

**IN THE COURT OF THE SESSIONS JUDGE :: :: TINSUKIA**

Present: **Sri C. Das,**  
Sessions Judge,  
Tinsukia

Date of Judgment :- 02/05/2022

The case was committed on 18.08.2018 by learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tinsukia in G.R. Case No.943/2018)

**Sessions Case No. 90 (T) of 2018**

U/s. 302 I.P.C.

(FIR No.123 of Doomdooma P.S.)

COMPLAINANT:	STATE OF ASSAM
REPRESENTED BY	Sri A.K. Choubey, Public Prosecutor, Tinsukia
ACCUSED	Smti Karina Sanjoy, W/o. Lt. Sanjoy Johan, R/o. Honjan Basti, Budlabeta T.E., P.S. Doomdooma, Dist. Tinsukia (Assam)
REPRESENTED BY	Advocate Sri N. Phukan

Date of Offence	16/05/2018
Date of FIR	17/05/2018

Date of Charge Sheet	28/06/2018
Date of Framing of Charges	04/09/2018
Date of commencement of evidence	18/09/2018, 20/02/19, 18/03/19, 07/06/19, 22/10/19, & 08/03/2022
Date on which judgment is reserved	NA
Date of Judgment	02/05/2022
Date of its Sentencing Order, if any	NA

**Accused Details:**

Rank of the Accused	Name of Accused	Date of Arrest	Date of Release on Bail	Offences charged with	Whether Acquitted or convicted	Sentence Imposed	Period of Detention Undergone during Trial for purpose of Sec. 428 Cr.PC
1	Smti Karina Sanjoy	18/05/2018	04/09/2018	302 of IPC			110 days

**J U D G M E N T**

1. The brief facts of the prosecution, is that on 17/05/2018 the complainant Dul Bahadur Kharka, had lodged an ejahar before Doomdooma police station, alleging *inter-alia* that Sanjoy Johon of Honjan Basti, was stabbed to death, being assaulted by his wife accused Smti Karina Sanjoy, on the night of 16/05/2018. Sonjoy was brought to the Hospital at about 10.30 pm on 16/05/2018. But he died while he was brought to the Hospital.

2. On the basis of the above ejahar, the police registered the Doomdooma P.S. Case No.123/2018 u/s 302 IPC and started the investigation. During the investigation, I.O. visited the place of occurrence, examined the witnesses u/s. 161 CrPC and u/s. 164 CrPC, collected the SCDs along with postmortem report, inquest report. I.O. arrested the accused. Thereafter, I.O. on completion of the investigation, filed the charge-sheet against the accused to face trial in the court.

3. The accused when appeared in the Court, learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tinsukia immediately, furnished the copy of the case as required u/s 207 CrPC. The offence u/s. 302 IPC since triable by Court of Sessions, learned court below committed the case to this court for

trial. Accordingly, a separate Sessions case was registered and was taken up for its trial.

4. After hearing both the parties and on perusing the materials on record, the charge u/s. 302 IPC was framed against the accused. The charge so framed was read over and explained to the accused, who pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

5. During the trial, the prosecution examined as many as, 6 (six) witnesses including the M.O. and I.O. to get support of its case. One CW is also, examined in this case. Learned Public Prosecutor declined to examine further witnesses of the case, for which the prosecution was closed. In the statement recorded u/s 313 Cr.P.C., the plea of the accused was total denial to the incriminating circumstances appeared against her in the evidence on record. But the accused did not adduce any defence witness for her favour. The argument of the parties was heard at length and the evidence on record perused.

**POINT FOR DETERMINATION:**

6. Whether on 16.05.2018 at Honjan Basti, Budlabeta T.E. under Doomdooma P.S., the accused committed murder by causing death of her husband; Sanjay Johan?

**DECISION AND REASONS THEREOF :**

7. This is a case where the allegation of the prosecution is that the accused had murdered her husband. Learned Public Prosecutor during the argument, pointed out that there is sufficient evidence tendered by the witnesses of the prosecution to hold that it was the accused, who committed the crime, as alleged. He therefore urged to record a conviction order against the accused as per law.

8. Per contra, learned counsel, appearing for the accused submitted that the evidence of the prosecution as per record cannot be reliable and believable since all of them tendered evidence which is inconsistent and contradictory to each other. Hence, he submitted that the accused may be acquitted from the charge of the case.

