

CNR No. MHAM030010032016



Presented on : 03.02.2016

Registered on : 03.02.2016

Decided on : 04.09.2024

Duration :08Y. 07M. 01D

**IN THE COURT OF 8th ADDITIONAL CHIEF JUDICIAL
MAGISTRATE, AMRAVATI**

(Presided over by Rajendra T. Ghogle)

Reg. Criminal Case No. 125/2016
(Old Reg. Criminal Case No. 602/2013)

Exh. 125

Assistant Conservator of Forest, (M.L.U.),
East Melghat Forest Division,
Chikhaldara, Tq. Chikhaldara,
H.Q. Paratwada, Dist. Amravati. **Complainant.**

V E R S U S

1. **Nanji S/o. Bhura Sakom,**
aged about - 68 yrs. Occu. - Agriculture
2. **Babulal S/o. Bhura Sakom,**
aged about - 73 yrs. Occu. - Agriculture
3. **Sunil S/o. Bisram Mawaskar,**
aged about - 27 yrs. Occu. - Labour
4. **Sunderlal S/o. Janglya Mandekar,**
aged about - 48 yrs. Occu. - Agriculture
5. **Suresh Rangu Belkar,**
aged about - 48 yrs. Occu. - Labour
All R/o. Chichkheda, Tq. Chikhaldara,
Dist. Amravati. **Accused**

**OFFENCE UNDER SECTION 9 PUNISHABLE UNDER SECTION 51
OF WILD LIFE PROTECTION ACT, 1972.**

Shri. K. S. Lawate, Ld. A.G.P for the State.
Shri. A. H. Shaikh, Ld. Advocate for accused persons.

J U D G M E N T

(Delivered on 04th day of September 2024)

Accused persons are prosecuted for offence under section 9 punishable under section 51 of Wild Life Protection Act, 1972 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act').

2. Shorn of superfluities, the indictment against accused persons runs as under :-

On 08.10.2013, information pertaining to encroachment of forest land was reported in Kundi Sr. No. 1 of Ambapati Beat Tembursonda Round. The forest officers visited the area and found trifling activity, so in pursuance of the said forest offence a P.O.R. was drawn. At the spot, the forest official found foul smell and so they searched the said area. They suspected some soil having dug, so also, the portion of trees purposefully kept on the same.

3. On 09.10.2013 forest officials including R.F.O., Round Officer, Pancha and others visited the spot. A team of veterinary doctors also visited with them. At about 09.00 p.m. the said team was on spot and prepared panchnama. The forest officers informed the higher officers, accordingly the permissions were sought, then the said place in presence of panchas was dug open and it was found that a tiger skeleton was found, along with decomposed skin and flesh was also seen. The nails and teeth of the said tiger skeleton were missing.

Judgment

The sample of bone and skin were taken and were sealed on spot. The entire skeleton was kept in bag and also sealed at the spot, in presence of panchas by drawing panchnama. Thereafter, P.O.R. No. 10/10 was registered under Wild Life Protection Act, 1972.

4. The accused No. 1 had done encroachment in Kundi Serial No. 1 Ambapati Beat. He was called on 11.10.2013 and his statement was recorded. He revealed that, he along with other accused Nos. 2 to 5 had hunted the said Tiger and subsequently buried the said Tiger. Accused Nos. 2 to 5 gave their statement that they have committed the hunting of Tiger. Accused Nos. 2 to 5 by way of discovery had given missing teeth and nails of the Tiger which were in their possession and they had exclusive knowledge of the said possession. The nails and teeth were seized by seizure panchnama from accused Nos. 2 to 5 in presence of panchas. The Authorized Investigating Officer has recorded confession of accused Nos. 1 to 5 and they have confessed that they have committed hunting of Tiger. The area of forest is reserved forest. The Tiger (*Panthera Tigris*) is Schedule-I animal. On completion of investigation, complaint was filed against accused persons under Section 9 punishable under Section 51 of Wild Life Protection Act, Section 26(1)(d)(i) of Indian Forest Act, Rule 10 of Bombay Forest Rules and Section 52 of Wild Life Protection Act, 1972.

5. My Learned Predecessor has framed the charge against accused persons for the offence under Section 9 punishable under section 51 of the Act at Exh. 60 and explained the contents thereof to accused persons. The accused persons abjured the guilt and claimed for trial vide Exh. 61 to 65.

