

IN THE COURT OF MR. HARGURVARINDER SINGH JAGGI,
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE (FTC– 01), SOUTH DISTRICT, SAKET
COURTS, NEW DELHI

[Date of Judgment: 14.09.2026]

SC No.: CNR No.:	6460/2016 DLST01-000032-2014	
FIR No.: Police Station: u/Section:	342/2013 Fatehpur Beri 307 IPC of 1860 25, 27 Arms Act of 1959	
Complainant:		STATE
Represented by –		Mr. Santosh Kumar, Additional Public Prosecutor for the State assisted by Sub-Inspector, Amit Chaudhary (IO).
v.		
Accused Person(s):		PRADEEP SINGH (A1)
Represented by –		Mr. K.K. Manan, Sr. Advocate i/b Mr. Ritik Sharma, Ms. Tanya Tyagi, Ms. Nandini Ohri, Ms. Jagriti and Ms. Reenaya Grover, Advocates.

Date of Offence:	08.10.2013
Date of FIR:	08.10.2013
Date of Chargesheet:	06.01.2014
Date of Framing Charges:	17.05.2014
Date of Commencement of Evidence:	14.07.2014
Date of Judgment reserved:	10.08.2026
Date of pronouncement of Judgment:	14.09.2026
Date of the Sentencing Order, if any:	TBA¹

Form-B

S.No.	Rank of the Accused	Name of the Accused	Date of Arrest	Date of Release on Bail	Offences Charged	Whether Acquitted or Convicted	Sentence Imposed	Period of detention undergone during Trial for purpose of Section 428 CrPC :: 468 BNSS
i.	A1	Pradeep Singh S/o Rambir	11.10.2013	03.06.2014	307 IPC 25, 27 Arms Act	Convicted	TBA ²	235 days

¹ To Be Announced (TBA)

² *ibid.*

JUDGMENT

14.09.2026

1. The sole accused, Pradeep Singh, S/o Rambir, stands trial before this Court upon a formal charge-sheet submitted by the Delhi Police (PS Fatehpur Beri) under Section 307 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) [corresponding to Section 109 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023] and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959, arising out of FIR No. 342/2013.

Facts

2. The prosecution alleges that on the evening of 08.10.2013, at Mandi Village, New Delhi, the accused retrieved an unlicensed country-made firearm from his residence, aimed it directly at the stomach of the victim, Sunny @ Panna, and fired a fatal-caliber shot with murderous intent, causing severe, life-threatening internal injuries.

3. The genesis of the incident, as delineated in the first information statement of complainant Sh. Pramod (PW-4) and supported by injured victim Sunny alias Panna (PW-5), traces back to an earlier dispute on 06.10.2013. On that date, at a school park in Baliyawas Village, complainant Pramod intervened to rescue accused Pradeep Singh, who was being held and confronted by local youth for allegedly flirting in their village while heavily intoxicated. Feeling humiliated by this public intervention, accused Pradeep Singh harbored severe

malice against Pramod and began subjecting him to continuous abusive and threatening telephonic calls over the subsequent 48 hours.

4. On 08.10.2013, at approximately 5:00 PM, complainant Pramod (PW-4), accompanied by his college friend Sudhir (PW-6), arrived in front of Pradeep's grocery shop (*parchun shop*) in Mandi Village in his Tata Manja car bearing registration number HR-72A-2223, to resolve the ongoing dispute. Upon their arrival, accused Pradeep Singh immediately seized Pramod by his shirt collar, dragged him toward his shop, and retrieved a wooden stick (*danda*) to assault him.

5. Hearing the commotion, local resident Sunny @ Panna (PW-5), whom Pramod had called to join them, arrived at the spot and attempted to intervene and pacify Pradeep. In the midst of a heated verbal exchange, accused Pradeep Singh stormed into his nearby residence, house No. 102, Mandi Village, retrieved an unlicensed country-made 7.65mm pistol, returned to the main road, aimed the firearm directly at the abdomen of Sunny @ Panna, and pulled the trigger. The bullet struck Sunny in his lower abdomen, causing him to collapse in a pool of blood. The accused thereupon fled the scene with the weapon.

Investigation by Police & Charge Sheet

6. Following the shooting, complainant Pramod (PW-4) and Sudhir (PW-6) immediately lifted the bleeding victim, placed him inside the Tata Manja car, and rushed him to Paras Hospital, Sushant Lok, Sector-43, Gurugram, Haryana. At approximately 5:30 PM,

Security Officer Rajesh Kumar (PW-7) of Paras Hospital telephonically alerted PS Fatehpur Beri regarding the admission of a gunshot victim. This information was recorded by Duty Officer ASI Dharampal (PW-2) vide **DD No. 37-A** (Ex.PW2/C).

7. The investigating officer (IO), Sub-Inspector (SI) Amit Chaudhary (PW-12), accompanied by Ct. Shyam Lal (PW-3), immediately proceeded to Paras Hospital. Finding victim Sunny @ Panna unfit for statement due to emergency medical surgery, IO SI Amit Chaudhary recorded the detailed statement of eyewitness Pramod (Ex.PW4/A), prepared *rukka* (Ex.PW12/A) at 7:25 PM, and dispatched Ct. Shyam Lal to the police station for FIR registration. Duty Officer HC Dharam Pal (PW-2) registered **FIR No. 342/2013** at 8:00 PM (Ex. PW2/A). The IO seized the blood-stained t-shirt and clothes of the victim from the hospital vide seizure memo Ex. PW3/A.

8. The IO along with Ct. Shyam Lal and complainant Pramod then visited the spot of occurrence at Mandi Village. The IO prepared the unscaled Site Plan (Ex.PW12/B). During a search of the road in front of the accused's shop, the IO spotted and recovered one empty/used 7.65mm fired cartridge case (Ex.P-2). The IO prepared its sketch memo (Ex.PW3/B), placed the cartridge in a transparent plastic jar, sealed it with the 'AK' seal, and seized it *vide* seizure memo Ex.PW3/C. On October 9, 2013, Crime Team Photographer ASI Rajnesh (PW-13) took six photographs of the spot (Ex. PW13/1-6, negatives Ex.PW13/7).

9. On 11.10.2013, at 6:30 AM, acting on secret intimation, a police raiding party comprising IO SI Amit Chaudhary, SI Satish Kumar (PW-9), and Beat Officer ASI Kailash Chand (PW-8) apprehended accused Pradeep Singh near Mandi Village. He was arrested *vide* Arrest Memo Ex.PW8/A, subjected to personal search *vide* Ex.PW9/A, and recorded a voluntary disclosure statement (Ex.PW9/B).

