

(2015) 09 GUJ CK 0069
In the Gujarat High Court
Case No : Criminal Appeal No. 18 of 2006

State of Gujarat

APPELLANT

Vs

Rasikbhai Damabhai Vasava

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 29-09-2015

Acts Referred:

Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (CrPC) — Section 313, 378
Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) — Section 302, 34

Citation : (2015) 09 GUJ CK 0069

Hon'ble Judges : K.S. Jhaveri, J;G.B. Shah, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : C.M. Shah, A.P.P., for the Appellant; Tejas M. Barot, Advocates for the Respondent

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

K.S. Jhaveri, J—The present appeal, under section 378 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, is directed against the judgement and order dated 21.12.2004 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Camp at Anand in Sessions Case No. 188 of 2004 whereby the accused has been acquitted of the charges leveled against him.

2. The brief facts of the prosecution case are that the accused was residing with his sister - the complainant and her husband. It is the case of the prosecution that on 23.05.2004 at about 08.00 pm, while the complainant and the deceased were sitting, a hot discussion took place between the complainant, her husband and the accused and in a fit of rage the accused inflicted iron pipe blows on the head of deceased which resulted into the death of the deceased. A complaint was therefore filed by complainant Savitaben. Thereafter, necessary panchnama was prepared. Pursuant to the complaint, investigation was carried out. After investigation, charge-sheet was filed and as the case was triable by the Court of Sessions, it was committed to the Court of Sessions.

2.1 The trial Court framed charge against the accused. The accused pleaded not

guilty to the charge and claimed to be tried. Therefore, the prosecution produced 7 witnesses as oral evidence as well as 13 documentary evidence. At the end of the trial and after recording the further statement of the accused under section 313 of Cr.P.C., and hearing arguments on behalf of prosecution and the defence, the learned Additional Sessions Judge acquitted the respondent of all the charges leveled against him vide impugned judgement and order. Being aggrieved by and dissatisfied with the aforesaid judgement and order passed by the Sessions Court the appellant State has preferred the present appeal.

3. Ms. Shah, learned APP appearing for the appellant-State has submitted that the trial court committed an error in releasing the respondent-accused. It was contended by Ms. Shah, that the judgement and order of the Sessions Court is against the provisions of law; the Sessions Court has not properly considered the evidence led by the prosecution and looking to the provisions of law itself it is established that the prosecution has proved the whole ingredients of the evidence against the present respondent. Learned APP has also taken this court through the oral as well as the entire documentary evidence.

4. Mr. Tejas Barot, learned advocate appearing for the respondent supported the impugned judgement and order and submitted that the same having been passed in accordance with law does not call for any interference. He submitted that the prosecution has failed to prove the case against the respondent beyond reasonable doubt. He submitted that the entire prosecution case is doubtful.

5. At the outset it is required to be noted that the principles which would govern and regulate the hearing of appeal by this Court against an order of acquittal passed by the trial Court have been very succinctly explained by the Apex Court in a catena of decisions. In the case of *M.S. Narayana Menon @ Mani Vs. State of Kerala and Another*, AIR 2006 SC 3366 : (2006) 3 BC 433 : (2006) 132 CompCas 450 : (2006) 6 CompLJ 39 : (2006) CriLJ 4607 : (2006) 3 CTC 730 : (2006) 6 JT 72 : (2006) 6 SCALE 393 : (2006) 6 SCC 39 : (2006) 3 SCR 124 Supp : (2006) AIRSCW 4652 : (2006) 5 Supreme 547 , the Apex Court has narrated about the powers of the High Court in appeal against the order of acquittal. In para 54 of the decision, the Apex Court has observed as under:

"54. In any event the High Court entertained an appeal treating to be an appeal against acquittal, it was in fact exercising the revisional jurisdiction. Even while exercising an appellate power against a judgement of acquittal, the High Court should have borne in mind the well-settled principles of law that where two view are possible, the appellate court should not interfere with the finding of acquittal recorded by the court below."

5.1 Further, in the case of *Chandrappa and Others Vs. State of Karnataka*, (2007) CriLJ 2136 : (2007) 3 JT 316 : (2007) 3 SCALE 90 : (2007) 4 SCC 415 : (2007) 2 SCR 630 the Apex Court laid down the following principles:

"42. From the above decisions, in our considered view, the following general principles regarding powers of the appellate court while dealing with an appeal

against an order of acquittal emerge:

[1] An appellate court has full power to review, reappraise and reconsider the evidence upon which the order of acquittal is founded.