Judgment

6. At the trial, to substantiate the indictment against accused persons, the prosecution has examined nine witnesses. Thereafter, the statement of accused persons under section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure came to be recorded. The defence of accused persons is of denial and false implication. At the conclusion of the trial, I have heard Ld. A.G.P. and Ld. Advocate for accused persons, at length.

7. In the light of charge against accused persons, evidence on record, statement of accused under section 313 of Code of Criminal Procedure and the rival submissions at the bar, the following point arises for my determination. I have recorded my findings against each of them for the reasons to follows:-

Sr. No.	<u>POINTS</u>	<u>FINDINGS</u>
1)	Whether the prosecution proves that, accused persons, in furtherance of their common intention, committed hunting of Tiger in reserved forest area?	In the negative. However, accused persons have committed offence under section 39(3) of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972
2)	What order?	As per final order.

REASONS

AS TO POINT NO. 1 :-

8. The evidence relied upon by the prosecution in order to establish the guilt of accused persons, consist of :-

Judgment

- i) the evidence of R.F.O. Anjangaon, Shri. Talwade (PW-1) at Exh. 29.
- ii) the evidence of Forest Guard, Tembrusonda Shri. Girhe (PW-2) at Exh. 42.
- iii) the evidence of Round Officer, Tembrusonda Shri. Masood Khan (PW-3) at Exh. 44.
- iv) the evidence of panch, Belsare (PW- 4) at Exh. 47.
- v) the evidence of Dr. Khan (PW-5) at Exh. 49.
- vi) the evidence of panch, Birju (PW-6) at Exh. 51.
- vii) the evidence of panch, Waghmare (PW-7) at Exh. 52.
- viii) the evidence of Investigating Officer, A.C.F. East Melghat, Shri. Jagtap (PW-8) at Exh. 77.
- ix) the evidence of Veterinary Dr. Kale (PW-9) at Exh. 116.

9. Talwade (PW-1) is the RFO, of Anjangaon Surji division. He states that, on 09.10.2013, he was on patrolling duty, at that time he had received a call from Forest Guard Girhe. He went to the spot and found that some trees were in broken condition, soil was dug and there was smell of deceased animal. The Panchas were called and after digging the soil, a skeleton of a wild animal was seen. The yellow and black strips were found on the skin. He prepared panchnama Exh. 30 in presence of panchas.

10. Talwade (PW-1) further states that, Jagtap (PW-8) recorded confession statements and accordingly nails and teeth of tiger were seized in his presence as per panchnama Exh. 33 to 36. The accused persons were arrested and arrest panchnama Exh. 37 to 41 was prepared. No material was brought on record to discredit or

Judgment

disbelieve his evidence on the aspect of spot panchnama Exh. 30 and panchnama of nails and teeth seized in his presence Exh. 33 to 36.

11. In cross-examination Talwade has boldly admitted that, spot of panchnama is adjacent to the agriculture field of accused No. 1. He admits that, accused No. 1 cultivates crops in forest division. He also admits that, he had drawn panchnama Exh. 31. Thus, from his cross-examination it emerges that, the spot of incident is adjacent to the agriculture field of accused No. 1 and he is doing cultivation in forest division.

12. Girhe (PW-2) is a Forest Guard, Tembrusonda. He states that, on 09.10.2013 he was on patrolling duty. He found some piece were in broken condition and there was smell of deceased animal. He had phoned to his senior official and lodged Primary Offence Register (POR) No. 10/10 Exh. 43. During cross-examination, suggestions were given to him by accused persons that, it does not contain the name of accused persons, which he has denied. He has admitted that, accused persons had made encroachment on the forest land. Thus, P.O.R. Exh. 43 has been duly proved.

13. Masood Khan (PW-3) is the Forest Officer of Tembrusonda Division. He states that, he had went to Kundi Survey No. 1. After digging ditch, he found skeleton of Tiger. The nails and teeth were missing. The skeleton was in fragmented condition. The veterinary doctor had taken sample of hair, skin and bone. The panchnama was drawn and skeleton was burned and disposed of. On 09.10.2013, accused Nanji had stated the names of other accused persons.