10. Pursuant to a one-day police custody remand granted by the Ld. Metropolitan Magistrate, accused Pradeep Singh led the police team to his residence at House No. 102, Mandi Village. From inside a wooden bed, a divan located in a left-side room, the accused produced the weapon of offence—an unlicensed improvised country-made 7.65mm pistol with an empty magazine (Ex.P-1), bearing the inscription, “Made in USA, No. 441”. The IO prepared the sketch memo of the pistol (Ex.PW9/C), sealed it in a cloth pullanda with ‘AK’ seal, and seized it *vide* seizure memo (Ex.PW9/D), drawing up pointing-out memos Ex.PW9/E and Ex.PW9/F.

11. On 19.11.2013, MHC(M) ASI Ramesh (PW-18) dispatched the sealed parcels of the crime cartridge (Ex.P-2) and recovered pistol (Ex.P-1) to the Forensic Science Laboratory (FSL), Rohini, through Ct. Sunil Punia (PW-1) *vide* road certificate No. 131/21/13. The Assistant Director, Dr. N.P. Waghmare conducted a comparison microscopic examination and issued FSL ballistics examination report No. FSL 2013/F-8718 dated 30.03.2015 (Ex.PW15/B), conclusively

establishing that the fired empty cartridge (Ex.P-2) recovered from the crime spot was discharged from the recovered country-made pistol Ex. P-1.

Charge & Points of Determination

12. By formal order dated 17.05.2014, the Ld. Predecessor Court framed formal charges against accused Pradeep Singh as under:

12.1. **First Charge (u/s 307 IPC):** That on 08.10.2013 at about 5:00 PM at Mandi Village, New Delhi, he fired upon Sunny @ Panna at his stomach with a firearm, with such intention or knowledge and under such circumstances that if by that act he caused the death of Sunny @ Panna, he would have been guilty of murder.

12.2. **Second Charge (u/s 25/27 Arms Act):** That on the aforesaid date, time, and place, while firing upon Sunny @ Panna, he used an unlicensed country-made pistol (recovered on 11.10.2013) in contravention of Section 3 of the Arms Act.

13. The charges were read over and explained to the accused in vernacular, to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

Points for Determination

14. To decide, the guilt or innocence of the accused, the Court frames the following core points for determination:

- 14.1. Whether the prosecution has established beyond reasonable doubt that on 08.10.2013 at about 5:00 PM in front of his shop at Mandi Village, accused Pradeep Singh intentionally fired a gunshot targeting the abdomen of victim Sunny @ Panna, causing dangerous, life-threatening injuries, with such intention or knowledge that if death had been caused, he would be guilty of murder under Section 307 IPC?
- 14.2. Whether the defence theory of a 'ricochet bullet', alleging that the bullet struck the floor first during a scuffle and bounced back into Sunny's abdomen is a physically and ballistically viable explanation or a manufactured afterthought?
- 14.3. What is the evidentiary effect of the inordinate delay of 3 years and 8 months between the examination-in-chief of complainant Pramod (PW-4) on 19.05.2015 and his cross-examination on 28.01.2019, during which he resiled on the firing trajectory?
- 14.4. Whether accused Pradeep Singh was in unlawful possession of, and used, the unlicensed country-made pistol (Ex.P-1) and fired cartridge (Ex.P-2) in violation of Section 3 of the Arms Act, punishable under Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act?

Prosecution's Evidence

15. To prove the guilt of the accused, the prosecution examined 18 witnesses in total. The prosecution witnesses have been culled into the categories of the primary eyewitnesses, the injured victim, the medical experts, and the Investigating Officer in the following paragraphs of this judgment.

A. Deposition of Complainant / Eyewitness Sh. Pramod (PW-4)

16. Mr. Pramod (PW-4), the complainant and direct eyewitness, was examined-in-chief on **19.05.2015** before Court, who deposed unequivocally as under:

“I am a student doing my diploma from DPG Polytechnic Engineering College. On 06.10.2013, I was playing volleyball in the park... 4-5 people had caught hold of Pradeep, who is brother of my friend Narender. Pradeep was abusing those persons and was under the influence of liquor. Somehow I released Pradeep... After about one hour, Pradeep started calling me on mobile and abusing me... On 08.10.2013, after college, Pradeep called me again to Mandi village... I along with my friend Sudhir went to Mandi village in my Tata Manja car... When we reached in front of shop of accused Pradeep, he immediately caught hold of me from my shirt collar and dragged me inside the shop and took out a danda for beating me... In the meantime my friend Sunny @ Panna also reached there... When we were standing with the father of Pradeep, Pradeep went to his house and came back with a pistol and I saw him carrying pistol in his hand... When we started going from there, accused Pradeep fired upon Sunny as a result he sustained bullet injury on his stomach. I along with Sudhir took Sunny to Paras Hospital in my car and he was admitted there... My statement recorded by police is Ex. PW4/A... Accused Pradeep is present in court today (correctly identified).”

17. Remarkably, the cross-examination of PW-4 was deferred at the request of the defence and was conducted after an extraordinary, unexplained delay of over **3 years and 8 months**, on **28.01.2019** before Court. In cross-examination, PW-4 made the following statements:

*“XXXXXX by Sh. Jitender Tyagi, Ld. Counsel for accused:
...The accused had fired towards us from the distance of 100 metres and the bullet could have hit any of us (me, Sunny @ Panna and Sudhir)... We were standing near our car when Pradeep fired on us. We were standing on road near our car ahead of father and brother of accused. It is correct that the bullet fired had first hit the ground and then it bounced back and hit Sunny and then Sunny informed us after sometime that he had sustained injury in his abdomen...”*

B. Deposition of Injured Victim Sunny @ Panna (PW-5)

18. The injured victim Sunny @ Panna (PW-5) was examined-in-chief on **19.05.2015** before Court, who deposed as follows:

“On 08.10.2013 at about 5 PM... I received phone call of my friend Pramod who called me at the house of accused Pradeep. I reached there and saw accused Pradeep had caught hold of Pramod from his shirt collar. At that time my friend Sudhir and father and brother of accused Pradeep were also present there... Narender asked Pradeep to bring the revolver from the house on which Pradeep brought the revolver from his house and at that his father also told him to kill me and that he will face the consequences. In the meantime accused Pradeep fired upon me as a result I received bullet shot injury on my stomach. After sustaining injury I fell down and was removed to hospital... Accused Pradeep is present in court today (correctly identified). The bullet which was fired by accused Pradeep upon me is still

in my body as it is near my backbone and could not be removed by the Doctors.”

19. PW-5 was recalled for cross-examination on **30.03.2019** before Ld. ASJ Sunena Sharma, where he firmly rejected the defence ricochet theory:

*“XXXXXX by Sh. Jitender Tyagi, Ld. Counsel for accused:
...Q. I put it to you that when accused Pradeep fell down due to your pushing, you have fired upon the accused but, the bullet did not hit him, rather the bullet hit the ground first and then hit back to you on your stomach (jameen se takrakar tumko lag gayi)?*

Ans. It is wrong.

It is wrong to suggest that for quite some time I could not even realize that I have sustained fire arm injuries. It is wrong to suggest that I have cooked up entire story to rope in the accused in false case... It is wrong to suggest that accused Pradeep has never caused gunshot injury to me or that I named him falsely...”

