



103

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRA-D-630-DB-2004 (O&M)

Date of Reserve: 29.10.2025

Date of Decision: 03.02.2026

Uploaded on: -05.02.2026

Amarjit Singh and Anr.

...Appellants

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : **Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat**
 Hon'ble Ms. Justice Sukhvinder Kaur

Present: Mr. P.K.S Phoolka, Advocate
 for the appellants.

Mr. Bhanu Partap Singh, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J.

1. Challenging the legality and correctness of the impugned judgment dated 27.05.2004 and order of sentence dated 28.05.2004, passed by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda, whereby, the appellants have been convicted for commission of the offence punishable under Sections 302,120-B and 201 of IPC, the appellants have preferred the present appeal before this Court.

2. The FIR (Ex.PA-2) in the present case was registered on the basis of the statement(Ex.PA) of Des Raj son of Ajmer Singh, resident of Ward No.2, Bhuchho Mandi, aged about 49 years and the same has been reproduced below:-

“I am resident of abovestated address and do the work of gold. We are three brothers. The eldest is myself, younger to me Amarjit Singh and younger to all is Kishan Singh. We all are living separately from the last 7-8 years



and residing separately. About 22 years prior, the marriage of my brother Amarjit Singh was performed with Paramjit Kaur D/o Sampuran Singh gold smith r/o Malout Mandi, from her womb a male child namely Bikramjit Singh @ Bikkey was born, now aged about 22 years. Amarjit Singh developed an illicit relation with his wife's sister Malkit Kaur, and he kept Malkit Kaur in his house for the last 8 years. From her womb, a female child was born. Thereafter, my brother separated Paramjit Kaur and she used to cook by her hard work and Bikramjit Singh was kept with him by giving some incentive. Today Bikramjit Singh told me that in the morning of 18.11.2001, a telephonic message was received from his maternal grand father (Nanna) Sampuran Singh from Malout to the effect that Bikramjit Singh be sent at Malout. On this his father sent him to Malout, and while going, he said to his mother Paramjit Kaur that I am going to Malout. On this she said don't worry, you may go. We will go to kallanwali. On 19.11.2001 at 5:00PM. Amarjit Singh father of Bikky and his maternal aunt, Malkit Kaur also reached Malout Mandi at the house of Sampuran Singh. Then in the night, Sampuran Singh maternal grand father of Bikramjit Singh, his wife Murti Devi Dhana Singh and Amarjit Singh and his wife Malkit Kaur all were sitting together and when Bikky tried to go with them, then his maternal grand father Sampuran Singh said that he should be sleep and he slept one side. In the morning of next day dated 20.11.2001, Amarjit Singh and his wife Malkiat Kaur came back to Bhucho Mandi and Bikramjit Singh stayed there. Amarjit Singh, after reaching to Bhucho Mandi, rang up Maloot that Bikky be sent. On this Bikramjit Singh came at Bhucho Mandi at 2:00 PM, where he enquired about his mother, who did not meet him at home. He thought that she might have gone to Kalianwali, then he enquired on



telephone from Kalainwali and Malout. They replied that she had not come. Sampuran Singh his maternal grand father said that let her run away where ever she wants to go. No need to lodge report. I am her father. From dated 20.11.2001 up till now Bikramjit Singh remained in the search of his mother Paramjit Kaur, but Paramjit Kaur was nowhere found . Bikramjit also disclosed that his father and maternal aunt Malkiat Kaur did not allow him to meet his mother. If he used to talk, then he was beaten. I am sure that Paramjit Kaur has been kept concealed with the conspiracy of Sampuran Singh by him and his wife Murti Devi, son Dhanna Singh and Amarjit Singh and his wife Malkiat Kaur with an intention to kill her or that she has been killed. The motive behind the revenge is that Amarjit Singh and his wife Malkiat Kaur did not like her as Amarjit Singh rehabilitated Malkiat Kaur in his house without taking consent of Paramjit Kaur. Malkiat Kaur was also married on two places priorly and from both places she is divorced. Statement heard and is correct. Action may be taken.Sd/- Des Raj Attested Jogga Singh S.I. I/C P.P. Bhuchi, Dt.4.1.2002”.