9. Having heard the argument, advanced by learned counsel for both sides, it is necessary to go through the evidence on record to arrive at a definite and proper conclusion in the case.

10. The prosecution examined the complainant Sri Dul Bahadur Kharka, as PW1. He stated in his evidence that about five months ago, on the day of occurrence in the morning, Sunil Bhuyan, the son of the deceased Sanjay Johan, told him that his father was murdered and the dead

body was lying in the garden hospital. So, he went to the hospital and doctors told him to wait there. Doctor handed him a paper and asked him to go to the garden office and accordingly, he delivered the said document to the garden office and accordingly, their office prepared an ejahar, wherein he had put his signature and handed it over to the police vide Ext.1 and Ext.1(1) is his signature. PW1 also, stated that the police came with him to the garden hospital and police interrogated the accused Karina Sanjay at the hospital and conducted inquest on the dead body of the deceased at the garden hospital vide Ext. 2 and Ext. 2(1) is his signature. He lastly, stated that he had heard that accused Karina Sanjay had committed murder of deceased Sanjay Johan.

11. During his cross-examination, PW1 stated that the house of the accused is situated at a distance of about 2 kilometres from his house and that the son of deceased Sanjay Johan did not tell him as to who had committed murder of his father and also that he did not state before the police that he had heard that Karina Sanjay had committed murder of her husband. Thus, the evidence of PW1 is not direct and his evidence is confined to filing of ejahar.

12. PW2 Sri Basulal Nag stated in his evidence that the occurrence took place about three months ago in the

evening. He stated that there are nine bighas of land between his house and that of deceased Sanjay Johan and that the son of deceased Sanjay Johan came to his house and told him about his father and his mother accused were having a quarrel. PW2 saw that deceased Sanjay Johan had sustained cut injuries on his chest and he was being held by his another son and that an ambulance was called and Sanjay Johan was taken to the hospital. He heard that Sanjay Johan had died at the hospital. PW2 has further stated that the sons of deceased Sanjay Johan told him that it was accused Karina Sanjay, who had caused those injuries to Sanjay Johan. PW2 lastly, stated that the police seized one kalam dao (billhook) from the house of the accused, on being shown by accused Karina Sanjay vide Ext. 3 and Ext. 3(1) is his signature thereon.

13. During cross-examination, PW2 stated that he had not seen the occurrence, taking place and that nobody told him that accused Karina Sanjay had caused injuries to her husband. He stated that he did not tell to the police that Karina Sanjay had caused injuries to her husband. PW2 stated further, during cross-examination that he does not know how Sanjay Johan died and that he has not seen the seized dao in the Court and also that he did not go through the Ext.3 before putting his signature thereon and he was not read over the contents of Ext.3 and also that he does

not know how to write English. Thus, the evidence of PW2 is a reported version and not direct evidence.

14. The next witness was examined by the prosecution, is Dr. Prasanta Borgohain, PW3, M.O. He stated that on 17/05/2018, while he was working as SDM & HO at Tinsukia Civil Hospital, he conducted post-mortem examination upon the dead body of Johan Sandu, in connection with Doomdooma P.S. case No.128/2018, who was brought and identified by C/302 Sushil Gogoi and Sunil Bhuyan and on examination, he found the following:-

*"A male dead body of average built, swarthy in complexion, hair 6cm long, black, wearing a black half pant, coffee-colour ganji, stained with blood. Eyes partially open, mouth closed. Rigor-mortis well developed.*

*Injuries:-*

*1. Incised and penetrating elliptical injuries of size 7cmx3cm over the chest wall, mid part on the upper third of the sternum obliquely, left end upside and right end downside, piercing the sternum with 2.5cm fracture and penetrating the right side of the heart and base of aorta vessels along with pericardium, about 500 ml. of blood found in pericardial and chest cavity.*

*2. 2cmx2cm size of abrasion found over the left leg knee joint."*

*Opinion:-* In his opinion, PW3 opined that the death

was due to shock and haemorrhage as a result of injury on heart, which was ante-mortem, caused by sharp object and the nature of the injury was homicidal. Approximate time since death was 8 to 24 hours. Ext.4 is the post-mortem report and Ext. 4(1) is his signature. The Doctor stated that along with the dead body, he also, received the inquest report and he had gone through the same and Ext. 2 is the inquest report and Ext.2(2), 2(3), 2(4) & 2(5) are his signatures.