C. Deposition of Eyewitness Sudhir (PW-6)

20. Eyewitness Sudhir (PW-6) was examined on 19.05.2015. He confirmed the presence of all parties and the firing of the gun, though he claimed he sat inside the car when the shot was fired:

“Pramod had parked his car just ahead to the shop of accused Pradeep. I then sat inside the car and closed the door... I heard voice of firing shot and I immediately opened the door of the car and saw that Sunny had sustained injury on his stomach. Thereafter I along with Pramod took Sunny to Paras Hospital...”

XXXXXX by Sh. S.K. Kain, Ld. Addl. PP for State:

Vol. At that time I was sitting inside the car and Pramod, Sunny @ Panna and Narender were standing in front of the

bonnet of the car... I later on came to know that accused Pradeep had fired upon Sunny...”

D. Medical & Surgical Evidence (PW-10, PW-11, PW-14, PW-16)

21. Dr. Manish Dhar (PW-11), former CMO of Paras Hospital, proved MLC No. 5364 dated 08.10.2013 (Ex. PW10/B), testifying that victim Sunny @ Panna was admitted at 5:45 PM with an entry gunshot wound 3 cm below the umbilicus, with no exit wound, and was immediately rushed to the Operation Theater.

22. The general surgeon, Dr. Pankaj Gupta (PW-14) and CTVS / Vascular Surgeon Dr. Vishal Aggarwal (PW-16) testified regarding the emergency surgical procedure performed on Sunny. Dr. Pankaj Gupta (PW-14) deposed:

“On 08.10.2013... I was part of the team of doctors who operated upon Mr. Sunny, 19 years male, who had alleged gunshot injury to the abdomen and entry wound was in the anterior abdominal wall and had suffered injury to small intestine along with major vessels of the abdomen... My opinion is Ex. PW14/B as per which 'the nature of injury was dangerous to life'.”

23. Dr. Vishal Aggarwal (PW-16) testified:

“On opening the abdomen, there was bleeding, the whole of the abdomen was filled with blood and then Dr. Surender Singh Khatana, Vascular Surgeon and myself were called upon for emergency help as the patient was in critical condition and bleeding was not stopping. Myself and Vascular Surgeon identified the bleeding point to control of it and rest of the repair work was done by Dr. Surender Khatana...”

24. Sh. Kapil Chaudhary (PW-10), Senior Executive MRD, Paras Hospital, proved that the original hospital paper records were destroyed in a basement flood on 19.05.2020 (GD Entry Ex. PW10/C), and proved the photocopied operative notes (Ex.PW10/E) signed by operating surgeons Dr. Pankaj Gupta, Dr. Vishal Aggarwal, Dr. Surender Khatana, and Dr. Viprashree.

E. Ballistic Expert Evidence (PW-15)

25. Ms. Anubha Lal (PW-15), Junior Forensic Examiner, Ballistics Division, FSL Rohini, proved FSL Examination Report No. FSL 2013/F-8718 dated 30.03.2015 (Ex. PW15/B), authored by Assistant Director Dr. N.P. Waghmare. The report established: 1. Improvised pistol 7.65mm (Ex. P-1) was in working condition and test-fired successfully. 2. Fired empty cartridge case 7.65mm (Ex. P-2) recovered from the spot bore firing pin and breech face characteristic marks identical to test cartridges fired from pistol Ex. P-1, proving that Ex. P-2 was fired from pistol Ex. P-1.

F. Deposition of Investigating Officer SI Amit Chaudhary (PW-12)

26. IO SI Amit Chaudhary (PW-12) detailed the entire investigation, *rukka* preparation (Ex.PW12/A), site plan (Ex.PW12/B), seizure of empty cartridge (Ex. PW3/C), arrest of accused Pradeep (Ex.PW8/A), recording of disclosure statement (Ex. PW9/B), and recovery of pistol Ex. P-1 from the divan bed at the accused's residence (Ex.PW9/D).

Statement of Accused under Section 313, CrPC

27. All incriminating evidence was put to accused Pradeep Singh during his examination under Section 313 CrPC recorded on 26.09.2025. The accused, broadly as a mantra, denied all questions put to him. However, in response to the question number 43, the accused stated:

“43) What else do you have to say?”

Ans. I have been falsely implicated in the present case with the connivance of complainant party... I was not carrying any pistol/revolver in fact, it was being carried by the injured who fired at me at the instance of the complainant and instead of hitting me the bullet hit the ground which was cemented floor (farsh) and the same bounced back and hit the injured from below under his belly button.”

28. Although the accused on 26.09.2025 opted to lead defence evidence (DE), after 220 days, he failed to produce any witness or documentary material, and the DE was formally closed on 04.05.2026.

Submission by Counsels for Parties

29. The oral arguments were advanced by the learned counsel for the parties on 25.07.2026³ and 10.08.2026.

30. Mr. Santosh Kumar, learned APP for the State summed up the prosecution's case by submitting that on 08.10.2013, at approximately 5:00 PM on the main road outside accused Pradeep Singh's grocery shop in Mandi Village, New Delhi, the accused fired a

³ Vide eFiling No. ADL20260004010D202600035, written arguments on behalf of accused Pradeep Singh were filed on 25.07.2026.

direct shot at the victim, Sunny @ Panna (PW-5), using an unlicensed, country-made 7.65mm pistol (Ex.P-1).

31. Mr. Kumar, learned APP for the State urged that the bullet struck the midline of the victim's abdomen i.e., 3 cm below the umbilicus, lacerating his small intestine and severing retroperitoneal blood vessels. The projectile remained embedded deep inside his body near the lumbar spine.

32. The learned APP for the State argued that bringing a firearm from his residence, aiming it at a vital organ, and pulling the trigger satisfies all the statutory requirements of an offence of attempt to murder, punishable under Section 307 IPC, and illegal possession and deployment of an unlicensed firearm, as punishable under Sections 25 & 27 of the Arms Act, 1959.

33. Mr. Kumar learned APP for the State urged that there was an underlying enmity and motive for the accused to commit the heinous alleged offence. The learned APP for the Stated further urged that the incident was driven by an underlying personal dispute that began two days prior on a volleyball court, where complainant Pramod (PW-4) intervened during a scuffle involving the accused, who was in an inebriated state. Feeling insulted by Pramod's intervention and the fact that Pramod reported his abusive behavior to his elder brother, Narender, Pradeep made continuous harassing phone calls over two

days, challenging Pramod and Sunny to visit his village, which led directly to the confrontation on 08.10.2013.

34. Mr. Kumar, learned APP for the State, submitted that the injured eyewitness has made an unshakable testimony, which demands special evidentiary status. The learned APP for the State relied upon the landmark judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***State of U.P. v. Naresh – 2011 INSC 189***, submitting that the testimony of an injured witness is placed on a higher evidentiary pedestal. An injured witness bears the stamp of presence on his own body, making his presence at the scene indisputable and his narrative intrinsically reliable.