3. Initially, the offence under Sections 364,120-B IPC was found to have been committed and the FIR was registered. On 06.01.2002, accused Sampuran Singh, Murti Devi and Dhanna Singh were joined in the investigation and were arrested. On 28.09.2002, Surinder @ Sunder, M.C, Ward No.2, Bhucho Mandi appeared before the I.O and made a statement that Amarjit Singh and Malkiat Kaur, both appellants had suffered extra judicial confession before him with regard to commit the murder of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur by strangulating her and her dead body was buried in their old house.



They also requested him to produce them before the police as they committed the murder of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur. On 29.09.2002, Amarjit Singh and Malkiat Kaur, both appellants were arrested by the police. They were interrogated and they suffered their respective disclosure statements regarding the commission of crime and buried the dead body of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur in their old house. Accordingly, Dr.Bharat Bhushan Jindal and Dr. Kasturi Lal and Harbans Singh, Naib Tehsildar-cum- Executive Magistrate were associated in the process of recovery of the dead body and Amarjit Singh & Malkiat Kaur, both appellants got the dead body/skelton recovered in their presence. The photographs were clicked as well as a video film was prepared during the recovery proceedings. After exhuming the dead body, it was sent to Guru Gobind Singh Medical College & Hospital, Faridkot for post mortem examination and the offence under Sections 302/201 of IPC was added in the present case. After necessary investigation, the challan was presented before the Court of Area Magistrate. Since, the offence was exclusively triable by the Court of Sessions, the case was committed to the Court of Sessions Judge, Bathinda.

4. Finding a prima facie case under Sections 302/201 of IPC against the appellants and three of their co-accused and they were charge-sheeted accordingly. However, the appellants pleaded that they were innocent and claimed to be tried by the Trial Court.

5. To substantiate the charge against the appellants, the prosecution examined Des Raj son of Ajmer Singh, complainant as PW-1, who stated that his brother Amarjit Singh, accused was previously married to Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur daughter of Sampuran Singh and one son and one daughter



were born to Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur. The daughter had expired, whereas, her son Bikramjit Singh was alive. Amarjit Singh accused resided separately from them for the last about 10 years. He did not know if Amarjit Singh, accused had developed illicit relations with his sister-in-law Malkiat Kaur. He also did not know as to with whom Bikramjit Singh used to reside. However, he did not support the case of the prosecution and was declared hostile. He stated that his signatures were obtained on blank papers by the police and he had not lodged the FIR (Ex.PA-2). In his cross-examination, he stated that Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur was aged about 53-54 years and had grey hairs. Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur was divorced by her husband Amarjit Singh about 8/9 years prior to the registration of the case. After divorce, Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur used to reside in the adjoining house of his father Ajmer Singh. The prosecution further examined Bikramjit Singh @ Bikky as PW-2 and he also did not support the case of the prosecution. The prosecution further examined ASI Gurdev Singh as PW-3, who was posted as Incharge, Police Post, Bhucho in September, 2002. On 22.09.2002, he had recorded the statement (Ex.PD) of Bikramjit Singh @ Bikky PW-2 and also recorded the statement of Surinder @ Sunder, M.C PW-7. On 29.09.2002, PW Tarlok Chand produced Amarjit Singh and Malkiat Kaur, both appellants before SHO Police Station, Nathana and they were formally arrested. Amarjit Singh and Malkiat Kaur, both appellants suffered their disclosure statements Ex.PF & Ex. PG, which were witnessed by PW Tarlok Chand and Bikramjit Singh also. SHO Devinder Singh instructed him to move an application to Civil surgeon, Bathinda as well as to SDM, Bathinda for deputing the medical officers as well as the Executive Magistrate to witness the recovery likely to be effected in



