

SC No. 114/2013  
State Vs. Ram Singh and another.  
FIR No. 413/2012  
P.S. : Vasant Vihar, New Delhi.

13.09.2013(2.30PM)

Present : Shri Dayan Krishnan , Shri Rajeev Mohan &  
Shri A.T.Ansari, Ld. Spl. Public Prosecutor for the  
State, assisted by Sh.Madhav Khurana,Advocate.

Shri V.K.Anand Ld. Counsel for accused Mukesh.

Shri Vivek Sharma, Shri Manoj Tomar and  
Shri Sada Shiv, Ld. Counsels for accused Pawan.

Shri A.P Singh, Shri V.P. Singh and Ms. Geeta Ld.  
Counsels for accused Vinay Sharma & accused  
Akshay @ Thakur.

Shri Rajeev Jain, Ld. Amicus Curie.

Proceedings against accused Ram Singh had already  
been abated, since he expired.

Remaining convicts namely Mukesh, Pawan, Vinay  
and Akshay Thakur are produced from custody in  
court.

Vide my separate order on sentence of even date, all  
the convicts have been sentenced.

Attested copy of the judgment, order on sentence,  
copy of charge, evidence, statement under section 313 Cr.P.C,  
exhibited documents be given to the convicts, free of cost.

The convicts are also informed that they can file an  
appeal against the judgment and order on sentence within a  
period of **30** days as per Article **115** of the Limitation Act, 1963.

The exhibits be preserved till the confirmation of  
death penalty by the Hon'ble High Court. The death penalty

reference is being sent to Hon'ble High Court of Delhi for the **confirmation** of the same. The file be prepared as per Rule 34 of Chapter 24 Part B Vol. III of Delhi High Court Rules and be sent to Hon'be High Court as per rules.

(Yogesh Khanna )  
ASJ ( Special Fast Track Court),  
Saket Courts, New Delhi  
13-09-2013

**IN THE COURT OF SHRI YOGESH KHANNA,**  
**ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE,**  
**SPECIAL - FAST TRACK COURTS,**  
**SAKET DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, NEW DELHI.**

**Unique ID No. 02406R0020522013**

**SC No. 114/2013**

**FIR No. 413/2012**

**P.S. : Vasant Vihar, New Delhi.**

**U/s : 120B IPC & U/s 365 / 366 / 376(2)(g) / 377 /  
307 / 302 and / or 396 /395 IPC read with  
section 397 / 201 / 412 read with section  
120B IPC.**

**State**

**( Government of NCT of Delhi)**

**..... Complainant.**

**Versus**

**1. Ram Singh, since deceased.**

**S/o Shri Mange Lal**

**R/o Jhuggi No. J-49,**

**Ravidass Camp, Sector-3,**

**R.K Puram, New Delhi.**

**(Proceedings abated against him on 12-03-2013.)**

**2. Mukesh**

**S/o Shri Mange Lal**

**Presently R/o Jhuggi No. J-49,**

**Ravidass Camp, Sector-3,**

**R.K Puram, New Delhi.**

**Permanent R/o Village Karoli,**

**District & P.S Karoli,**

**Rajasthan.**

**3. Akshay Kumar Singh**

**S/o Shri Saryu Singh**

**R/o Village Karmalaungh**

**P.S. Tandwa, District Aurangabad,**

**Uttar Pradesh.**

**4. Vinay Sharma**  
**S/o Shri Hari Ram Sharma**  
**R/o Jhuggi No. J-105,**  
**Ravidass Camp, Sector-3,**  
**R.K Puram, New Delhi.**

**5. Pawan Kumar @ Kaalu**  
**S/o Shri Heera**  
**R/o Jhuggi No. J-64,**  
**Ravidass Camp, Sector-3,**  
**R.K Puram, New Delhi.**

**..... Convicts.**

**Date of arguments on sentence concluded : 11-09-2013**

**Date of order : 13-09-2013**

### **ORDER ON SENTENCE**

I have heard the arguments on the point of sentence from both the sides. The prosecution has argued that looking at the crime committed by the convicts they be awarded maximum penalty - of death. However, the Id counsel for convict person argued at length and raised the following issues to be considered at the time of award of the sentence :

- a.** The young age of convict person viz., convict Pawan Gupta @ Kaalu, aged 19 years ; convict Vinay Sharma, aged 20 Years; convict Mukesh aged 26 years and convict Akshay Kumar Singh @ Thakur aged 28 years.
- b.** socio-economic conditions of the convict person, they being poor making two ends meat, having families to support ;

- c. clean antecedents and be given chance of reformation ;
- d. the presumption of innocence being in their favour ;
- e. life imprisonment being the rule and death being an exception and there being no special reasons to award death sentence ;
- f. they being convicted only on the ground of conspiracy and not of their individual acts ;
- g. that convict Mukesh and convict Pawan were drunk at the time of incident and that accused Mukesh was driving the bus throughout.