35. Mr. Kumar, learned APP for the State further urged not only there is direct identification of the accused but consistency in the testimony of the victim, Sunny (PW-5). The learned APP for the State submitted that Sunny (PW-5) deposed clearly and cogently regarding the exact sequence of events, stating that Pradeep brought the pistol from his house and fired directly at his stomach. In his cross-examination, PW-5 remained unshaken and categorically refuted the defence theory of an accidental discharge or ricochet.

36. Mr. Santosh Kumar, learned APP for the State, submitted that the medical evidence unequivocally corroborates the gunshot wound and establishes the intent and knowledge aspect of Section 307, IPC. The learned APP drew the attention of the Court to the testimony of CMO Dr. Manish Dhar (PW-11) and Senior Executive Kapil Chaudhary (PW-10), who proved MLC No. 5364 (Ex.PW-10/B),

confirming a single gunshot entry wound in the lower abdomen with no exit wound, establishing that the projectile remained embedded in the victim's body. The learned APP for the State further submitted that it has come in evidence from the operating surgeons Dr. Pankaj Gupta (PW-14) and CTVS Surgeon Dr. Vishal Aggarwal (PW-16), who detailed the life-saving surgery required to stop severe internal abdominal hemorrhaging. Dr. Gupta officially certified the injury as "dangerous to life" (Ex.PW-14/B).

37. Mr. Santosh Kumar, learned APP for the State marched towards the testimony of the ballistic expert witness and urged that there is a strong ballistic and forensic linkage to fasten the guilt and liability upon the accused. The learned APP submitted that the IO/SI Amit Chaudhary (PW-12) recovered a fired 7.65mm empty cartridge case (Ex.P-2 / Ex.EC1) directly from the spot on the night of the incident. Pursuant to the disclosure statement (Ex.PW-9/B) of accused Pradeep Singh following his arrest on 11.10.2013, an unlicensed country-made 7.65mm pistol (Ex.P-1 / Ex.F1) was recovered from inside a divan bed in his bedroom. The learned APP for the State submitted that such a recovery is a proved fact within the rigours of Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872.

38. Mr. Kumar, learned APP for the State submitted that the FSL ballistics examination report (Ex.PW-15/B) confirmed through comparison microscopy that the crime cartridge case (Ex.P-2) was

fired from the recovered pistol (Ex.P-1), and the gunshot residue (GSR) analysis confirmed the weapon's recent discharge.

39. Regarding the minor contradictions, Mr. Kumar, learned APP for the State, cited the latest judgment of the Apex Court in the case of ***Govardhan v. State of Chhattisgarh – 2025 INSC 47***, arguing that criminal trials are not expected to run with mathematical precision. The learned APP further submitted that minor discrepancies regarding exact step measurements or whether the parties stepped toward the flat roof/backside of the shop before the firing do not touch the core of the prosecution case or dilute the direct ocular and medical evidence.

40. *Per contra*, Mr. K.K. Manan, learned senior counsel for the accused, Pradeep Singh in an eloquent manner contended the submissions advanced by the learned APP for the State. The learned senior counsel urged that not only the prosecution has failed to prove intent, knowledge the key ingredients of commission of offence punishable under Section 307, IPC but also miserably failed to rebut the defence of ricochet bullet.

41. The defence contended that the prosecution failed to prove an intention or knowledge to cause death under Section 307 IPC. The defence highlighted the critical admission made by complainant Pramod (PW-4) during cross-examination on 28.01.2019, *“It is correct that the bullet fired had first hit the ground and then it bounced back and hit Sunny...”* Mr. Manan, learned senior counsel for the defence

argued that if a shot was fired downwards hitting the cemented floor/*farsh* first before bouncing into the victim's abdomen, it demonstrates that the firearm was pointed downward, completely negating any direct intention to commit murder.

42. Mr. Manan, learned senior counsel for the accused, submitted that the case of the prosecution falls like a pack of cards due to the absence of independent public witnesses. The learned senior counsel further submitted that the alleged incident took place on a main village road outside a commercial grocery shop at 5:00 P.M. Despite the presence of local shopkeepers and residents, the Investigating Officer (PW-12) failed to join a single independent public witness during the spot inspection, the seizure of the empty cartridge (Ex.P-2), or the alleged recovery of the weapon (Ex.P-1).

43. Mr. Manan, learned senior counsel, unleashed his verbal contention that the alleged recovery from the house is bogus and an eyewash. The learned senior counsel further submitted that the IO/SI Amit Chaudhary (PW-12) admitted in cross-examination that female family members were present at the residence during the search, yet their signatures were not obtained on the seizure memo (Ex.PW-9/D), creating severe doubt regarding the genuine recovery of the pistol under Section 27 of the Evidence Act.

44. Moving forward with the defence arguments, Mr. Manan, learned senior counsel urged that the Court may treat carefully and discard the oral submissions advanced by the learned APP for the

State as not only the prosecution witness, particularly, the eye witness turned hostile but also the testimony of other witnesses is mired by structural contradictions. The learned senior counsel drew attention to the testimony of an independent eyewitness Sudhir (PW-6), who completely resiled from his Section 161 CrPC statement.

45. Mr. Manan, learned senior counsel, submitted that on the stand, Sudhir (PW-6) testified that he sat inside the Tata Manja(*sic*) car with closed doors, heard a gunshot coming from behind the vehicle, and did not see who fired, explicitly refusing to identify accused Pradeep as the shooter.

46. The learned senior counsel further pointed out structural contradictions between witness statements regarding whether the dispute occurred on the open road or on the flat roof/backside of the shop. Mr. Manan, learned senior counsel further submitted that injured victim Sunny (PW-5) alleged that Pradeep's father, Rambir and his brother, Narender actively instigated the shooting. However, because eyewitnesses PW-4 and PW-6 contradicted Sunny, the IO dropped charges against both family members, proving that Sunny's narrative is exaggerated and unreliable.

47. Mr. Manan, learned senior counsel submitted there are wide gaps between the forensic and scientific evidence. The learned senior counsel urged that the GSR result is inconclusive. The learned senior counsel further urged that the FSL report (Ex.PW-15/B) noted that Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer testing of the entrance hole on

the victim's T-shirt (Ex.TS1) was inconclusive due to insufficient data, leaving the firing distance completely unproven. The learned senior counsel further submitted that the substitute witness, Ms. Anubha Lal (PW-15) conceded in cross-examination that she had no personal knowledge of the tests performed by Dr. N.P. Waghmare, rendering the ballistic opinion legally unverified.

48. About the delay in trial and secondary medical records, Mr. K.K. Manan, learned senior counsel for the defence argued that the multi-year delay between the examination-in-chief of PW-4 (2015) and his cross-examination (2019) introduced memory lapses and inconsistencies that must be resolved in favor of the accused.

