleged customer from whom illicit liquor was purportedly purchased had not been examined and no liquor had been seized. It was contended that PW-5 had denied witnessing any purchase of liquor and had stated that the police officials had left the police station without making a daily diary entry, in civilian clothes and without proper authority for arrest. These circumstances, according to learned counsel, raised serious questions regarding the legality and credibility of the investigation.

15. It was further submitted that PW-5 was not posted on the relevant beat and that no secret information had been conveyed to the Station House Officer. Learned counsel contended that the prosecution had failed to establish the circumstances in which the police officials had proceeded to the relevant location.

16. Learned counsel further submitted that the alleged recovery of the weapon, namely a baseball bat, exhibited as Ex. P-4, had not been satisfactorily established. It was contended that when the parcel was opened before the Court, the seal was already broken, thereby raising doubts regarding the integrity of the alleged recovery and the preservation of the

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:BHARTI
Signing Date:30.10.2026
17:00:46

case property.

17. Reliance was also placed on the orders passed by this Court granting bail to the co-convict Anand, namely the order dated 11.08.2025 in Crl. A. No. 1064/2025 and the order dated 28.08.2025 in Crl. Appeal No. 1213/2025. Learned counsel submitted that the contradictions and deficiencies in the prosecution's case were similar to those considered by this Court while granting bail to the co-convict.

18. It was further contended that the prosecution had failed to examine any independent witness despite the admitted presence of a public gathering at the relevant time. Learned counsel submitted that the learned Trial Court had relied upon the testimony of police witnesses without adequately considering the absence of independent corroboration. Reliance was placed on ***Khem Karan v. State of U.P., (1974) 4 SCC 603***, in support of the submission that the evidence of interested witnesses required careful scrutiny.

19. Learned counsel also submitted that the learned Trial Court had failed to consider material procedural lapses, including the non-examination of the alleged customer from whom illicit liquor was purportedly purchased, the absence of seizure of liquor and the non-examination of key police officials. It was contended that these omissions materially weakened the prosecution's case.

20. It was further submitted that the learned Trial Court had failed to consider the defence version that the police officials had entered the house of the co-convict while intoxicated and had misbehaved with his daughter, which allegedly triggered public outrage. Learned counsel contended that the defence version had not been adequately discussed or considered in the

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:BHARTI
Signing Date:30.10.2026
17:00:46

impugned judgment.

21. Learned counsel further submitted that the prosecution had failed to establish that the police officials were obstructed in the discharge of their official duties. It was pointed out that the relevant daily diary entry had not been produced to establish that the police officials were on patrol at the relevant time. It was also questioned why the officials were not wearing their police uniforms if they were performing patrol duty. According to learned counsel, these circumstances remained unexplained during the trial and cast doubt on the prosecution's version.

22. Lastly, learned counsel submitted that the learned Trial Court had failed to consider the mitigating circumstances relevant to the appellant, including the absence of any prior conviction, his status as the sole breadwinner of his family, the prolonged pendency of the trial for approximately fifteen years and his compliance with the conditions of bail throughout the trial. It was contended that these circumstances warranted due consideration while determining the appropriate sentence.

23. On the aforesaid grounds, learned counsel for the appellant prayed that the impugned judgment and order on sentence be set aside and that the present appellant be granted appropriate relief.

Submissions On Behalf Of The Respondent-State

24. Learned APP for the State opposed the appeal and submitted that the prosecution had successfully established the case against the appellant through the testimonies of the injured police officials, the medical evidence and the circumstances surrounding the incident. It was submitted that the learned Trial Court had duly appreciated the evidence on record and rightly

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:BHARTI
Signing Date:30.10.2026
17:00:46

convicted the appellant for the offences in question.

25. Learned APP submitted that on 29.12.2010, HC Subhash received DD No. 76B telephonically and proceeded to the spot along with other police personnel. Upon reaching the spot, Constables Karambir, Ravinder and Joginder were found in an injured condition, and an Alto car bearing registration No. DL4CAA-4972, with a damaged front windshield, was also found there. It was submitted that, upon the identification of Constable Karambir, the accused persons, including the appellant, were apprehended at the spot and had sustained injuries during the intervention by members of the public.