15. PW3 was cross-examined, wherein he stated that apart from the aforesaid two injuries, he did not find any other injuries. If a person falls from a distance over a sharp weapon, the aforesaid injuries might have also been caused. Apparently, there is no dispute raised by the defence as regards to detection of injuries that caused the death of the deceased Sanjoy Johan.

16. PW4 Pulop Praja stated in his evidence that the distance between his house and that of Hunjan Basti of Badlabheta T.E. will be about 5 to 6 k.m. and he does not know the complainant, the deceased as well as, the accused. PW4 stated that on the day of occurrence, at about 2.30 pm, he had gone to a shop at Hunjan Basti and he saw that some people and policemen were present there. He had put his signature on a piece of paper, on being asked by the police. He further stated that, later on,

he came to know that there was a murder at that place and a dao was recovered by the police in his presence vide Ext. 3 and Ext. 3(2) is his signature.

17. The defence side declined to cross-examine the above witness.

18. Now, I shall take up the evidence of Satrugan Bhuyan as PW5. He stated that the deceased Sanjay Johan was his elder brother and the accused Karina Sanjay is the wife of the deceased. They lived separately. He stated that the occurrence took place one year ago and on the day of occurrence, in the morning hours, two persons came to his house and told him that his elder brother; Sanjay had sustained injuries on his chest. Hence, he immediately, went to the house of his brother and he saw that his brother had a bleeding wound on his chest. His said brother was not in a position to speak to him. At that time, the accused Karina was also, present in the house. He asked the accused as to how his brother sustained injuries. But she did not say anything to him. Later on, the police arrested the accused Karina Sanjay.

19. Subsequently, PW5 was declared hostile and the learned Public Prosecutor cross-examined the witness. Apparently, PW5 although declared hostile, his evidence

discloses injury sustained by the deceased on the chest. But the accused was mum to explained the way the deceased sustained such injury.

20. The last witness was examined by the prosecution is the Investigating Officer S.I. Keshab Mohan, as PW6. He stated in his evidence that on 17/05/2018, while he was working at Doomdooma police station, one Sri Dul Bahadur Kharka, line-chowkidar of Hunjan Basti, Badlabheta T.E. had lodged an ejahar before police, alleging that Sanjay Johan was stabbed to death by his wife Karina Sanjay on 16/05/2018 at night and it was also stated in the ejahar that the injured Sanjay Johan was brought to the Badlabheta T.E. garden Hospital at about 10.30 p.m., and on receiving the ejahar, the then O.C. of the police station namely; Sri Moni Mohan Koch registered a case being Doomdooma P.S. Case No.123/2018 and handed over to proceed with the investigation to him. Ext.1 is the said ejahar and Ext.1(2) is the signature of Moni Mohan Koch along with his endorsement.

21. The I.O. stated that after taking over the investigation of the case, he went to the Badlabheta T.E. Hospital, where the dead body of the deceased was lying and that he conducted inquest upon the dead body of the deceased and that at that time, it was about 10.20 a.m., in presence

of Sunil Bhuyan, Rupak Mura and Dul Bahadur Kharka. Ext.2 is the inquest report and Ext.2(6) is his signature. Thereafter, he sent the dead body to Tinsukia Civil Hospital for conducting post-mortem examination. After that, he went to the place of occurrence and reached there at about 10.45 am and he prepared the sketch map of the place of occurrence vide Ext.5 and Ext.5(1) is his signature. Then he recorded the statements of Gansinha Bhuyan, Basulal Nag and Pulup Praja at the place of occurrence. He also stated that when the informant came to the police station to lodge the ejarah, he after taking over the charge of investigation of the case, recorded his statement in the police station. When he visited the place of occurrence, he also took with him the accused, whom he found at Badlabheta T.E. Hospital. The accused led him to the seizure of a dao and that she told him that she had committed the murder of her husband by stabbing him with the said dao. He seized the said dao vide M.R. No. 26/2018 vide seizure list Ext.3 and Ext.3(3) is his signature. M.Ext.1 is the said dao, which he had seized after being shown by the accused. He stated that the seizure was made in presence of Basulal Nag and Pulup Praja. Thereafter, he arrested the accused and sent her to the Court for sending her to judicial custody. On conclusion of investigation, he filed the charge sheet against the accused vide Ext.6 and Ext.6(1) is his signature.