pursuance of the disclosure statement Ex.PF and Ex.PG which were signed by Devinder singh. Accordingly, Harbans Singh Sekhon, Executive Magistrate-cum-Naib Tehsildar, Nathana and doctors Kasturi Lal and Bharat Bhushan Jindal were deputed to witness the recovery. They accompanied him to the place of recovery pre-disclosed by the accused Amarjit Singh and Malkiat Kaur. Amarjit Singh accused had already sold his old house to Surinder Singh. When they reached at the aforesaid place SHO Devinder Singh alongwith some other police officials and the members of the public were also present there. As per the demarcation of both the accused, the earth was dug out to the depth of about 10 feet and a skelton of dead body was taken out. A movie was also prepared of the aforesaid process of recovery of skelton. At the time of inquest report the skelton was identified to be that of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur by PW-1 Des Raj and PW-2 Bikramjit Singh @ Bikky. The skelton was taken into possession after converting the same into parcel and sealing the same by Inspector Devinder Singh with his seal vide memo Ex.PH which was attested by him, Harbans Singh Naib Tehsildar, PW Tarlok Chand, Surinder Singh and Bikramjit Singh in addition to himself. His statement was recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. In his cross-examination, he admitted that PW-1 Des Raj and PW-2 Bikramjit Singh had also identified the skelton/dead body to be that of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur. However, as per the Inquest Report, the identification of the alleged recovered skelton was made only at the instance of Amarjit Singh and Malkiat Kaur, both appellants. The prosecution further examined Dr. Kasturi Lal as PW-4, who was associated by the police for exhuming the dead body of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur, since deceased. He fully supported the case of the prosecution. He stated that the site was



exhumed in their presence and the exhumation process was started after their arrival at the spot. Both the Medical Officers and Executive Magistrate along with the accused and police officials had returned to Police Post, Bhucho Mandi. The prosecution further examined Harbans Singh Sekhon, Naib Tehsildar-cum-Executive Magistrate, Nathana as PW-5. He along with two Medical Officers joined the police team and got the dead body of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur recovered from the place disclosed by the appellants. The recovered skelton, the last remains and the bones etc. were put in a wooden box which were sealed by the Medical Officers. The wooden box containing the dead body was sealed with the seal and was handed over to the police, which was taken into possession by the police vide the memo Ex.PH. In his cross-examination, he stated that he had reached at the spot at about 10:00 AM. Both the Medical Officers were already present at the spot, when he reached there. Even the police officials also remained there. The prosecution further examined Surinder Singh as PW-6, who had purchased the house from Ajmer Singh, father of Amarjit Singh, accused in the month of May, 2002. On 29.09.2002, at about 09:30 A.M, one Head Constable accompanied by Amarjit Singh, accused/appellant No.1 came to his house. Amarjit Singh, accused/appellant No.1 had disclosed the place stating that he had buried the dead body of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur. At that time, Harbans Singh, Naib Tehsildar, Tarlok Chand, Bikramjit Singh were also present. However, the said witness was declared hostile. In his cross-examination, he admitted that Tarlok Chand had produced Amarjit Singh and Malkiat Kaur, both appellants in the Police Post, Bhucho and he was also summoned there as he had purchased the house from Ajmer Singh father of Amarjit Singh, accused/appellant No.1. The



prosecution further examined Surinder Kumar @ Sunder as PW-6, before whom the appellants had suffered extra judicial confession. However, while appearing as a witness, he did not support the prosecution case and stated that the appellants had never approached him and had not disclosed anything to him in respect of death of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur. The prosecution further examined PW-8 S.I Joga Singh, who stated that he had recorded the statement (Ex.PA), on the basis of which FIR (Ex.PA/2) was registered by the police. The prosecution further examined Gurjit Singh as PW-9, Photographer, who had clicked the photographs Ex.PW-9/1 to Ex.PW-9/9 and the negatives were Ex.PW-9/10 to Ex.PW-9/18. The video films, photographs and negatives were handed over by him to the police. Even the video cassette was converted into parcel and was sealed and was taken into possession by the police. The prosecution further examined Inspector Devinder Singh as PW-10, who was posted as SHO Police Station Nathana on 29.09.2002. He was a witness to the arrest of both the appellants, who were produced by Tarlok Chand. In his presence, both the appellants had suffered their disclosure statements and in pursuance of the said disclosure statements, the dead body of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur, since deceased was recovered by the police. He further stated that Harbans Singh, Naib Tehsildar-cum-Executive Magistrate and two Medical Officers were associated during the process of investigation and recovery of the dead body. The prosecution further examined PW-11 H.C Sukhmander Singh, whose testimony was formal in nature. The prosecution further examined Dr.S.S Sandhu as PW-12, who had conducted the post mortem examination on the dead body of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur on 30.09.2002. He made the following observations after seeing the dead body:-