[2] The Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 puts no limitation, restriction or condition on exercise of such power and an appellate court on the evidence before it may reach its own conclusion, both on questions of fact and of law.

[3] Various expressions, such as, "substantial and compelling reasons", "good and sufficient grounds", "very strong circumstances", "distorted conclusions", "glaring mistakes", etc. are not intended to curtail extensive powers of an appellate court in an appeal against acquittal. Such phraseologies are more in the nature of "flourishes of language" to emphasis the reluctance of an appellate court to interfere with acquittal than to curtail the power of the court to review the evidence and to come to its own conclusion.

[4] An appellate court, however, must bear in mind that in case of acquittal there is double presumption in favour of the accused. Firstly, the presumption of innocence is available to him under the fundamental principle of criminal jurisprudence that every person shall be presumed to be innocent unless he is proved guilty by a competent court of law. Secondly, the accused having secured his acquittal, the presumption of his innocence is further reinforced, reaffirmed and strengthened by the trial court.

[5] If two reasonable conclusions are possible on the basis of the evidence on record, the appellate court should not disturb the finding of acquittal recorded by the trial court."

5.2 Thus, it is a settled principle that while exercising appellate power, even if two reasonable conclusions are possible on the basis of the evidence on record, the appellate court should not disturb the finding of acquittal recorded by the trial court.

5.3 Even in a recent decision of the Apex Court in the case of State of Goa Vs. Sanjay Thakran and Another, (2007) 5 JT 146 : (2007) 3 SCALE 740 : (2007) 3 SCC 755 : (2007) 3 SCR 507 , the Court has reiterated the powers of the High Court in such cases. In para 16 of the said decision the Court has observed as under:

"16. From the aforesaid decisions, it is apparent that while exercising the powers in appeal against the order of acquittal the Court of appeal would not ordinarily interfere with the order of acquittal unless the approach of the lower Court is vitiated by some manifest illegality and the conclusion arrived at would not be arrived at by any reasonable person and, therefore, the decision is to be characterized as perverse. Merely because two views are possible, the Court of appeal would not take the view which would upset the judgement delivered by the Court below. However, the appellate court has a power to review the evidence if it is of the view that the conclusion arrived at by the Court below is

perverse and the Court has committed a manifest error of law and ignored the material evidence on record. A duty is cast upon the appellate court, in such circumstances, to re-appreciate the evidence to arrive to a just decision on the basis of material placed on record to find out whether any of the accused is connected with the commission of the crime he is charged with."

5.4 Similar principle has been laid down by the Apex Court in the cases of State of Uttar Pradesh Vs. Ram Veer Singh and Others, AIR 2007 SC 3075 : (2007) 10 SCALE 545 : (2007) 13 SCC 102 : (2007) 10 SCR 689 : (2007) AIRSCW 5553 : (2007) 6 Supreme 164 and in Girja Prasad (Dead) by LRs. Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh, AIR 2007 SC 3106 : (2007) 10 JT 421 : (2007) 10 SCALE 358 : (2007) 7 SCC 625 : (2007) AIRSCW 5589 : (2007) 6 Supreme 49 . Thus, the powers which this Court may exercise against an order of acquittal are well settled.

5.5 In the case of Lunaram Vs. Bhupat Singh and Others, (2009) CriLJ 1899 : (2009) 3 JT 155 : (2009) 3 SCALE 363 : (2009) 3 SCC 749 : (2009) 3 SCR 706 : (2010) AIRSCW 298 : (2009) 7 Supreme 103 ,the Apex Court in paras 10 and 11 has held as under:

"10. The High Court has noted that the prosecution version was not clearly believable. Some of the so-called eye witnesses stated that the deceased died because his ankle was twisted by an accused. Others said that he was strangled. It was the case of the prosecution that the injured witnesses were thrown out of the bus. The doctor who conducted the post-mortem and examined the witnesses had categorically stated that it was not possible that somebody would throw a person out of the bus when it was in a running condition.

11. Considering the parameters of appeal against the judgement of acquittal, we are not inclined to interfere in this appeal. The view of the High Court cannot be termed to be perverse and is a possible view on the evidence."