Judgment

14. During cross-examination, Masood Khan (PW-3) admits that, accused No. 1 had done encroachment on forest land. He admits that, adjacent to agriculture field there is a nala(Brook) in which the Tiger skeleton was found. He admits that on 09.10.2013 panchnama was prepared and on the same day P.O.R. Exh. 43 was registered. Merely, before drawing panchnama, no notice was issued to panchas would not be the ground to discard the panchnama. Thus, the evidence of Masood (PW-3) would be helpful to the prosecution to show that Tiger's skeleton without nails and skin was found on the spot.

15. Belsare (PW-4) is panch witness to spot panchnama Exh. 30 and seizure panchnama Exh. 48. He states that, Forest Officer had called him in Kundi Survey No. 1. At that time, Forest Officers and Guards were present. In his presence spot panchnama Exh. 30 was drawn and bones, hair and soil were seized vide seizure panchnama Exh. 48. In cross-examination he admits that, he does not know the contents of panchnama and nothing was seized in his presence. Thus, his evidence would not be helpful to prosecution.

16. Dr. Bashirullah Khan (PW-5) is veterinary doctor. On 09.10.2013, he along with Forest Officer had visited Kundi forest. He further states that, from the spot bones, skin and sample of hair was seized and panchnama Exh. 48 was drawn. The said seized and sealed articles were handed over to Talwade (PW-1). The articles were taken to Achalpur Hospital and microscopic examination was done in presence of other doctors. He prepared Laboratory Specimen Form Exh. 50.

Judgment

17. The Laboratory Specimen Form Exh. 50 was duly proved in the evidence of Dr. Bashirullah Khan (PW-5). He admits that, the information written in record of Necropsy Examination is true and correct. He boldly replied that, it was prepared by Dr. V. S. Rahate. He has identified signature Exh. 70. Thus, his evidence would be helpful to show that, he along with Dr. Rahate had made autopsy of the animal.

18. Birju (PW-6) is pancha to seizure panchnama Exh. 48. He states that, in his presence bones, skin and skeleton were drawn. He further wants the court to believe that, the panchnama was prepared between 05.00 to 05.30 p.m. At that time, another panch Moti Belsare was present. The nails and teeth were seized vide seizure panchnama Exh. 33 to 36. Thus, his evidence is of formal nature.

19. Waghmare (PW-7) is panch witness to sealing of articles i.e. tiger's bones and skin. He states that, panchnama Exh. 53 pertaining to sealing of tiger's bones and skin was done in his presence. At that time, other forest officers were also present. The panchnama was drawn within twenty minutes. In cross-examination, he replied that, he is working in Forest Department and on the say of his superior, he had signed the panchnama Exh. 53. Thus, his evidence would not be helpful to the prosecution in respect of panchnama in respect of sealing of articles Exh. 53.

20. Jagtap (PW-8) is the Assistant Conservative Officer of forest at East Melghat region. On 09.10.2013, he had received an information from Range Forest Officer, Anjangaon that Tiger has died.

Judgment

He along with staff of Forest Department went to the spot. He found that accused No. 1 had encroached the forest land. Near his land, there was Nala (Brook). In Nala they saw hair of Tiger, hence they dug the spot. They found the skeleton of Tiger. The specimens were seized and sealed vide seizure panchnama Exh. 48. He had signed the seizure panchnama Exh. 48. The seizure panchnama Exh. 48 also bears signature of B. B. Khan (PW-5). Hence, the seizure panchnama Exh. 48 has been duly proved in his evidence.

21. Jagtap (PW-8) further states that, a panchnama pertaining to sealing of article Exh. 53 was done in his presence. There is no reason to disbelieve the evidence of Jagtap (PW-8) on the point of sealing of articles. The panchnama Exh. 53 has been duly proved. Jagtap (PW-8) further states that, on 10.10.2013 the remaining organs of the Tiger were burned in presence of panch and panchnama Exh. 32 was drawn. The panchnama Exh. 32 bears signature of Dr. Kale (PW-9). Dr. Kale states that, on 10.10.2013, all the bones of Tiger were burned in his presence and panchnama Exh. 32 was drawn. Thus, I do accept the positive evidence of Dr. Kale (PW-9) on the point of drawing of panchnama of burning of bones. Hence, panchnama Exh. 32 has been duly proved.