1. Both feet were mummified and both legs were tied with red cloth, just above the ankle joints.
2. Bones of both forearm were also tied with red cloth, just above the lower ends.
3. Skelotenysed skull and tuffed of hair was lying separately hair and skull were sailed with mud.
4. skull, both femers, both humurous bones and some other bones were lying separately, while thresic and abnominal bones were mixed together in the mud.

Bones were subjected to boiling and cleansingly and I observed the following observations-

Skull:-

No ante mortem injrury was present.

- a) sagittal sutures were fused at the posterior half and partially in the interiour half.
- b) Coronal sutures are (i) left fused at its upper part (ii) right part fused at its upper end.
- c) lambeid sutures were not fused.

2. Upper Jaw, 14 teeth were present, 2 teeth missing, right incisor and right third molar, sockets which were lying empty.

Lower Jaw

- i) nine teeth were intact, third molar in each half we a present.
- (ii) Seven socket were empty without any tooth.
- (iii) Mental forament was present in the centre.
- (iv) Chin was founded.
- v) Angle of mandible was not everted.

4. Sterum

All the pieces were fused.

5. Femer

- a) Both(Two) femer bones were present:
- b) Neck of the femer forms the right angle with the shaft.

6. Tibia

Tibia bones were two in number of both sides were present:

*7. Fibular**Fibula two in number of both sides were present.**8. Humerous**Both sides were present(Two in number)**9. Radius**Two radial bones of both sides were present.**10. Sacrum**All the five pieces were fused together alongwith coccy.**Sacrum was white and straight in first three segments.**11. Ribs**15 in number were present.**12.Small bones 28 in number were present.**13. Teeth lying separately, seven in number.**14. Vertebrae**2 in number were present without any injury.**15. Scapulae**Two in number of both sides were present.**16.Hip bones**right and left hip bones were present(two in numbers)**a) Ischial tubersities were everted.**(b) Obturator formina were triagular.**(c) Acctabular were narrow and shallow.**Opinion**1. Age About 35 years to 40 years.**2. Sex Female.**3. Cause of Death: Cause of death could not be given as there were no ante mortem injury was present and soft tissue(all over the body)and in the neck. Soft tissue alongwith other structure were missing”.*

6. The prosecution further examined HC Sarban Singh as Pw-13 and HC Jagrup Singh as PW-14, who were formal witnesses.



7. After the statement of prosecution witnesses concluded, the statements of the appellants were recorded under Section 313 Cr.P.C. In his statement under Section 313 Cr.P.C, Amarjit Singh, appellant No.1/accused raised the following defence:-

“I am innocent. I have been falsely implicated in this case on misguided suspicion. I was illegally detained in P.P.Bhucho for about 3/4 days prior to my arrest and tortured and obtained my signatures on blank papers. The alleged place of recovery was never in my possession and ownership. The snaps were tactfully prepared from the Photographer by the Police of P.P Bhucho and P.S.Nathana just to strengthen the prosecution case.

Whereas, Malkiat Kaur, appellant No.2/ accused in the concluding part of her statement under Section 313 Cr.P.C stated as under:-

“I am innocent. I have been falsely implicated in this case on misguided suspicion. I was illegally detained in P.P.Bhucho for about 3/4 days prior to my arrest and tortured and obtained my signatures on blank papers. The snaps were tactfully prepared from the Photographer by the Police of P.P Bhucho and P.S.Nathana just to strengthen the prosecution case.