22. The I.O during his cross-examination stated that on 17/05/2018 at about 10 a.m., when the complainant came to the police station, he came to know about the occurrence. At about 10.30 a.m., he recorded the statement of the complainant and it took 10 minutes to record his statement. At about 10.45 a.m., he started his journey to the place of occurrence via Badlabheta T.E. hospital. The I.O. stated that to his estimation, the distance between the police station and the place of occurrence would be about 7 k.m. and it took about 20 minutes to reach the hospital. It took about one hour to complete the inquest report. He had not mentioned the distance between the hospital and the place of occurrence and that it takes about 10 minutes to reach the place of occurrence from the hospital.

23. The I.O. further stated that before conducting the inquest upon the dead body of the deceased, he did not try to procure the attendance of a Magistrate and that the inquest report, Ext. 2 was prepared jointly by himself and O.C. Moni Mohan Koch. Therefore, there are two types of handwritings available in the said report. But it is not mentioned in the inquest report that it contained the handwriting of Moni Mohan Koch. The I.O. also stated that the Ext.2 is a printed form and in column No.10, it is

mentioned that there are no injuries found on the head and face and it was written in his handwriting, but in Column No.10(d), it has been stated that there was injury mark on the chest of the deceased. The I.O. further stated that in column No.4 of the Ext.2, it is seen that white ink has been used to erase something, which was written earlier and over the white ink, the name of Sunil Bhuyan, son of Lt. Johan Santu is written and that the correction is without the initials of the maker. The I.O. stated that he never escorted the dead-body himself, when it was sent for post-mortem examination. He denied the suggestion that the Ext.2 was not sent to the Tinsukia Civil Hospital, when he sent the dead-body there. He stated that some of the columns of Ext.2 were left vacant, when he prepared the same at the place of occurrence and that in Ext.2, below his signature, his name has been written by the O.C. Moni Mohan Koch.

24. The I.O. further stated in his cross-examination that in Ext.3, the description of the seized article has been given in the handwriting of another person. It also, contains the signs of eraser ink over which, corrections have been made and that there is no initials of writer of the said column and that in Ext.3 his signature exists, but the other handwritings belong to someone else. He denied the suggestion that the Ext.3 is illegally manufactured

document. He denied the suggestion that he has deposed false evidence by stating that he prepared the Ext.3 at the place of occurrence. He also denied the suggestion that he actually seized the M.Ext.1 at 11.35 a.m. The I.O. stated that he never sent the M.Ext.1 for forensic examination, as because he did not find any bloodstain upon it. The deceased and the accused, both are associated with tea garden labourer's association. The materials like M.Ext.1 is available in every household of tea garden labourers, as it is used in pruning the tea bushes. He denied the suggestion that he had unnecessarily seized the M.Ext.1, as the weapon of the offence and thereby, misdirected his investigation. He lastly stated that he did not send the accused to the Court for recording her confessional statement, nor did he send any witness to the Court for recording their statement u/s. 164 Cr.P.C.

25. Later on, one CW1 was examined in this case. Now, I shall take up the evidence of CW1 Sri Sunil Bhuyan. He stated that he does not know the complainant, but the deceased was his father and the accused is his mother. He does not live with his mother/accused as he married in the year 2017. His mother/ accused used to reside at Hunjan Basti of Badlabheta T.E., while he stays at Ranshi Line of the same garden. The occurrence took place in the year 2018.

26. CW1 further stated that at the relevant time of occurrence, the accused resided with his deceased/ father. On the next day morning, he got the information from the garden hospital that his father was dead. Accordingly, he went to the Hospital and saw the dead body of his father. He did not notice any injury on the dead body of his father. CW1 stated that the police conducted the inquest upon the dead body of his father vide Ext. 2 and Ext. 2(7) is his signature. Thereafter, the dead body of his father was sent for post-mortem examination by the police. He also accompanied with the dead body of his father/ deceased to the hospital for post-mortem examination.

27. On a question to the witness by the court that whether CW1 went to the house of Basu Lal Nag to inform that his mother and father were quarrelling, to which he replied that he did not visit his house.