These circumstances, broadly, are alleged to be the **mitigating** circumstances put forth by the convict person and hence, it is argued that the death sentence be not awarded to them.

Various judgments were referred to by the Id counsels from either sides. The crux of the judgments is - to award a death penalty the court has to first weigh the aggravating circumstances against the mitigating circumstances and if there are no mitigating circumstances then the court need to apply the **Rarest of Rare test** to find if the case falls within such category.

The law on this aspect has been developed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the following judgments viz.,

In "**Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab**" (1980) 2 **SCC 684**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that **extreme**

**depravity** constitute legitimate **special reason** for award of death sentence. It has been held that ;

*“In many cases, the extremely **cruel** or **bestly** manner of the commission of murder is itself a demonstrated index of the depraved character of the perpetrator. That is why, it is not desirable to consider the circumstances of the crime and the circumstances of the criminal in two separate watertight compartments.”*

It was also held that :

*“ if a murder involves exceptional depravity, it shall be an **aggravating circumstance** for imposition of penalty of death.”*

Further in **Machhi Singh v. State of Punjab (1983)**

**3 SCC 470**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that ;

*“ In the first place, the very humanistic edifice is constructed on the foundation of “reverence for life” principle. When a member of the community violates this very principle by killing another member, the society may not feel itself bound by the shackles of this doctrine. Secondly, it has to be realized that every member of the community is able to live with safety without his or her own life being endangered because of the protective arm of the community and on account of the rule of law enforced by it”.*

It was further observed that ;

*“ When the **community feels** that for the sake of self preservation the killer has to be killed, the community may well withdraw the protection by sanctioning the death penalty. But the community will not do so in every case. It may do so ( in rarest of rare cases) when its **collective conscience** is so shocked that it will expect the holders of the judicial power centre to inflict death penalty **irrespective** of their personal opinion as regards desirability or otherwise of retaining death penalty. The community may entrain such a sentiment when the crime is viewed from the platform of the motive for, or the manner of commission of the crime, or the anti-social or abhorrent nature of the crime, such as for instance :*

*(i) **manner** of commission of Murder i.e., when the murder is committed in an extremely **brutal, grotesque, diabolical, revolting,** or **dastardly** manner so as to arouse intense and extreme indignation of the community ;*

*(ii) whether the victim is subjected to **inhuman acts** of **torture** of cruelty in order to bring about his or her death.*

In **Devender Pal Singh vs. State (NCT of Delhi)**

**(2002) 5 SCC 234**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that :

*“ Principle culled out from the judgments in Bachan Singh (supra) and Machhi Singh (supra), is that when the **collective conscience***

*of the community is so shocked, the court must award the death sentence."*

In **Ram Singh v. Sonia & Ors. (2007) 3 SCC 1**, the

Hon'ble Supreme Court once again held that :

*"It would be a failure of justice not to award the death sentence in a case where the crime was executed in the most **grotesque** and **revolting manner**".*

In **C. Munniappan v. State of Tamil Nadu (2010)**

**9 SCC 567**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held;

*"Stressing upon the manner of commission of offence, if extremely brutal, the diabolical, grotesque killing, shocking to the collective conscience of the society, the death sentence should be awarded."*

In **Ajitsingh Harnamsingh Gujral v. State of Maharashtra (2011) 14 SCC 401**, the Hon'ble Supreme

Court further held that ;

*" the distinction has to be drawn between **ordinary** murders and murders which are **gruesome, ghastly** or **horrendous**. While life sentence should be given in the former, the latter belongs to the category of the rarest of rare cases, and hence death sentence should be given."*



In **Sunder v. State (2013) 3 SCC 215** the Hon'ble

Supreme Court held ;