26. Learned APP submitted that the appellant and his associates had actively participated in the assault on the police personnel. It was alleged that accused Surender Singh struck Constable Joginder with a baseball bat, while accused Rana Pratap and Amit assaulted Constable Ravinder with bricks. The apprehended suspect was forcibly freed during the incident, and members of the public intervened and rescued the police officials. It was submitted that these circumstances established the nature of the occurrence and the appellant's involvement therein.

27. Learned APP further submitted that the medical evidence corroborated the prosecution's case regarding the injuries sustained by the police personnel. The injured constables were medically examined at BSA Hospital, and their respective MLCs were collected during the investigation. It was submitted that, during further investigation, medical opinions were obtained in respect of the injuries sustained by Constable Karambir and Constable Joginder, pursuant to which the injuries of Constable Karambir were opined to be grievous and those of Constable

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:BHARTI
Signing Date:30.10.2026
17:00:46

Joginder to be simple. Accordingly, Section 308 IPC was added during the investigation.

28. Learned APP further submitted that the investigation had resulted in the recovery of the baseball bat at the instance of accused Surender Singh and two pieces of bricks at the instance of accused Rana Pratap and Amit, which were allegedly used in the assault on the police personnel. The exhibits were seized and deposited in the malkhana. It was contended that the statements of the injured police personnel, the medical evidence and the recoveries made during the investigation, when considered cumulatively, supported the prosecution's case.

29. It was further submitted that the appellant had been involved in several other criminal cases, including cases involving serious offences.

30. In view of the aforesaid submissions, learned APP for the State contended that the prosecution had established the appellant's involvement in the offences beyond reasonable doubt and that the impugned judgment did not suffer from any infirmity warranting interference by this Court. Accordingly, learned APP prayed that the appeal be dismissed.

Findings and Analysis

31. This Court has heard learned counsel for both the parties and perused the material on record.

32. The testimonies of PW-2 Ct. Karambir, PW-5 HC Ravinder and PW-9 Ct. Joginder consistently establish that the appellant participated in the assault upon the police officials while they were discharging their official duties. PW-5 specifically deposed that the appellant and co-accused Amit

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:BHARTI
Signing Date:30.10.2026
17:00:46

struck him on the head with brick stones, while PW-2 and PW-9 corroborated this account. Their testimony is supported by the medical evidence and identification of the seized brick stones. The discrepancies concerning the colour of Ravinder's shirt, the broken seal of the baseball bat and the non-examination of independent witnesses do not materially undermine the consistent evidence regarding the appellant's participation. Relevant portion of statements reproduced below-

> *"PW-2: Ct. Karambir*
>
> *"Other accused persons namely Rana Pratap and Amit caught hold of Ct. Ravinder and on the asking of accused Surender, accused Amit and Rana Pratap hit Ct. Ravinder on his head and other part of body with brick stones."*
>
> *PW-5: HC Ravinder*
>
> *"Meanwhile accused Surender son of late Sh.Chaman Lal also came there and exhorted other accused persons Amit and Rana Pratap and told them to pick the bricks and stones from the road and beat us with the same. Accused Amit and Rana Pratap picked the brick lying on the road and bang the same on my head, due to which blood started oozing out from my head."*
>
> *PW-9: Ct. Joginder*
>
> *"Two of the accused caught hold Ct. Ravinder and on the asking of accused Surender, who is brother in law (sadu) of accused Anand Sansi, accused Rana Pratap and Amit lifted the bricks lying on the road and hit the same on the head of Ct. Ravinder."*

33. It is significant to peruse the MLCs of the injured police officials to

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:BHARTI
Signing Date:30.10.2026
17:00:46

ascertain the nature of the injuries sustained by them. PW-3, Dr. Deepti Bhalla, proved the MLCs Ex. PW-3/A to Ex. PW-3/C. The MLC of Ct. Karambir (Ex. PW-3/A) records a fracture of the nasal bone, opined to be grievous in nature, whereas the injuries sustained by Ct. Joginder and HC Ravinder, as recorded in Ex. PW-3/B and Ex. PW-3/C, respectively, were opined to be simple. The medical evidence, therefore, establishes that the injuries sustained by the police officials were not uniform in nature and must be appreciated in light of the specific overt acts attributed to each accused in the ocular testimony.