8. In his defence evidence, the appellants examined Brij Mohan, Record Keeper as DW-1, who stated that the summoned record has been destroyed in the fire in the year 1984. The appellants further examined Subhash Goklani, Advocate as DW-2, who stated that he had issued a notice dated 09.01.1998 to Amarjit Singh son of Ajmer Singh on the instructions of Sampuran Singh, accused and the carbon copy of the same was retained in his office. The carbon copy of the notice was Ex.DB and the acknowledgment was Ex.DC. He further stated that he knew Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur, since



deceased as he was engaged by her for filing an application under Section 125 Cr.P.C against Amarjit Singh, appellant No.1.

9. Learned counsel for the appellants vehemently argued that in the present case, both the material witnesses i.e. PW-1 Des Raj and PW-2 Bikramjit Singh @ Bicky had turned hostile and did not support the case of the prosecution. In fact, the police had already come to know about burying of the skelton in the old house of appellant No.1 and no fact was discovered in pursuance of the disclosure statement made by the appellants. Apart from that, both the appellants were arrested, when both of them had allegedly suffered an extra judicial confession in the presence of Surinder @ Sunder, M.C, but he did not support the case of the prosecution. Learned counsel further contends that even the dead body of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur, since deceased was not identified by any private witness and the dead body of some other person was planted in the present case. Even, the prosecution had utterly failed to prove the evidence with regard to the identity of the dead body and thus, the appellants were liable to be acquitted by this Court.

10. On the other hand, learned State counsel vehemently argued that Des Raj-PW-1 was declared hostile, but he had clearly stated that Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur, since deceased was married to appellant No.1 several years ago and due to temperamental differences between them, she was living separately from appellant No.1. Even, later on, appellant No.1 had developed illicit relations with appellant No.2 and they had started living separately from Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur. Thus, even PW-1 Des Raj had clearly supported the case of the prosecution. Apart from that, the appellants had suffered an extra judicial confession in the presence of Surinder @ Sunder,



M.C and they were produced before the police. They were interrogated and were questioned. On finding sufficient evidence, both the appellants were ordered to be arrested by the police and they suffered their disclosure statements Ex.PF & Ex. PG. In pursuance of disclosure statements suffered by both the appellants, the dead body of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur, since deceased was recovered from the old house of appellant No.1. Thus, the recovery which was effected in the presence of Executive Magistrate and two Medical Officers were sufficient to bring home the guilt of the appellants and the present appeal is liable to be dismissed by this Court.

11. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully; with their able assistance.

12. In the present case, undoubtedly, the criminal machinery was set into motion after recording the statement (Ex.PA) of Des Raj-PW-1. During the course of trial, Des Raj appeared as PW-1 and he admitted the case of the prosecution only to the extent that appellant No.1 had earlier married to Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur and one son & one daughter were born out of the said wedlock. Appellant No.1 was also residing separately from them for the last about 10 years. Still further, he did not know if Amarjit Singh-appellant No.1 had developed illicit relations with Malkiat Kaur-appellant No.2. However, he admitted the marriage of appellant No.1 with Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur several years ago and also the fact that appellant No.1 had married appellant No.2 and they were residing separately. Consequently, even from the testimony of PW-1, it was easy to infer the motive for causing the murder of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur as appellant No.1 had developed illicit relations with appellant No.2. Still further, from the prosecution evidence,



it is apparent that both the appellants had appeared before Surinder @ Sunder, M.C on 28.09.2002 and suffered their extra judicial confession before him with regard to committing murder of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur by strangulating her and further her dead body was buried in their old house and they also requested him to produce them before the police as they had committed a blunder. During the course of trial, Surinder @ Sunder, M.C was examined as PW-7, but he did not support the case of the prosecution. However, it is a fact that on 29.09.2002, both the appellants were arrested and were thoroughly interrogated in the presence of ASI Gurdev Singh PW-3 and Inspector Devinder Singh PW-10. In the presence of ASI Gurdev Singh PW-3, the appellants suffered their respective disclosure statements Ex.PF & Ex.PG. Thereafter, SHO Devinder Singh instructed PW-3 ASI Gurdev Singh to move an application to Civil Surgeon, Bathinda as well as to SDM, Bathinda for deputing Medical Officers as well as the Executive Magistrate to witness the recovery likely to be effected in pursuance of the disclosure statements suffered by the appellants. Accordingly, Dr.Bharat Bhushan Jindal and Dr. Kasturi Lal and Harbans Singh, Naib Tehsildar-cum-Executive Magistrate PW-5 were deputed to witness the recovery. Thereafter, the police team accompanied by two doctors and the Executive Magistrate reached the old house of appellant No.1 and exhumed the dead body/skelton of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur, since deceased. The skelton was identified to be that of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur by PW-1 Des Raj and PW-2 Bikramjit Singh @ Bikky. Apart from that, the prosecution also examined PW-4 Dr. Kasturi Lal, who was an independent witness and was part of the team, which had exhumed the dead body from the old house of appellant No.1. He clearly stated that he along with