22. Jagtap (PW-8) states that on 11.10.2013, Forest Range Officer, Anjangaon arrested all accused vide arrest panchnama Exh. 37 to 41. He further wants the court to believe that, all accused gave confession statement of taking nails and teeth of the Tiger. The confessions statement of accused Nos. 1 to 5 were duly proved vide Exh. 78 to 82 as well as seizure panchnama of nails and teeth Exh. 33

Judgment

to 36. According to Jagtap (PW-8) accused No. 1 had made confession statement that eight to ten days prior to the incident, his brother accused No. 2 Babulal and accused No. 4 Sundarlal informed that, one tiger is dead near his land. The accused Nos. 2 to 4 had confessed that they had taken the nails the teeth of Tiger. No material is brought on record to discredit his evidence, on the point of confession statements. In cross-examination, it is admitted that, confession statements of accused were recorded on 11.10.2013 which is in corroboration with the confession statement Exh. 78 to 82.

23. Jagtap (PW-8) states that, specimen of dead Tiger was sent by Range Officer to Forensic Lab at Wild Life Institute of India, Dehradun. The forensic report Exh. 83 states that the biological material samples are of Tiger (*Panthera Tigris*). The DNA report Exh. 86 states that, the phalange bone is in total degraded and fragmented condition, hence no opinion can be given.

24. Jagtap (PW-8) further states that, Regional Forensic Department, Nagpur vide letter had given CA report Exh. 112. The forensic report Exh. 112 states that, on chemical testing no poison has been revealed. Thus, from forensic report Exh. 112 it emerges that, the death of Tiger was not due to poison.

25. Hunting of any wild animal specified in Schedule-I to IV except provided under section 11 and 12 is prohibited under section 9 of Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972. The term “hunting” is defined in section 2(16) of Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972 as including the killing, poisoning, capturing, cursing, snaring, trapping any wild life

Judgment

etc. Hunting of wild life inevitably disturb the food chain in jungle. Therefore, in order to protect the wild life, stringent punishment is provided for hunting of wild life.

26. The complainant came with the story that, accused Nos. 1 to 5 killed the Tiger scientific name Panther Tigris listed in Schedule-I at Sr. No. 39, appended to Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972 in Kundi Survey of Ambapati Beat. However, as per forensic report Exh. 111, on chemical testing no poison has been revealed. The death of the Tiger was not due to poison. The confession statement Exh. 78 to 82 are totally silent in respect of hunting of Tiger. The Tiger's skeleton was found in decomposed condition. The nails and teeth of the Tiger were missing. The Tiger was found in Nala. There is no cogent and satisfactory evidence on record to show that actual hunting of Tiger was done by accused Nos. 1 to 5. The confession statement Exh. 78 to 82 of accused Nos. 1 to 5 are also totally silent in respect of hunting of Tiger. The cause of death of Tiger was also not revealed. DNA report Exh. 86 states that, no opinion can be given as the phalange bones were totally in degraded and fragmented condition. In these circumstances, it can not be said that, accused Nos. 1 to 5 have done hunting of Tiger.

27. On the point of non examination of independent eye witness by the prosecution, it was argued on behalf of accused that, all the accused are residing in tribal area. Their caste is "Korku" and they are illiterate as well as they have no knowledge of law. The recovery of teeth and nails of Tiger from accused persons creates doubt as prosecution failed to examine any eye witness.

Judgment

28. In retort, it was argued on behalf of prosecution that, if evidence of official witnesses is found reliable and trustworthy, conviction can be based on official witnesses without corroboration of independent witnesses. Amplifying these submission, it was also argued that, confession statement Exh. 78 to 82 of accused persons were duly proved as they have confessed that they have taken nails and teeth of Tiger. These confession statements are in corroboration with the evidences of official witnesses, therefore, the question of examination of independent eye witnesses does not arise.

29. The rule of corroboration is a principle of prudence which should not be applied rigidly or punctiliously. Forest is an area where human activities are scanty expects the clandestine adventures of poachers. The invaders of forest and wild life usually take care that their poaching techniques of unnoticed by others including wild animal. They adopt devices to keep their movements undetected. Hence, it would be pedantic to insists on the rule of corroboration by independent eye witness evidence in proof of offence relating to forest and wild life.

