

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO(s). 904 OF 2000

ANTAR SINGH

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

STATE OF M.P.

Respondent(s)

(With office report)

Date: 30/11/2006 This Appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.B. SINHA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MARKANDEY KATJU

For Appellant(s)

Mr.Syed Ali Ahmad, Adv.

Mr. Syed Tanweer Ahmad, Adv.

Mr.Girdhar G. Upadhyay, Adv.

Ms. Vinita G. Upadhyay, Adv.

Mr. Awadesh Kumar Singh, Adv.

Mr. S.S. Banayopadhyay, Adv.

Ms. Shabana Saifi, Adv.

Mr. R.D. Upadhyay,Adv.

Mr. Shivpati B. Pandey,Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Ms. Vibha Datta Makhija,Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

The appeal is dismissed in terms of the signed judgment. If the appellant is on bail the bail bond shall stand cancelled and he shall surrender forthwith.

(Meenu Sethi)

Court Master

(Pushap Lata Bhardwaj)

Court Master

Signed reportable judgment is placed on the file

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.904 OF 2000

Antar Singh

...Appellant

Versus

State of Madhya Pradesh

...Respondent

J U D G M E N T

S.B. SINHA, J.

Appellant with one Badri has preferred this appeal

aggrieved by and dissatisfied with the judgment of conviction

and sentence dated 10.8.1999 passed by a Division Bench of

the High Court of Madhya Pradesh, Bench at Indore in

Criminal Appeal No. 787/1994 whereby and whereunder the

judgment of learned Sessions Judge dated 22.11.1994

passed in Sessions Trial No.385/93 convicting the accused-

appellants under Sections 302 and 449 of the I.P.C. and sentencing them to imprisonment for life for the said offence was upheld subject to the modification that the appellants herein were convicted under Section 302/34 I.P.C. instead of Section 302 I.P.C.

The occurrence took place on 6th July, 1993 at about 4 p.m. The deceased was a lady named Keshrabai. She and her

...2/-

- 2 -

daughter -Annubai (P.W.1) aged about 15 years at the relevant time were in their house. The appellant herein and three others entered into their house armed with axe, phaliya, lathies bow & arrows etc. Eight other persons had surrounded the entire house. They were also armed with deadly weapons. Allegedly, Badri assaulted the deceased. Indisputably, the deceased suffered as many as eight injuries as would appear from the deposition made by Doctor R.C.Hanotiya- P.W.11 who had conducted the postmortem examination on the dead body of the deceased- Kesharbai on 8.7.1993. He found the following injuries on the person of the dead body:

"....incised wound on the back side of the right elbow

left side of the stomach, right side of the chest, on the front of the head and behind the head and found her neck completely cut off...."

The learned Sessions Judge fully relying on the evidence of the eye witness- Annubai, who examined herself as P.W.-1 before the learned Sessions Judge, while acquitting eight of those accused persons, who were said to have waited outside the house and who had not been named in the First Information Report recorded a judgment of conviction and sentence against the appellant, Badri, Devsingh and Varsingh.

The appellant herein as also the said Badri preferred an appeal before the High Court. The said appeal was dismissed by

...3/-

- 3 -

reason of the impugned judgment. The special leave petition filed by Badri was dismissed on 16.12.1999. The appellant alone is thus before us.

The short question which arises for consideration is as to whether on the basis of the facts found by the learned Sessions Judge and as upheld by the High Court, the appellant herein can be said to have developed a common intention to kill the deceased-Kesharbai along with Badri and

others.

Mr.Syed, learned counsel appearing for the appellant

would submit that having regard to the fact that Annubai-

P.W.1 in

her deposition attributed overt acts on the part of Badri, the

appellant cannot be said to have any common intention to

kill the deceased.

The question is as to whether in a given situation,

the accused persons had shared common intention to

commit the murder or not, must be judged having regard to

the facts and circumstances of each case. No hard and fast

rule can be laid down therefor. As noticed hereinbefore, the

deceased suffered as many as eight injuries. The manner in

which she was done away with was cruel in nature. She was

murdered in her own house. For the aforementioned

purpose, twelve persons had assembled. Eight persons had

surrounded her house while other four persons with deadly

weapons entered therein.

In a situation of this nature, we are of the opinion

that common intention on the part of all accused

persons who had

...4/-

entered into the house can be safely inferred. The manner in which the occurrence had taken place itself would show that the accused had intention to kill the deceased. There was no provocation. There was no sudden quarrel. The deceased was a old lady and her daughter Annubai- P.W.1 was 15 year old girl. P.W.1 could not have resisted the appellant nor could the deceased herself offer any resistance to the murderer. Within a short time, it will bear repetition to state, eight injuries were inflicted on her person in quick succession . All the accused persons committed the said offence by going into her house. It was, therefore, not a case where this Court can differ with the opinion of the learned trial Court and that of the High Court that the appellant had no common intention to kill the deceased along with Badri and other.

For the aforesaid reasons, we do not find any merit in this appeal. The appeal is dismissed accordingly. If the appellant is on bail the bail bond shall stand cancelled and he shall surrender forthwith.

.....J.

[S.B. SINHA]

.....J.

[MARKANDEY KATJU]

New Delhi,

November 30, 2006.