

HON'BLE SMT JUSTICE ANIS

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE No.938 OF 2008

-

ORDER:

-

This Criminal Revision Case under Sections 397 and 401 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short, 'Cr.P.C') is filed by the revision petitioners herein challenging the judgment dated 20.06.2008, passed by the District and Sessions Judge, Chittoor, whereunder and whereby the conviction and sentence passed against the revision petitioners herein for the offence punishable under Section 411 IPC, vide judgment dated 30.01.2006 in C.C.No.320 of 2005 by the V Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Chittoor, was confirmed.

2. The revision petitioners herein are the accused and respondent herein is the complainant in C.C.No.320 of 2005 before the trial Court. For the sake of convenience, the parties hereinafter will be referred to as they are arrayed in the C.C. before the trial Court.

3. The brief facts of the case are that on the night of 23.05.2005 some unknown offenders have committed theft of gold chain and small bangle wearing by 1 ½ year baby of the complainant while the said child was sleeping by the side of window and bolted away with the gold jewels all valued about Rs.12,000/- in the house bearing D.No.1-585, Karnala Street, Kattamanchi of Chittoor. PW.2 lodged a complaint and a case was registered in Cr.No.194 of 2005 under Sections 380 IPC. On the night of 28.07.2005, some unknown offenders gained entrance into house bearing D.No.1-486 by breaking open the lock of main door and committed theft of gold jewels worth Rs.8,000/- and PW.1 filed a complaint and upon the complaint of PW.1 a case was registered in Cr.No.259 of 2005 under Sections 457 and 380 IPC. On 30.07.2005 some unknown offenders gained ingress at D.No.23-531, Sathyanarayanapuram, Muthumariyamman temple street, Kongareddipalle by breaking open the lock of the main door and committed theft of gold jewels all worth about Rs.7,000/- kept in trunk box and bolted away with the booty during the temporary absence of the inmates and a case was registered in Cr.No.261 of 2005 under Sections 457 and 380 IPC.

During the course of investigation, the Investigating Officer recorded the statements of all the witnesses and on 05.08.2005 at 5:00 A.M. the accused was arrested and found having possession of gold jewels and in the presence of mediators jewellery was recovered from the possession of the accused/petitioners. After completing investigation, the Investigating Officer filed the charge sheet against the petitioners/accused for the offence punishable under Sections 457 and 380 or 411 IPC.

4. The learned V Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Chittoor, took cognizance of the case and framed a charge for the offence punishable under Section 411 IPC against the accused. During trial, to prove the case of prosecution, PWs.1 to 7 were examined and Exs.P1 to P13 were got marked and Mos 1 to 11 were marked.

5. After closure of the prosecution evidence, accused were examined under Section 313 Cr.P.C putting all incriminating material available against them. Accused denied the material evidence and reported no oral or documentary evidence on their behalf.

6. The trial Court, after hearing the arguments and after perusing the record, convicted the accused Nos.1 and 2 for the offence punishable under Section 411 IPC and sentenced them to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for a period of two years each and to pay a fine of Rs.500/- each, and in default of payment to undergo Simple Imprisonment for a period of one month each.

7. Aggrieved by the conviction and sentence passed by the trial Court, accused Nos.1 and 2 preferred Criminal Appeal No.31 of 2006 before the District and Sessions Judge, Chittoor, where the Appellate Court after considering the evidence on record confirmed the conviction and sentence and dismissed the appeal.

8. Being aggrieved by the judgment of the Appellate Court passed in Criminal Appeal No.31 of 2006, the accused preferred the present revision case.

9. Learned counsel appearing for the revision petitioners/accused argued that the prosecution failed to prove that accused were having stolen property in their possession and failed to conduct any test identification

parade. Further, no property was recovered from the petitioners and finally prayed the Court to take lenient view.

10. On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor appearing for the State argued that both the Courts rightly held that the petitioners/accused were in possession of stolen property. Therefore, both the Courts rightly convicted the accused for the offence under Section 411 IPC and concurrent findings needs no interference and prayed the Court to dismiss the revision.

11. Now, the point for determination is --

Whether the prosecution could bring home the guilt of the accused for the offence punishable under Section 411 IPC, with which they are charged?

12. **POINT:**

A perusal of evidence of PWs 1 to 3 shows that on 23.5.2005, 28.07.2005 and 30.07.2005 some unknown persons gained entry into the house of PWs 1 to 3 and committed theft of gold and other valuables. The police registered the case in Cr.Nos.194 of 2005, 259 of 2005 and 261 of 2005. As per the evidence of Investigating Officer, on 05.08.2005, he arrested the accused and found the stolen articles with them. The trial Court as well as the appellate Court clearly held that basing on the evidence of PWs 1 to 3 and 4 and recovery of MOs 1 to 11, police arrested the accused along with MOs 1 to 11 and same were seized under the cover of panchnama. Believing the evidence of PWs 1 to 7, the trial Court as well as the appellate Court held that the accused committed the offence under Section 411 IPC. Therefore, findings of the trial Court as well as the appellate Court needs no interference regarding the conviction of petitioners under Section 411 IPC.

13. The learned counsel for the petitioners argued that petitioners are innocents and they were implicated by the police though the valuables were not recovered from them and finally prayed the Court to take lenient view.

14. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the view that a lenient view shall be taken in favour of the revision petitioners. In the circumstances, the conviction imposed against the accused is confirmed by reducing the sentence of imprisonment to one year from two years. The

sentence of fine is unaltered. The period of imprisonment already suffered by the revision petitioners/accused is directed to be given set off.

15. Accordingly, the Criminal Revision Case is disposed of.

16. Miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, in this Criminal Revision Case shall stand closed.

ANIS, J

Date:30.03.2015

PNV