Executive Magistrate and one more doctor reached the place of recovery and the site was dug in their presence and the process of exhuming the dead body started after their arrival at the spot. The prosecution further examined PW-5 Harbans Singh Sekhon, Naib Tehsildar-cum-Executive Magistrate, Nathana, who stated that the last remains and bones etc. were recovered after digging the site, at the instance of both the appellants. Even, the recovery proceedings of the skelton were carried out and reduced into writing by the Medical Officers and he had also signed the proceedings. Apart from that, the entire process of exhuming the dead body was carried out in the presence of PW-9 Gurjit Singh, Photographer, who had clicked the photographs Ex.PW-9/1 to Ex.PW-9/9 and the negatives were Ex.PW-9/10 to Ex.PW-9/18. He also conducted the videography of the spot of recovery of dead body and the video Casettee was converted into parcel and the parcel was Ex.PW-9/19 and the memo in this regard was prepared, which was Ex.PW-9/20. This clearly shows that the dead body/skelton/last remains of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur, since deceased were recovered by the police in the presence of two Medical Officers and one Executive Magistrate and the recovery was effected at the instance of both the appellants.

13. Learned counsel for the appellants had raised an argument that the dead body of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur was not identified by any witness and rather, the dead body was of some other person. In fact, as per the statement of PW-12 Dr. S.S Sandhu, it was a dead body of a female aged about 35 to 40 years, whereas, the age of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur was about 53 years at the time of the incident. Apart from that, PW-1 Des Raj had not supported the case of the prosecution and no witness had made a statement with



regard to identification of the dead body of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur. However, we do not find any merits in the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the appellants. The complete proceedings regarding digging up of earth and exhuming the dead body of Paramdeep Kaur were conducted in the presence of a Executive Magistrate i.e. Harbans Singh Sekhon PW-5, PW-4 Dr. Kasturi Lal and Dr. Bharat Bhushan Jindal. Even, all the said witnesses had categorically stated that the police had recovered the skelton/last remains of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur from the backyard of the house of appellant No.1 and the recovery was made at the instance of appellants. The testimonies of three independent witnesses were duly corroborated by the statements of PW-3 ASI Gurdev Singh and PW-10 Inspector Devinder Singh. In fact, we have carefully perused the testimonies of these official witnesses and they had no reason to falsely involve the appellants in a criminal case. All the above stated witnesses were subjected to lengthy cross examination and nothing could be elicited from their testimonies, which could discredit them in any manner. Apart from that, PW-12 Dr. S.S Sandhu had only formed an opinion with regard to the age of the deceased, on the basis of the skelton of Paramdeep Kaur @ Pardeep Kaur, who was a grown up lady and the age difference as highlighted by learned defence counsel was of no consequence, when the dead body had been duly identified by the witnesses during the process of investigation.

14. Even otherwise, we have carefully perused the findings recorded by the Trial Court and finds that the Trial Court has discussed the evidence led by both the sides in detail and has correctly appreciated the evidence. Even, we find that the impugned judgment dated 27.05.2004 and order of sentence dated

28.05.2004 passed by the Trial Court do not suffer from any material irregularity, illegality or perversity.

15. Accordingly, impugned judgment dated 27.05.2004 and order of sentence dated 28.05.2004, passed by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda are ordered to be upheld by this Court and the present appeal is ordered to be dismissed.

16. Ordered accordingly.

17. The appellants may be taken in custody forthwith, if on bail, to serve the remaining sentence.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

03.02.2026
hitesh

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No