49. Further, Mr. Manan learned senior counsel urged that the secondary evidence of the medical records about the original treatment and operation records of Paras Hospital were destroyed in a basement flood on 19.05.2020 *vide* GD Entry (Ex.PW-10/C). The defence lodged its objection to the mode of proof for photocopied operation notes (Ex.PW-10/E).

50. In the end, as a swan song argument, Mr. Manan learned senior counsel for the accused relied upon the principles laid down by the Apex Court in ***Vaibhav v. State of Maharashtra – 2025 INSC 800***, to argue that where the ballistic trajectory, ricochet possibility, and lack of independent corroboration create reasonable doubt, the accused is entitled to an acquittal.

51. Mr. Santosh Kumar, learned APP for the State rejoined his arguments and once again urged that the core offence of Section 307, IPC stands proved as the accused fired a direct shot at the victim's stomach. The learned APP for the State further submitted that Sunny (PW-5) is an injured witness, whose cogent testimony carries special weightage and cited the judgment of *State of U.P. v. Naresh – 2011 INSC 189*.

52. Mr. Kumar, learned APP for the State submitted that the medical evidence led by the prosecution confirms, the gunshot wound is dangerous to life, and till date the bullet is lodged in the body of the victim. The learned APP further submitted that the FSL report (Ex.PW-15/B) matches the crime-cartridge (Ex.P-2) to the recovered pistol (Ex.P-1). The learned APP for the State submitted that no defence has been led by the accused to rebut the accusation, which the prosecution successfully proved about the recovery of an unlicensed 7.65mm pistol from accused's bed/*divan*. The learned APP urged that the Court may conclude with findings of guilt of the accused being established successfully.

Legal provision & Legal principles

53. The relevant legal provisions for the proper adjudication of the present case are Sections 307, IPC, and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act.

54. Section 307 defines attempt to murder as under:

“307. Attempt to murder.—Whoever does any act with such intention or knowledge, and under such circumstances that, if he by that act caused death, he would be guilty of murder, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years, and shall also be liable to fine; and if hurt is caused to any person by such act, the offender shall be liable either to imprisonment for life, or to such punishment as is hereinbefore mentioned.

Attempts by life-convicts.—When any person offending under this section is under sentence of imprisonment for life, he may, if hurt is caused, be punished with death.

Illustrations

(a) A shoots at Z with intention to kill him, under such circumstances that, if death ensued A would be guilty of murder. A is liable to punishment under this section.

(b) A, with the intention of causing the death of a child of tender years, exposes it in a desert place A has committed the offence defined by this section, though the death of the child does not ensue.

(c) A, intending to murder Z, buys a gun and loads it. A has not yet committed the offence. A fires the gun at Z. He has committed the offence defined in this section, and, if by such firing he wounds Z, he is liable to the punishment provided by the latter part of the first paragraph of this section.

(d) A, intending to murder Z by poison, purchases poison and mixes the same with food which remains in A's keeping; A has not yet committed the offence defined in this section. A places the food on Z's table or delivers it to Z's servants to place it on Z's table. A has committed the offence defined in this section.

55. The key ingredients of Section 307, IPC are as under:

- 55.1. Doing an overt act towards commission of murder – The accused must do some act beyond mere preparation that is directed towards causing death.
 - 55.2. Requisite *mens rea* – The act must be done with such intention or knowledge that would make the act murder if death resulted.
 - 55.3. Circumstances must be such that, if death ensued, it would amount to murder (Section 300) – The act must be under circumstances that satisfy the test: “if by that act caused death, he would be guilty of murder.”
 - 55.4. Hurt need not be caused to constitute an offence under Section 307, IPC. However, if hurt is caused, the accused may be punished with imprisonment for life in addition to fine.
 - 55.5. If the accused is under sentence of imprisonment for life, and hurt is caused, the punishment may extend to death.
56. To establish an offence under IPC Section 307 (Attempt to murder), the prosecution must show that the accused did an act with the intention or knowledge and in the circumstances such that, if death had been caused by that act, the accused would have been guilty of murder.
57. Section 27 of the Arms Act reads as under:

*“27. **Punishment for using arms, etc.**—(1) Whoever uses any arms or ammunition in contravention of section 5 shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than three years but which may extend to seven years and shall also be liable to fine.*

(2) Whoever uses any prohibited arms or prohibited ammunition in contravention of section 7 shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than seven years but which may extend to imprisonment for life and shall also be liable to fine.

(3) Whoever uses any prohibited arms or prohibited ammunition or does any act in contravention of section 7 and such use or act results in the death of any other person, shall be punishable with death.”

58. Section 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 sets out punishments for using arms, with enhanced penalties for use of prohibited arms/ammunition and an extreme penalty where such use causes death. The key ingredients of Section 27 are as below:

58.1. “Use” of arms/ammunition in contravention of Section 5
– If a person uses any arms or ammunition in contravention of Section 5, the punishment is imprisonment not less than 3 years and up to 7 years, and fine.

58.2. “Use” of prohibited arms/prohibited ammunition in contravention of Section 7 – If a person uses prohibited arms or prohibited ammunition in contravention of Section 7, the punishment is imprisonment not less than 7 years and up to life, and fine.

58.3. Use/act involving prohibited arms/ammunition leading to death – If a person uses prohibited arms or prohibited ammunition, or does any act in contravention of Section 7, and that use/act results in the death of any other person, the punishment is death.

Analysis & Findings

59. The Court has carefully evaluated the oral testimonies, medical records, forensic reports, and physical exhibits. Having conducted a rigorous judicial scrutiny, the Court finds that the prosecution has proved the guilt of accused Pradeep Singh beyond a shadow of reasonable doubt on all counts. The Court's findings on the core points are detailed in the ensuing paragraphs of this judgment.

A. Absolute Rejection of the 'Ricochet Bullet' Defence on Scientific & Ballistic Principles

60. The primary defence advanced by the accused, Pradeep Singh is that he did not fire directly at Sunny, but rather the bullet struck the cemented floor, ricocheted, and accidentally hit Sunny's abdomen is a cleverly engineered, scientifically impossible afterthought.

61. As the timeless legal maxim, *res ipsa loquitur* dictates the idiom/phrase, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. In a firearm injury trial, the ultimate physical proof lies in the depth of trajectory and weapon impact recorded inside the human body.

62. The undisputed medical evidence proved by CMO Dr. Manish Dhar (PW-11), general surgeon Dr. Pankaj Gupta (PW-14), and CTVS surgeon, Dr. Vishal Aggarwal (PW-16) establishes that the 7.65mm bullet entered Sunny's abdomen 3 cm below the umbilicus, lacerated his small intestine, severed major abdominal blood vessels, filling the entire peritoneal cavity with blood, and traveled all the way through the posterior abdominal wall to embed itself deep adjacent to his lumbar spine, where it remains permanently lodged.