“Inter alia, the following factors to be the aggravating circumstances :

**a)** The accused have been held guilty of two heinous offences, which independently of one another, provide for the death penalty ;

**b) No** previous **enmity** between the parties, no grave and sudden provocation which compelled the accused to take the life of the prosecutrix ;

**c)** Extreme mental **perversion** ;

**d)** The **manner** in which the victim was murdered, and the approach and method **adopted** by the accused, disclose the traits of outrageous criminality in the behaviour of the accused ;

**e)** Well planned and **consciously motivated** crime ;

**f) Extreme misery** caused to the aggrieved party.

As observed earlier the Id counsels for the convicts had referred to **(a)** their young age ; **(b)** their socio-economic status ; **(c)** their clean antecedents and reformative approach ; as the mitigating circumstances in favour of the convicts. However, one need to add that the Hon'ble Supreme Court had repeatedly held that the young age of the accused is not a determinative factor by itself against the award of the death sentence. Rather **all** the circumstances need to be taken

together and proper weightage to be given to each circumstance. The Hon'ble Supreme Court rather has re-held the death sentence in the following cases despite the young age of the convict ;

- (a) Mohammed Ajmal Mohammad Amir Kasab @ Abu Mujahid v. State of Maharashtra (2012) 9 SCC 1 ;
- (b) Atbir v. State (NCT of Delhi) (2010) 9 SCC 1 ;
- (c) Vikram Singh v. State of Punjab (2010) 3 SCC 56 ;
- (d) Shivu v. High Court of Karnataka (2007) 4 SCC 713 ;
- (e) Jai Kumar v. State of M.P. (1999) 5 SCC 1 ;
- (f) Dhananjay Chatterjee v.State of WestBengal (1994) 2 SCC 220.

Similarly the **socio-economic status** of the convict ; or the convict being under any **intoxication** cannot be the determinative factors in sentencing as has been held in ;

- a) Shimbhu v. State of Haryana 2013 (10) SCALE 595 ;
- b) State of Karnataka v. Krishnappa (2000) 4 SCC 75.

I would like to refer to the contents of **para 18** of **Krishnappa's case**, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that ;

*"The reasons that accused an unsophisticated and illiterate citizen belongs to the **weaker***

**section** of the society ; that he was a **chronic addict to drinking** and had committed rape of a girl where in the state of **"intoxication"** and that his family comprise of a old mother, wife and children depends upon him. These reasons are **neither special nor adequate**. The measure of punishment in the wake of rape cannot depend upon the social status of the convicts or the accused. It must depend upon the **conduct of the accused**, the state and **age** of the sexually assault **female** and the **gravity** of the criminal act. The crimes of violence upon women needs to be severally dealt with. The social economic status, religion, race, caste or creed of the accused or the victims are **ir-relevant consideration** in sentencing policy. The protection of society and deterring the criminals is the avowed object of law and that is required to be achieved by imposing an appropriate sentence. The sentencing court are expected to consider all relevant facts into consideration bearing on the questions of sentence and proceed to impose a sentence commensurate with the gravity of the sentence. Court must hear the loud cry for justice by the society in cases of the heinous crime of rape on innocent helpless girls of tender years, and respond by imposition of proper sentence. Public abhorrence of the crime needs reflection through imposition of appropriate sentence by the court. To show **mercy** in the case of such a heinous crime would be a **travesty of justice** and the plea

*of leniency would be wholly misplaced.*

The submission qua clean antecedents or a chance of reformation, I may refer to the following judgments where the accused were first offenders but were awarded death for the acts they had committed viz., **(a)** Mohd Anis Kasab (Supra) and **(b)** Dhananjay Chatterjee (Supra). Rather, I may refer to the deposition of **PW82** Shri Ram Adhar wherein he had deposed about dacoity committed with him by the convict person along with their associates in the same bus on the time **just prior** to the incident **belies** the claim of the convicts that they had clean antecedents. Qua the plea of reformation I may add that in Sunder's case (supra) the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that the **method** adopted by the accused may disclose the traits of outrageous criminality in the behaviour of accused.

Further, the plea of presumption of the **innocence** in favour of the convicts is now not available to them since they stand convicted. I may also put the record straight that convict person are not convicted only on account of conspiracy but also for their **overt** acts. Lastly, the plea of convict Mukesh that he had helped the system by admitting that he was present inside the bus, is probably to seek misplaced mercy as he took this contradictory stand in his statement under section 313 Cr.P.C to

save himself after he found the chain of circumstances being **proved** against him too.