34. As regards Section 186 IPC, the objection under Section 195 CrPC is rejected in view of the written complaint, Ex. PW-13/A, proved by PW-13, A.K. Lall, the then ACP, Rohini Sub-Division. The testimonies of PW-2, PW-5 and PW-9 establish that the appellant participated in obstructing the police officials while they were discharging their official duties. Accordingly, the conviction under Section 186 read with Section 34 IPC warrants no interference.

35. The convictions under Sections 332 and 353 read with Section 34 IPC are supported by the consistent testimonies of PW-2, PW-5 and PW-9, who attributed to the appellant and co-accused Amit the assault upon HC Ravinder with brick stones. The MLC of HC Ravinder, Ex. PW-3/C, records simple injuries. The evidence establishes that the appellant caused hurt to, and used force against, a police official in the course of the discharge of official duties. The convictions under Sections 332 and 353 read with Section 34 IPC are accordingly upheld.

36. As regards Section 333 read with Section 34 IPC, the MLC of Ct. Karambir, Ex. PW-3/A, records a fracture of the nasal bone, opined to be

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:BHARTI
Signing Date:30.10.2026
17:00:46

grievous in nature. Although this injury was attributed to co-accused Anand, the appellant's liability depends upon whether the evidence establishes that the grievous hurt was caused in furtherance of the common intention shared by him. The coordinated assault upon the police officials is relevant to this determination. The judgements relied upon by the learned counsel for the appellant in this regard are distinguishable and do not support his case.

37. For the foregoing reasons, the convictions under Sections 186, 332, 333 and 353 read with Section 34 IPC are upheld.

38. The conviction under Section 308 IPC, however, requires separate consideration. It is desirable to quote the provisions of Section 308 IPC, which are as under:

> ***"****Section* ***308. Attempt to commit culpable homicide:—*** *Whoever does any act with such intention or knowledge and under such circumstances that, if he by that act caused death, he would be guilty of culpable homicide not amounting to murder, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to three years, or with fine, or with both, and if hurt is caused to any person by such act, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to seven years, or with fine, or with both."*

39. The conviction of the appellant under Section 308 IPC cannot be sustained. PW-2, Ct. Karambir, PW-5, HC Ravinder, and PW-9, Ct. Joginder, have consistently deposed that the appellant and co-accused Amit struck Ravinder on the head and other parts of the body with brick stones. The Court does not overlook that an assault with a brick directed at the head

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:BHARTI
Signing Date:30.10.2026
17:00:46

involves a potentially dangerous act. Nevertheless, the applicability of Section 308 IPC depends not merely upon the weapon used or the part of the body targeted, but upon proof that the act was committed with the intention or knowledge that, if death had ensued, the appellant would have been guilty of culpable homicide not amounting to murder.

40. In the present case, the incident arose suddenly when the police officials intervened in connection with the alleged recovery of illicit liquor; no prior enmity or premeditation is shown in the evidence reproduced before this Court. Although Ravinder testified that blood started oozing from his head, his injuries were medically opined to be simple. The depositions do not specify repeated blows with the bricks or disclose other circumstances sufficiently demonstrating the requisite intention or knowledge. On an assessment of the nature of the assault and the evidence as a whole, the requisite *mens rea* has not been proved beyond reasonable doubt. The conviction of the appellant under Section 308 IPC is accordingly set aside.

Conclusion

41. In view of the foregoing discussion, the appeal is partly allowed. The conviction of the appellant for the offences punishable under Sections 186, 332, 333 and 353 read with Section 34 IPC is upheld. The conviction under Section 308 IPC is set aside.

42. Consequently, the order on sentence dated 14.07.2025 is set aside to the extent of the sentence imposed for the offence punishable under Section 308 IPC, namely, rigorous imprisonment for four years and six months, along with a fine of ₹10,000/-, and simple imprisonment for one month in default of payment of fine. The remaining sentences imposed by the learned

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:BHARTI
Signing Date:30.10.2026
17:00:46

Trial Court are maintained. The direction that the substantive sentences shall run concurrently shall operate in respect of the sentences that have been upheld.

43. The appellant shall be entitled to the benefit of Section 428 CrPC in accordance with law. The appeal stands disposed of in the above terms. The pending application, if any, stands disposed of.

44. A copy of this judgment be sent to the learned Trial Court and the learned Superintendent of the concerned Jail for information and necessary compliance.

MADHU JAIN
(JUDGE)

OCTOBER 30, 2026/rm

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:BHARTI
Signing Date:30.10.2026
17:00:46