63. As a fundamental law of ballistics and kinetic energy conservation i.e., $E_k = \frac{1}{2}mv^2$, when a bullet strikes a hard, unyielding surface like a cemented floor, *farsh*, it undergoes severe deformation, catastrophic loss of velocity, and immediate tumbling, instability. A ricocheted bullet loses the vast majority of its kinetic energy and directional momentum. It is physically, ballistically, and medically impossible for a ricocheted 7.65mm bullet having lost its velocity and stability, to possess the requisite kinetic force to pierce the anterior abdominal wall, tear through multiple loops of small intestine, sever deep retroperitoneal blood vessels, and penetrate all the way to get locked deep near the spinal column. Had the bullet ricocheted off the floor, it would have resulted, at best, in a superficial abrasion or shallow soft-tissue contusion. The deep, penetrating, life-threatening spinal trajectory establishes beyond any doubt that the shot was fired directly, at close range, with unmitigated lethal force aimed at the victim's vital organ.

B. Evidentiary Effect of Delayed Cross-Examination & Winning Over of PW-4

64. The Court must address the line elicited during the cross-examination of complainant Pramod (PW-4) on 28.01.2019, where he stated, *“It is correct that the bullet fired had first hit the ground and then it bounced back ...”* The Court holds that this concession is completely unbelievable, tainted, and legally unsustainable due to the extraordinary delay in cross-examination.

65. PW-4’s examination-in-chief was recorded on 19.05.2015, where he unambiguously stated that Pradeep brought a pistol from his house and fired directly upon Sunny. His cross-examination was deferred at the request of the defence and was conducted on 28.01.2019 after an inexplicable, inordinate delay of 3 years, 8 months, and 9 days. This prolonged *hiatus* provided the accused with ample time and opportunity to approach, influence, coerce, or win over the witness.

66. The law regarding delayed cross-examination and won-over witnesses is settled by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***Vinod Kumar v. State of Punjab – (2015) 3 SCC 220*** and ***Khujli @ Satish v. State of M.P. – (1991) 3 SCC 627***. The Apex Court laid down that where a prosecution witness fully supports the prosecution case in examination-in-chief recorded promptly, but resiles or introduces favorable concessions during cross-examination conducted after a

long delay, the Court must rely on the examination-in-chief and reject the late concessions as a product of winning over.

67. In ***Zahira Habibullah Sheikh v. State of Gujarat – (2004) 4 SCC 158***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that trial courts cannot act as mute spectators when witnesses are won over during delayed trials. Applying these binding principles, this Court discards the delayed concession of PW-4 dated 28.01.2019 as a manufactured attempt to save the accused, and relies firmly on his chief deposition dated 19.05.2015.

C. Direct, Unwavering Testimony of Injured Victim Sunny @ Panna (PW-5)

68. The case of the prosecution is firmly anchored in the direct, ocular testimony of the injured victim, Sunny @ Panna (PW-5). It is a settled proposition of criminal jurisprudence, *See State of U.P. v. Naresh – 2011 INSC 189* and *Abdul Sayeed v. State of M.P., (2010) 10 SCC 259* that the testimony of an injured witness stands on a higher pedestal. An injured witness bears the stamp of presence on his body and has no reason to let his actual assailant go scot-free while falsely implicating an innocent person.

69. PW-5 unequivocally deposed that accused Pradeep Singh retrieved the pistol from his house, pointed it at him, and fired directly into his stomach. In his cross-examination dated 30.03.2019, PW-5 stood firm as a rock, explicitly denying the defence suggestion of a

ricochet or accidental discharge. His testimony remains untarnished and fully trustworthy.

D. Scientific, Forensic & Medical Corroboration

70. The ocular account is seamlessly corroborated by scientific and medical evidence.

71. Medical Certification: The MLC (Ex.PW10/B) and opinion Ex.PW14/B by Dr. Pankaj Gupta certifies that the gunshot wound was dangerous to life. Had emergency surgery not been performed immediately, Sunny would have died of massive internal hemorrhage.

72. Forensic Ballistics Link: FSL Ballistics Report (Ex.PW15/B) by Dr. N.P. Waghmare conclusively proves under comparison microscopy that the empty crime cartridge (Ex.P-2) recovered from the spot was fired from the country-made pistol (Ex.P-1) recovered from inside accused Pradeep's bed (read as divan). This provides an unbreakable physical link between the accused, the weapon, and the crime scene.

E. Proof of Statutory Ingredients u/s 307 IPC and 25/27 Arms Act

73. To establish an offence under Section 307 IPC, the prosecution is not required to prove that death actually occurred, but that the act was done with such intention or knowledge as specified in Section 300 IPC – See *State of M.P. v. Saleem – (2005) 5 SCC 554* and *Jage Ram v. State of Haryana, [2015] 11 SCR 1007*. The choice of a lethal firearm, retrieving it from home, aiming at the abdomen, a vital organs zone, and inflicting a life-threatening wound lodging near the spine

establish the requisite *mens rea* intent and knowledge beyond any doubt.

74. The prosecution has also proved that accused Pradeep Singh was in conscious, unlawful possession of the unlicensed country-made 7.65mm pistol (Ex.P-1), recovered at his instance under Section 27 Evidence Act and used the same to fire at Sunny, satisfying all ingredients of Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act.

F. Evaluation of Written Arguments Filed by Learned Defence Counsel

75. In the detailed written arguments dated 25.07.2026 filed on behalf of accused Pradeep Singh, reliance has been placed upon several judicial decisions. This Court has meticulously examined each precedent and finds them entirely distinguishable and inapplicable to the facts of the present case.

76. **Prithvi Pal Singh @ Munna v. State, 2001 (1) R.C.R. (Cri.) 482:** The defence relied on this decision to argue that non-joining of public witnesses during recovery invalidates the seizure. In ***Prithvi Pal Singh's case***, the case rested exclusively on a chance police trap/recovery without any injured victim or direct ocular witness. However, the case at hand is anchored in the direct ocular evidence of an injured witness (PW-5), and recovery u/s 27 Evidence Act was made from a private divan (read as bed) within the exclusive knowledge of the accused. Non-joining of public witnesses does not

vitiating recovery supported by direct ocular proof – See ***State of Govt. of NCT of Delhi v. Sunil – (2001) 1 SCC 652***. Thus, the judgment of ***Prithvi Pal Singh’s case*** is distinguishable.

77. ***Maheshwar Tigga v. State of Jharkhand – (2020) 10 SCC 108***:

This decision involved a rape prosecution where the prosecutrix’s sole testimony was flatly contradicted by medical evidence showing no injuries. In the present trial, there is absolute harmony between ocular deposition (PW-5), medical records (Ex.PW10/B, Ex.PW14/B), and ballistic matching (Ex.PW15/B). Maheshwar Tigga has no application to the facts of the present case.