Lastly I would like to refer to “**Gurvail Singh @ Gala & Anr. vs. State of Punjab**”, AIR 2013 SC 1177, wherein the Hon’ble Supreme Court held that;

*“to award the death sentence, the aggravating circumstances ( **crime test**) have to be fully satisfied and there should be no mitigating circumstance ( **criminal test** ) favouring the accused. Even if both the tests are satisfied as against the accused, then the Court has to finally apply the Rarest of Rare Cases test ( **R-R Test** ), which depends on the **perception of the society** and not “**judge - centric**”, this is whether the **society** will **approve** the awarding of death sentence to certain types of crime or not. While applying this test, the Court has to look into variety of factors like society’s **abhorrence, extreme indignation** and **antipathy** to certain types of crimes like **rape and murder** of minor girls and the court award death sentence, because situation demands, due to constitutional compulsion, reflected by the will of the people”.*

Thus, with the aid of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, let me now find the aggravating and mitigating circumstances in the present case. The **aggravating** circumstances are :

- (a) Offence in the present case has been committed in a extremely brutal, grotesque, diabolical, revolting and thus dastardly manner so as to arouse **intense** and **extreme indignation** of **society**.
- (b) Demonstration of **exceptional depravity** and **extreme brutality** ;
- (c) **Extreme misery** inflicted upon the prosecutrix before her death :
- (d) Grave **impact** of the crime on **social order**.

On the other hand, the mitigating circumstances, as alleged, are (a) the young age of the convict ; (b) their socio economic status as also the plea of the reformatory approach and (c) their clean antecedents. These circumstances, as alleged, have been dealt with by me in my earlier part of this order. The aggravating circumstances thus outweigh the mitigating circumstances. Now I need to move to **R-R Test** to see if the case is covered under the bracket of rarest of rare case.

### **R-R Test**

The facts show that entire intestine of the prosecutrix was perforated, splayed and cut open due to repeated insertions of rods and hands. The convicts, in the most barbaric manner, pulled out her internal organs with their bare hands as well as by the rods and caused her irreparable injuries, thus exhibiting

extreme mental perversion not worthy of human condonation. As convict in pursuance of their conspiracy lured the victims into the bus Ex. P-1, brutally gang raped the prosecutrix, inflicted inhuman torture and threw the defenceless victims out of the moving bus in naked condition, profusely bleeding in a cold winter night ; their unprovoked crime demonstrated exceptional depravity of mind of the convicts.

In the postmortem report Ex. **PW34/A**, besides other serious injuries, various bite marks were observed on her face, lips, jaw, near ear, on the right and left breasts, left upper arm, right lower limb, right upper inner thigh (groin) , right lower thigh, left thigh lateral, left lower anterior , genital. It rather show the beastly behaviour of convicts.

Further, the convicts did not stop after pulling out her internal organs after the crime of gang rape / unnatural sex but then had dragged the victims to the rear door of the bus Ex.P-1 to be thrown out and when the rear door was found jammed the victims were dragged by their hairs to the front door and thrown out of the moving bus. Her intestines were so severally damaged and the suffering inflicted on the prosecutrix was unparalleled. The brutality caused to her internal organs is extreme as is evident from the medical evidence on record and hence the act of convicts call for extreme penalty.

The **Gurvail Singh's case (Supra)** guides us that the R-R test largely depends on the perception of the society as to if it approve the awarding of death sentence to certain types of crimes. The court has to look into the factors like society's abhorrence, extreme indignation and antipathy to certain types of cases viz., like the case in hand - of gang rape with brutal murder of a helpless girl by six men.

These are the times when gruesome crimes against women have become rampant and courts cannot turn a blind eye to the need to send a strong deterrent message to the perpetrators of such crimes. The increasing trend of crimes against women can be arrested only once the society realize that there will be no tolerance from any form of deviance against women and more so in extreme cases of brutality such as the present one and hence the criminal justice system must instill confidence in the minds of people especially the women. The crime of such nature against a helpless women, per se, require exemplary punishment.