30. On the aspect of confession statements Exh. 78 to 82 by accused persons in respect of taking out nails and teeth of Tiger, it would be pertinent to note that, the confession is a statement made by accused charged with an offence stating or suggesting the inference that, he committed the crime. The confession is very valuable piece of evidence and it is admissible only if making of confession appears to the court that, it has not been caused by any inducement, threat or promise. Before the confession can be relied upon, it is necessary to see that, confession was made voluntarily and it is consistent and true.

Judgment

31. According to prosecution, the evidence of Jagtap (PW-8) is reliable as accused Nos. 1 to 5 have confessed about taking nails and teeth of Tiger. The confession of accused persons before forest official Jagtap (PW-8) can be the basis of conviction. In order to buttress these submissions, the learned advocate for prosecution placed reliance on the case of :-

- I) **Forest Range Officer, Chungathara II Range Vs. Aboobacker and another, reported in 1989 CRI.L.J. 2038**, wherein it has been postulated that, *admissibility of confession made to a forest Range Officer is not open to doubt since the embargo contending section 25 of Evidence Act is not applicable to. The Forest Officers, though they are vested with some of the police powers are not police officers.*
- II) **Matia Palei and another Vs. State of Orissa reported in 2001 CRI.L.J. 1897**, wherein it has been held that, *confession statement made before Forest Officers is admissible in evidence.*

32. I have carefully gone through the said case laws adduced by learned advocate for prosecution. The principles laid down thereunder are well established. In view of the said legal position and provisions of Section 50(8) of Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972, the statement of accused persons recorded by Assistant Conservator of Forest, Jagtap (PW-8), would be admissible in evidence. These statements are also recorded in presence of witnesses, therefore, the evidence of prosecution witness transpires confidence and their testimony would be reliable.

33. The evidence of Assistant Conservator of Forest, Jagtap (PW-8) has been fully corroborated with the statements of accused

Judgment

Nos. 1 to 5 Exh. 78 to 82. There was absolute no reason for Jagtap (PW-8) to falsely implicate accused persons in the above incident of taking out nails and teeth of Tiger. The evidence of Talwade (PW-1) in respect of Spot Panchnama Exh. 30 and nails and teeth of Tiger seized in his presence Exh. 33 and 36, is quite believable. The P.O.R. Exh. 43 is duly proved in the evidence of Girhe (PW-2). The evidence of Masood (PW-3) would be helpful to show that tiger's skeleton without nails and teeth was found at the spot of incident. Thus, the evidence of Forest Officials would be sufficient to establish the involvement of accused persons in the incident of taking nails and teeth of Tiger.

34. As per the provisions of clause (a) of sub section (1) of Section 39 of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972 wild animal hunted in contravention of any of the provisions of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972 shall be the property of State Government. Sub section 3 of section 39 lays down that no person shall without permission in writing of the Chief Wild Life Warden or authorized officer (a) acquire or keep in his possession, custody or control, or (b) transfer to any person whether by way of gift, sale or otherwise, or (c) destroy or damage such government property.

35. As stated above, accused Nos. 2 to 5 in confession statement Exh. 79 to 82 have stated that, they have taken out nails and teeth of Tiger. The accused No. 1 in confession statement Exh. 78 has stated that, he had buried the tiger near his land. The confession statement Exh. 78 to 82 were duly proved in the evidence of Jagtap (PW-8). The body parts i.e. nails and teeth of Tiger are government property. It was the duty of the accused No. 1 to inform the Forest

Judgment

Authority about the death of tiger near his land. However, accused No. 1 buried the tiger without informing the forest authorities. Thus, accused Nos. 1 to 5 have acted in contravention of section 39(3) of Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972.

36. The process was issued against accused Nos. 1 to 5 for offence under section 9, 39 50, 51, 52 of Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972, section 26 (1)(d)(i) of Indian Forest Act, 1947 and Rule 10 of Bombay Forest Rules. My learned predecessor has framed charge only under Section 9 of Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972. However, on going through the evidence of prosecution, it emerges that accused persons have committed offence under Section 39(3) punishable under Section 51 of Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972. Here it would be profitable to rely on Section 221(2) of Code of Criminal Procedure, which states as under :

“Where it appears from the evidence that, accused have committed different offence for which they might have charged under provisions of sub section 1, he may be convicted for the offence which he is shown to have been committed, although he was not charged with it”.

