

right over the premises and further forced him to leave the house within the meaning of Section 3(1)(v) and (15) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989.

2. It appears from the evidence that the appellant-complainant had constructed 'tin shed' (extension of his house) which was demolished by the Gram Panchayat after issuing a notice since it was unauthorized in nature. It also appears the appellant-complainant had filed a suit challenging the notice issued by the Gram Panchayat. It is submitted that appellant could not get the temporary relief in the said suit against proposed demolition of the unauthorized 'tin shed' constructed by him. Therefore, it cannot be said that the demolition of the 'tin shed' amounts to illegal dispossession of the appellant from his premises. On the contrary, it may be stated that the said demolition was lawful since it followed the process of law. Be that as it may, in paragraph no. 39, the learned Sessions Court

correctly appreciated the evidence of the appellant, who in their cross-examination had admitted that his dwelling house has not been demolished by the Gram Panchayat or their servant under the garb by demolishing the shade erected by him.

3. Thus, in view of the evidence available on record, I do not see any perversity in the findings recorded by the learned Sessions Court while directing the acquittal of the accused in the said Case.

4. That for the reasons stated herein above, leave is refused. Application is disposed off.

(SANDEEP. K. SHINDE, J.)_