I may leave here while saying that the gravity of the incident depicts the hair rising beastly and unparalleled behaviour. The subjecting of the prosecutrix to inhuman acts of torture before her death had not only shocked the collective conscience but calls for the withdrawal of the protective arm of



the community around the convicts. This ghastly act of the convicts definitely fits this case in the bracket of **rarest of rare** cases. Hence, I award the following punishment to each of the convict.

**(a)** The convicts, namely, convict Akshay Kumar Singh @ Thakur, convict Mukesh, convict Vinay Sharma and convict Pawan Gupta @ Kaalu are **sentenced to death** for offence punishable under section **302** Indian Penal Code. Accordingly, the convicts be **hanged by neck till they are dead**.

Fine of **Rs.10,000/-** to each of the convict is also imposed and in default of payment of fine such convict shall undergo simple Imprisonment for a period of **one month**.

**(b)** for the offence under section **120-B** IPC I award the punishment of **life imprisonment** to each of the convict and fine of **Rs.5000/-** to each of them. In default of payment of fine simple imprisonment for **one month** to such convict ;

**(c)** for the offence under section **365** IPC I award the punishment of **seven years** to each of the convict and fine of **Rs.5000/-** to each of them. In default of payment of fine simple imprisonment for **one month** to such convict ;

**(d)** for the offence under section **366** IPC I award the punishment of **seven years** to each of the convict person and fine of **Rs.5000/-** to each of them. In default of payment of fine simple imprisonment for **one month** to such convict ;

**(e)** for the offence under section **376(2)(g)** IPC I award the

punishment of **life imprisonment** to each of the convict person with fine of **Rs.5000/-** to each of them. In default of payment of fine simple imprisonment for **one month** to such convict ;

**(f)** for the offence under section **377** IPC I award the punishment of **ten years** to each of the convict person and fine of **Rs.5000/-** to each of them. In default of payment of fine simple imprisonment for **one month** to such convict ;

**(g)** for the offence under section **307** IPC I award the punishment of **seven years** to each of the convict person and fine of **Rs.5000/-** to each of them. In default of payment of fine simple imprisonment for **one month** to such convict ;

**(h)** for the offence under section **201** IPC I award the punishment of **seven years** to each of the convict person and fine of **Rs.5000/-** to each of them. In default of payment of fine simple imprisonment for **one month** to such convict ;

**(i)** for the offence under section **395** read with section **397** IPC I award the punishment of **ten years** to each of the convict person and fine of **Rs.5000/-** to each of them. In default of payment of fine simple imprisonment for **one month** to such convict ;

**(j)** for the offence under section **412** IPC I award the punishment of **ten years** to each of the convict person and fine of **Rs.5000/-** to each of them. In default of payment of fine simple imprisonment for **one month** to such convict ;

The sentences under section 120-B / 365 / 366 /

376(2)(g) / 377 / 307 /201 / 395 / 397 / 412 IPC to run concurrently. Benefit under section 428 Cr.P.C to be given wherever applicable.

I also recommend that appropriate compensation, under section 357-A Cr.P.C be awarded to the legal heir's of the prosecutrix and hence, a copy of this order be sent to the Secretary, Delhi Legal Service Authority, New Delhi, for deciding the quantum of compensation to be awarded under the scheme referred to in sub-section 1 of section 357-A Cr.P.C.

The convicts are also informed that they can file an appeal against the judgment and order on sentence within a period of **30** days as per Article **115** of the Limitation Act, 1963.

Attested copy of the judgment, order on sentence, copy of charge, evidence, statement under section 313 Cr.P.C, exhibited documents be given to the convicts, free of cost.

The exhibits be preserved till the confirmation of death penalty by the Hon'ble High Court. The death penalty reference is being sent to Hon'ble High Court of Delhi for the **confirmation** of the same. The file be prepared as per Rule 34 of Chapter 24 Part B Vol. III of Delhi High Court Rules and be sent to Hon'be High Court as per rules.