78. ***Krishnegowda & Ors. v. State of Karnataka – (2017) 13 SCC***

98: In ***Krishnegowda’s case***, the Hon’ble Supreme Court acquitted the accused due to an irreconcilable conflict between oral evidence and post-mortem findings, and no weapon was produced. Here, the ocular account of the gunshot wound perfectly matches the operative notes (Ex.PW10/E) and FSL report (Ex.PW15/B). Minor investigative omissions by IO PW-12 such as non-collection of calls detail record (CDRs) cannot override direct ocular and ballistic proof – See ***Dhanajaya Reddy v. State of Karnataka – (2001) 4 SCC 9***. Krishnegowda is thus clearly distinguishable.

79. ***Narsi v. State of Haryana – AIR 1999 SC 234***:

Narsi was a case based purely on circumstantial evidence where an uncorroborated police recovery was the sole link. The present case is based on direct

ocular testimony of the injured victim corroborated by medical evidence and ballistic matching. Narsi is factually inapplicable to the present case.

80. ***Vaibhav v. State of Maharashtra – 2025 INSC 800***. In ***Vaibhav's case***, a circumstantial case where two friends were in a room, the medical expert testified that an upward bullet exit trajectory toward a ventilator was consistent with an accidental self-shot. Whereas, in the case at hand, direct ocular testimony of Sunny alias Panna (PW-5) establishes that the accused, Pradeep fired at his stomach, and the bullet embedded deep near the lumbar spine, proving high kinetic energy impossible in a ricochet. Thus, ***Vaibhav's case*** also has no application to the case at hand.

81. With due deference and all humility at my command, this Court finds that none of the judicial precedents cited by the learned defence counsel for the accused comes to its rescue as they are found to be distinguishable to the facts of the case at hand.

Decision

82. The basic fundamental principle of criminal jurisprudence that the burden lies on the prosecution to prove its case against the accused beyond reasonable doubt. This burden never shifts. In the present case, the Court finds and concludes that the prosecution has successfully proved the guilt of the accused on both the counts.

83. In light of the exhaustive judicial evaluation of the evidence, this Court holds that the prosecution has successfully proved all charges against accused **PRADEEP SINGH** beyond reasonable doubt.

84. Accordingly, this Court finds and rules as below:

84.1. **The Accused (A1) Pradeep Singh** S/o Rambir is hereby **GUILTY** of charge framed against him under Section 307 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

84.2. **The Accused (A1) Pradeep Singh** S/o Rambir is hereby **GUILTY** of charge framed against him under Section 27 of the Arms Act, 1959.

85. Consequently, accused **PRADEEP SINGH** is hereby **CONVICTED. IT IS SO ORDERED THAT** – accused Pradeep Singh be taken into judicial custody forthwith. Let a copy of this judgment be furnished to the convict free of cost immediately.

86. Bail bonds and surety bonds tendered by the accused stand cancelled.

87. Now to come up on **18.09.2026 for hearing the convict, Pradeep Singh** on the quantum of sentence. Let the nominal roll from the concerned Jail Superintendent and prior involvement and conviction report be called from the concerned IO/SHO, PS Fathepur Beri returnable for 18.09.2026. Further, probation officer report and victim impact report from DSLSA South also be called in the interim.

Needless to mention, let the certified copy of the judgment be transmitted to all concerned without fail for information and compliance, if any.

Pronounced in the open Court on September 14, 2026	(Hargurvarinder Singh Jaggi) Addl. Sessions Judge (FTC-01) South District Saket Courts, New Delhi
---	--

Note: *This judgment comprises **44 pages** in total. The electronic signature certificate (digital signature) of the Presiding Officer has been appended on the **page No. 35/44** of the electronic or digital copy (PDF) of this document.*

FORM-C

List of Prosecution / Defence / Court Witnesses

A. Prosecution Witnesses

S.No.	PW Rank	Name of Witness	Proved Matter / Role
1	PW-1	Ct. Sunil Punia	Deposited sealed pullandas at FSL Rohini vide RC 131/21/13.
2	PW-2	HC / ASI Dharam Pal	Duty Officer; registered FIR Ex. PW2/A & DD 37-A Ex. PW2/C.
3	PW-3	Ct. Shyam Lal	Seizure of clothes Ex. PW3/A, cartridge sketch Ex. PW3/B, seizure Ex. PW3/C, identified cartridge Ex. P-2.
4	PW-4	Sh. Pramod	Complainant / Eyewitness; proved complaint Ex. PW4/A, threat complaint Ex. PW4/B.
5	PW-5	Sunny @ Panna	Injured Victim; deposed on gunshot injury, firing by Pradeep, and bullet lodged near spine.
6	PW-6	Sudhir	Eyewitness; deposed on presence at spot, firing, and removing victim to hospital.
7	PW-7	Sh. Rajesh Kumar	Security Officer Paras Hospital; made an initial intimation call to police.

S.No.	PW Rank	Name of Witness	Proved Matter / Role
8	PW-8	ASI Kailash Chand	Beat Officer; identified accused Pradeep; proved Arrest Memo Ex. PW8/A.
9	PW-9	SI Satish Kumar	Recovery witness; personal search Ex. PW9/A, disclosure Ex. PW9/B, pistol sketch Ex. PW9/C, seizure Ex. PW9/D.
10	PW-10	Sh. Kapil Chaudhary	Sr. Executive Paras Hospital; proved MLC Ex. PW10/B, GD entry for lost files Ex. PW10/C, operation notes Ex. PW10/E.
11	PW-11	Dr. Manish Dhar	Former CMO Paras Hospital; examined Sunny; prepared MLC No. 5364 Ex. PW10/B.
12	PW-12	SI Amit Chaudhary	Investigating Officer; Rukka Ex. PW12/A, Site Plan Ex. PW12/B, arrests, recoveries, chargesheet.
13	PW-13	ASI Rajnesh	Photographer Crime Team; proved 6 spot photos Ex. PW13/1-6 and negatives Ex. PW13/7.
14	PW-14	Dr. Pankaj Gupta	General Surgeon; operated on Sunny; certified injury as 'dangerous to life' Ex. PW14/B.
15	PW-15	Ms. Anubha Lal	Junior Forensic Examiner FSL; proved Ballistics Report Ex. PW15/B.

S.No.	PW Rank	Name of Witness	Proved Matter / Role
16	PW-16	Dr. Vishal Aggarwal	CTVS Surgeon operated on Sunny's major abdominal vascular bleeding.
17	PW-17	Sh. Rambir	Owner of Canter UP-16-T-0870; proved release application Ex. PW17/A & Sec 65B Certificate Ex. PW17/C.
18	PW-18	ASI Ramesh	MHC(M); proved Register No. 19 entries Ex. PW18/B colly & Road Certificate.