37. In view of the provision of section 221(2) of Code of Criminal Procedure, accused persons have contravened the provision of section 39(3) of Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972. On the other hand, my learned predecessor has framed charge vide section 221, 222 and 223 of Code of Criminal Procedure. Thus, in view of section 221(2) of Code of Criminal Procedure, offence has been committed by

Judgment

accused person under section 39(3) punishable under section 51 of Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972.

38. As stated above, there is no cogent and satisfactory evidence brought on record to show that accused persons have committed offence of hunting of tiger. The forensic report Exh. 112 states that, no poison has been revealed and death of the Tiger was not due to poison. The DNA report Exh. 86 states that, no opinions can be given in respect of death of Tiger. However, from the evidence of witnesses and confession statements of accused Exh. 78 to 82, it emerges that, accused Nos. 1 to 5 had taken out the nails and teeth of Tiger and they were found in their custody. The seizure panchnama Exh. 33 to 36 has been duly proved. Thus, accused Nos. 1 to 5 have committed offence under section 39(3) punishable under section 51 of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972. In the result, I answer point No. 1 accordingly.

AS TO POINT NO. 2 :-

39. The conspectus of aforesaid discussion and the finding on point No. 1 that, the offence under section 39(3) punishable under section 51 of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972, can be said to have been established beyond the reasonable doubt. Hence, accused persons are liable to be convicted for the offence under section 39(3) punishable under section 51 of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972. At this juncture, I take a pause to hear accused persons on the point of sentence.

Judgment

40. Heard Learned Advocate for accused persons Shri. S. A. Shaikh on the point of sentence. She submitted that there is no previous conviction to their credit. Accused persons are only earning members of their family. Hence, leniency be shown to them.

41. Per contra, Ld. A.G.P. Shri. K. S. Lawate states that considering the nature of offence committed by accused persons, maximum punishment be imposed to accused persons.

42. I have given my anxious consideration to the plea of leniency and stern sentence. Just desert is considered to be the foundation of punishment. However, the situation in the life of accused persons plays dominant role in determination of sentence. Having regards to the nature of offence and the prescribed punishment therefore, the benefit of Probation of Offenders Act cannot be extended to the accused persons as the offending act of accused persons has effect of ecological balance and food cycle. These acts are normally hidden and concealed.

43. In **Sansar Chand Vs. State of Rajasthan, reported in (2010) 10 SCC 604**, Hon'ble Apex Court has requested to take stringent action against those who are violating the provisions of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, in para 35 as under :

35. Before we part with this case, we would like to request the Central and State Government and their agencies to make all efforts to preserve the wild life of the country and take stringent actions against those who are violating the provisions of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, as this is necessary for maintaining the ecological balance in our country.

Judgment

44. The Tiger (Panthera Tigris) is the national animal of India and also called the Lord of jungle. The tiger was adopted as National Animal by the Indian Board of Wild Life in 1972 in place of the Lion. It is the duty of every citizen to protect the wild life. No doubt, there is no previous conviction to their credit. But, the accused persons have contravened Section 39(3) of Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972. Therefore, in my view the accused persons should not be shown leniency as the offence is serious in nature. In the result, in answer to point No. 2, I pass the following order:-

ORDER

- 1) Accused Nos. 1 to 5 are convicted for the offence under Section 39(3) punishable under section 51 of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972 vide Section 248(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.
- 2) Accused Nos. 1 to 5 are sentenced to suffer simple Imprisonment for Three Years each and to pay fine of Rs. 10,000/- each. In default of payment of fine to undergo further simple imprisonment of three months each, in respect of offence under Section 39(3) punishable under section 51 of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972.
- 3) Accused Nos. 1 to 5 are acquitted for the offence under Section 9 punishable under section 51 of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972 vide Section 248(1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

Judgment

- 4) Accused Nos. 1 to 5 to surrender their bail bonds.
- 5) The set off be given to accused Nos. 1 to 5 vide section 428 of Code of Criminal Procedure for the period which they have undergone in prison from 11.10.2013 to 31.12.2013.
- 6) Copy of this Judgment be given to the accused persons free of cost immediately.

Amravati.
Date :- 04/09/2024.

(Rajendra T. Ghogle)
8th Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate,
Amravati