**Announced in the open  
court today i.e. 13-09-2013.**

**( Yogesh Khanna )  
Additional Sessions Judge  
Special – Fast Track Court  
Saket District Courts**

**Complex**

**New Delhi.**

**IN THE COURT OF SH. YOGESH KHANNA,  
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE – SPL. FAST TRACK COURT : SAKET  
DISTRICT COURTS : NEW DELHI**

State Vs. Sanjay  
FIR No. 103/2013  
P.S Badarpur, New Delhi.  
U/s. 354/376/506 IPC

**C H A R G E**

I, Yogesh Khanna, Additional Sessions Judge (Spl. FTC), Saket Courts, New Delhi do hereby charge you Sanjay S/o Late Shri Hardev Singh as follows :

That on 4.12.2012 at about 11PM at House No. 15, Gali No. 10, Molar Band Extension, Badarpur, New Delhi, within the jurisdiction of PS : Badarpur, you committed rape with the prosecutrix against her will and without her consent and you, thus, thereby committed offence punishable U/s **376** IPC and within my cognizance.

**Secondly**, during the above date, time and place, you criminally intimidated the prosecutrix by threatening her to kill and you, thus, thereby committed offence punishable U/s **506** IPC and within my cognizance.

**Thirdly**, on 24.03.2013 at about 10PM, in the aforesaid house, you assaulted the prosecutrix intending to outrage her modesty and hence thereby committed offence punishable U/s **354 IPC** and within my cognizance.

I do hereby direct that you be tried by this Court for the above said offence.

( Yogesh Khanna )  
ASJ / Spl. FTC SD, Saket, New Delhi  
13.09.2013

Charge is read over and explained to the accused who is questioned as follows :

Q. Do you plead guilty or claim trial?

A. I plead not guilty and claim trial.

RO & AC

( Yogesh Khanna )  
ASJ / Spl. FTC SD, Saket, New Delhi  
13.09.2013

State Vs. Balbir Singh  
FIR No. 289/12  
PS: Neb Sarai  
U/s : 376 / 506 IPC

13.09.2013

Present : Shri A. T. Ansari Ld. Addl. P.P. for State  
Ld counsel for accused.

Accused on bail and present in court.

Some documents has been filed by the ld counsel for  
accused. Copy supplied to prosecution.

Put up for arguments on 09.10.2013.

(Yogesh Khanna)  
ASJ(Spl. FTC)  
Saket Court Complex  
13.09.2013

State Vs. Anurag Pradhan  
FIR No. 58/13  
PS: C.R.Park  
U/s : 376 IPC

13.09.2013

Present : Shri A. T. Ansari Ld. Addl. P.P. for State  
Ld counsel for accused.  
Accused on bail and present in court.

Today, I have to deliver order on sentence at 2.30PM, in gang rape case dt. 16.12.2012. Even otherwise, no prosecution witness is present today.

Matter is adjourned and shall be now taken up on 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> of December 2013 for further prosecution evidence.

(Yogesh Khanna)  
ASJ(Spl. FTC)  
Saket Court Complex  
13.09.2013

State Vs. Sanjay  
FIR No. 103/2013  
P.S Badarpur, New Delhi.  
U/s. 354/376/506 IPC

13.09.2013

Present : Shri A. T. Ansari Ld. Addl. P.P. for State  
Ld counsel for prosecutrix.  
Ld counsel for accused.  
Accused in JC and produced in court.

Fresh vakalatnama filed on behalf of accused. Be taken on record.

I have heard the arguments on charge and gone through the entire material available on record especially the statement of prosecutrix, MLC of prosecutrix and statements of police witnesses u/s. 161 CrPC.

Prima facie, accused is liable to be charged for the offences u/s. 354/376/506 IPC. Hence charge be framed accordingly.

Charge so framed , read over and explained to accused to which he pleads not guilty and claims trial.

To come on 19<sup>th</sup>, 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> of November 2013, for prosecution evidence. First of all, prosecutrix and other public witnesses be summoned for these above dates.

Bail application of accused be taken up on 08.10.2013.

(Yogesh Khanna)  
ASJ(Spl. FTC)  
Saket Court Complex  
13.09.2013





SC No. 193/13  
State Vs. Raju @ Bhirwari Mandal  
FIR No. 148/13  
PS: Neb Sarai

13.09.2013

Present : Shri A. T. Ansari Ld. Addl. P.P. for State  
Accused in JC and produced in court.

Today I have to deliver order on sentence at 2.30PM, in gang rape case dt. 16.12.2012. Even otherwise, no prosecution witness is present today.

Matter is adjourned and shall be taken up now on 24<sup>th</sup> of September, 2013 for prosecution evidence.

(Yogesh Khanna)  
ASJ(Spl. FTC)  
Saket Court Complex  
13.09.2013