B. Defence Witnesses

Nil

C. Court Witnesses

Nil

List of Prosecution / Defence / Court Exhibits

A. Prosecution

S.No.	Exhibit No.	Description of Exhibits	Exhibits/Documents Proved by
1	Ex. PW-2/A	Photocopied copy of Case FIR No. 342/13 u/s 307 IPC and 25/27 Arms Act.	PW-2: HC Dharam Pal
2	Ex. PW-2/B	Endorsement on original Rukka by the Duty Officer.	PW-2: HC Dharam Pal
3	Ex. PW-2/C	DD No. 37-A dated 08.10.2013 recorded at 5:30 PM regarding admission of Sunny with gunshot injury.	PW-2: ASI Dharampal
4	Ex. PW-3/A	Seizure memo of Sunny's blood-stained clothes and two sample seals from Paras Hospital.	PW-3: Ct. Shyam Lal & PW-12: SI Amit Chaudhary
5	Ex. PW-3/B	Sketch of the used/empty cartridge found at Mandi Village spot.	PW-3: Ct. Shyam Lal & PW-12: SI Amit Chaudhary
6	Ex. PW-3/C	Seizure memo of the plastic box containing used cartridge.	PW-3: Ct. Shyam Lal & PW-12: SI Amit Chaudhary
7	Ex. PW-4/A	First statement / complaint of complainant Pramod u/s 154 CrPC.	PW-4: Sh. Pramod & PW-12: SI Amit Chaudhary
8	Ex. PW-4/B	Photocopied copy of threat complaint u/s PS Fatehpur Beri dated 11.02.2015.	PW-4: Sh. Pramod

S.No.	Exhibit No.	Description of Exhibits	Exhibits/Documents Proved by
9	Mark PW-6/A	Sudhir Kumar's u/s 161 CrPC statement (confronted by PP during cross-examination).	PW-6: Sudhir / Sudhir Kumar
10	Ex. PW-8/A	Arrest Memo of accused Pradeep Singh dated 11.10.2013.	PW-8: ASI Kailash Chand, PW-9: SI Satish Kumar & PW-12: SI Amit Chaudhary
11	Ex. PW-9/A	Personal Search Memo of accused Pradeep Singh dated 11.10.2013.	PW-9: SI Satish Kumar & PW-12: SI Amit Chaudhary
12	Ex. PW-9/B	Disclosure statement of accused Pradeep Singh dated 11.10.2013.	PW-9: SI Satish Kumar & PW-12: SI Amit Chaudhary
13	Ex. PW-9/C	Sketch of recovered country-made pistol (Barrel length: 16cm, Butt: 9.8cm).	PW-9: SI Satish Kumar & PW-12: SI Amit Chaudhary
14	Ex. PW-9/D	Seizure memo of recovered country-made pistol with magazine.	PW-9: SI Satish Kumar & PW-12: SI Amit Chaudhary
15	Ex. PW-9/E	Pointing out memo of recovery of weapon at instance of accused at Mandi residence.	PW-9: SI Satish Kumar & PW-12: SI Amit Chaudhary
16	Ex. PW-9/F	Pointing-out-memo of the place of crime (Road near grocery shop).	PW-9: SI Satish Kumar & PW-12: SI Amit Chaudhary

S.No.	Exhibit No.	Description of Exhibits	Exhibits/Documents Proved by
17	Ex. PW-10/A	Authority Letter by Dr. Amar Preet Singh, GM operations, Paras Hospital, dated 14.03.2018.	PW-10: Sh. Kapil Chaudhary
18	Ex. PW-10/B	MLC No. 5364 of patient Sunny Balraj dated 08.10.2013.	PW-10: Sh. Kapil Chaudhary, PW-11: Dr. Manish Dhar, PW-12: SI Amit Chaudhary & PW-16: Dr. Vishal Aggarwal
19	Ex. PW-10/C	GD entry dated 31.08.2020 at PS Sushant Lok, Gurugram, regarding destruction of Sunny's original medical/operation records in waterlogging on 19.05.2020.	PW-10: Sh. Kapil Chaudhary
20	Ex. PW-10/D	Authority Letter by Dr. Rajeshwar Bhati MS Paras Hospital, Gurugram, dated 18.01.2024.	PW-10: Sh. Kapil Chaudhary
21	Ex. PW-10/E	Operative notes copy of injured Sunny showing signatures of surgeons.	PW-10: Sh. Kapil Chaudhary & PW-16: Dr. Vishal Aggarwal
22	Ex. PW-12/A	Original Rukka prepared on complainant Pramod's statement.	PW-12: SI Amit Chaudhary
23	Ex. PW-12/B	Site Plan of the scene of crime (Mandi Village, PS Fatehpur Beri).	PW-12: SI Amit Chaudhary

S.No.	Exhibit No.	Description of Exhibits	Exhibits/Documents Proved by
24	Ex. PW-13/1 to Ex. PW-13/6	Six photographs of Mandi Village spot of occurrence.	PW-13: ASI Rajnesh
25	Ex. PW-13/7 (Colly)	Negatives of the spot of occurrence photographs.	PW-13: ASI Rajnesh
26	Ex. PW-14/A	Operative records of General Surgeon Dr. Pankaj Gupta and Dr. Viprashree.	PW-14: Dr. Pankaj Gupta
27	Ex. PW-14/B	Opinion of Dr. Pankaj Gupta dated 31.10.2013 on nature of injury (dangerous to life).	PW-14: Dr. Pankaj Gupta
28	Ex. PW-15/A	Authority noting/letter signed by Sh. V.R. Anand, Division Head Ballistics, FSL Rohini, authorizing Ms. Anubha Lal.	PW-15: Ms. Anubha Lal
29	Ex. PW-15/B	FSL Examination Report No. FSL 2013/F-8718 dated 30.03.2015 by Dr. N.P. Waghmare (Assistant Director Ballistics).	PW-15: Ms. Anubha Lal
30	Ex. PW-17/A	Application for <i>superdari</i> /release of the seized Canter vehicle No. UP-16-T-0870.	PW-17: Sh. Rambir
31	Ex. PW-17/B (Colly)	Three photographs of the released Canter vehicle.	PW-17: Sh. Rambir

S.No.	Exhibit No.	Description of Exhibits	Exhibits/Documents Proved by
32	Ex. PW-17/C	Certificate u/s 65-B of the Indian Evidence Act regarding photographs of the Canter.	PW-17: Sh. Rambir
33	Ex. PW-18/B (colly) (OSR)	Photocopy of Store-Room Register No. 19 (running into 04 pages) and road certificate details.	PW-18: ASI Ramesh
34	Ex. PW-18/B (OSR)	Original Road Certificate (RC No. 131/21/13).	PW-18: ASI Ramesh

B. Defence

Nil

C. Court Exhibits

Nil

D. Material Objects

S.No.	Material Object Number	Description	Proved by
1	Ex. P-1	Material Object: Recovered country-made pistol (made in USA, No. 441) with empty magazine.	PW-9: SI Satish Kumar & PW-12: SI Amit Chaudhary
2	Ex. P-2	Material Object: Fired/used empty 7.65mm cartridge case u/s KF 7.65 base inscription.	PW-3: Ct. Shyam Lal & PW-12: SI Amit Chaudhary

END OF DOCUMENT