5.6 Even in a recent decision of the Apex Court in the case of Mookkiah and Another Vs. State rep. by the Inspector of Police, Tamil Nadu, AIR 2013 SC 321 : (2013) 1 Crimes 8 : (2013) 1 JT 626 : (2013) 1 SCALE 95 : (2013) 2 SCC 89 : (2013) AIRSCW 339 : (2013) 1 Supreme 88 , the Apex Court in para 4 has held as under:

4. It is not in dispute that the trial Court, on appreciation of oral and documentary evidence led in by the prosecution and defence, acquitted the accused in respect of the charges leveled against them. On appeal by the State, the High Court, by impugned order, reversed the said decision and convicted the accused under Section 302 read with Section 34 of IPC and awarded RI for life. Since counsel for the appellants very much emphasized that the High Court has exceeded its jurisdiction in upsetting the order of acquittal into conviction, let us analyze the scope and power of the High Court in an appeal filed against the order of acquittal. This Court in a series of decisions has repeatedly laid down that as the first appellate court the High Court even while dealing with an appeal

against acquittal, was also entitled, and obliged as well, to scan through and if need be reappreciate the entire evidence, though while choosing to interfere only the court should find an absolute assurance of the guilt on the basis of the evidence on record and not merely because the High Court could take one more possible or a different view only. Except the above, where the matter of the extent and depth of consideration of the appeal is concerned, no distinctions or differences in approach are envisaged in dealing with an appeal as such merely because one was against conviction or the other against an acquittal. [Vide State of Rajasthan Vs. Sohan Lal and Others, (2004) CriLJ 3842 : (2004) 5 JT 388 : (2004) 5 SCALE 86 : (2004) 5 SCC 573 : (2004) SCC(L&S) 1078 : (2004) 2 SCR 480 Supp : (2004) 2 UJ 1118 : (2004) AIRSCW 4321 : (2004) AIRSCW 5560 : (2004) 6 Supreme 669 : (2004) 3 Supreme 404 J"]

5.7 It is also a settled legal position that in acquittal appeal, the appellate court is not required to re-write the judgement or to give fresh reasonings, when the reasons assigned by the Court below are found to be just and proper. Such principle is laid down by the Apex Court in the case of State of Karnataka Vs. Hemareddy Alias Vemareddy and Another, AIR 1981 SC 1417 : (1981) CriLJ 1019 : (1981) 1 SCALE 206 : (1981) 2 SCC 185 : (1981) SCC(Cri) 395 : (1981) 2 SCR 695 wherein it is held as under:

"...This court has observed in Girja Nandini Devi and Others Vs. Bijendra Narain Choudhury, AIR 1967 SC 1124 : (1967) 1 SCR 93 that it is not the duty of the appellate court when it agrees with the view of the trial court on the evidence to repeat the narration of the evidence or to reiterate the reasons given by the trial court expression of general agreement with the reasons given by the Court the decision of which is under appeal, will ordinarily suffice."

5.8 Thus, in case the appellate court agrees with the reasons and the opinion given by the lower court, then the discussion of evidence at length is not necessary.

6. We have examined the matter carefully and gone through the evidence on record. We have appreciated, reappreciated and re-evaluated the evidence on the touchstone of latest decision of the Hon"ble Apex Court.

6.1 We find that the trial Court while considering the evidence on record, has very elaborately discussed the evidence on record in paras 9 to 12. The trial court has observed that the blood group of the deceased was not ascertained. No blood samples of the deceased were sent for testing. The trial court further observed that the eye witnesses have turned hostile and have not supported the case of the prosecution.

7. Further, learned APP is not in a position to show any evidence to take a contrary view in the matter or that the approach of the Court below is vitiated by some manifest illegality or that the decision is perverse or that the Court below has ignored the material evidence on record. In above view of the matter, we are of the considered opinion that the Court below was completely justified in

passing impugned judgement and order.

8. We are, therefore, of the considered opinion that the findings recorded by the trial Court in acquitting the accused of the charge levelled against him are absolutely just and proper and in recording the said findings, no illegality or infirmity has been committed by it. We are in complete agreement with the reasonings given and the findings arrived at by the trial Court. No interference is warranted with the judgement and order of the trial Court.

9. Accordingly, appeal is hereby dismissed. The judgement and order dated 21.12.2004 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Camp at Anand in Sessions Case No. 188 of 2004 is confirmed qua the acquittal of the respondent. Bail bond, if any, shall stand cancelled. R & P, if lying with this court, to be sent back forthwith.