28. During cross-examination, the CW1 stated that he cannot say the contents in Ext. 2. Thus, the testimony of CW1 does not reveal that CW1 is an eyewitness of the occurrence, neither he could implicate his accused mother in the occurrence.

29. After perusing the evidence of the prosecution witnesses including the testimony of CW1 on the record carefully, it appears that there is no dispute that the deceased Sanjay Johan was the husband of the accused. The deceased sustained injury on the chest leading to his death. There is no eyewitness of the occurrence. It is not denied by the parties that the deceased Sanjay Johan died in the hospital. Apparently, there is no eyewitness of the occurrence. Thus, the prosecution case rests on circumstantial evidence.

30. To record a conviction order on circumstantial evidence against the accused, the Hon'ble Supreme Court laid down certain norms in **Hanumant vs. State of MP (1963) STR 1091** as *(i) The circumstances from which the conclusion of guilt is to be drawn should be fully established; (ii) The fact so established should be consistent with the hypothesis of guilt and the accused, that is to say, they should not be explainable on any other hypothesis except that the accused is guilty; (iii) The circumstances should be of a conclusive nature and tendency; (iv) They should exclude every possible hypothesis except the one to be proved and (v) There must be a chain of evidence so complete as not to leave any reasonable .....* In another case Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in **State of Odisha vs. Banabihari Mohapatra**

**on SLP (Cri) No.1156/2021** held that *Before a case against an accused can be said to be fully established on circumstantial evidence, the circumstances from which the conclusion of guilt is to drawn must fully be established and the fact so established should be consistent only with the hypothesis of guilt of the accused. There has to be a chain of evidence so complete, as not to leave any reasonable doubt for any conclusion consistent with the innocence of the accused and must show that in all human probability, the act must have been done by the accused.*

31. After having found the law laid down in respect of recording a conviction order against the accused on the basis of circumstantial evidence, it is proper to scrutinize the evidence on record. The evidence of PW1 is found not direct but he lodged the ejahar in this case. The evidence of PW2 is also not direct but it discloses from his testimony that the deceased had a quarrel with the accused at their house and subsequently, he saw that Sanjay Johan sustained cut injury on the chest. The evidence of PW2 could not disclose how the deceased sustained injury on the chest. His evidence shows that the son of the deceased Sri Sunil Bhuyan, who was examined as CW1, informed him about the quarrel between the accused and the deceased and thereafter, PW2 found the father of CW1 in the hospital with chest injury and subsequently,

succumbed to the injury. But the evidence of CW1 could not implicate the accused for causing death of father of CW1. Thus, from the evidence of PW2 with CW1, does not establish that the accused caused death of her husband; Sanjay Johan @ Sandu. Further, the evidence of PW4 and 5 could not disclose specifically that it was the accused caused stabbed her husband to death. Thus, no circumstance appears from the evidence of PW1, 2, 4, 5 and CW1 to implicate the accused for causing death of Sanjay Johan @ Sandu.

32. Besides above, the evidence of PW2 and 4 with the support of I.O. proved the seizure of dao vide Ext.3. It appears from the version of I.O. that the accused participated in leading to discovery of dao, which he seized vide Ext.3. But the statement of the accused in respect of leading to discovery of dao was not recorded, which is however, is not mandatory **u/s. 27 of Evidence Act**. Now the question is whether the accused can be implicated for causing death of the deceased Sanjay Johan @ Sandu for taking part in the leading to discovery of dao or knife. But the evidence of PW1, 2, 4, 5 as well as, CW1 does not disclose that the accused caused stab injury to the chest of her deceased husband to cause his death. There is no evidence on record that the accused had intention or motive to cause death of her husband to implicate her **u/s**

**302 IPC.** Thus, the circumstance of leading to discovery of knife is not sufficient enough to implicate the accused **u/s 302 IPC.**

33. Then, next question as to why the accused led the I.O. to discover the knife in the light of **Section 27 of Evidence Act.** Admittedly, the accused and the deceased lived together as wife and husband in the same household. Hence, she knew where the knife or dao was kept and as such, she was able to bring out the said weapon from her house to hand over to the police. But that does not establish the fact that the accused murdered her husband. At best, it creates strong doubt against the accused for taking part in leading to discovery of weapon in absence of corroborating evidence to implicate the accused in the occurrence.

34. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Sujit Biswas vs. State of Assam AIR 2013 SC** held that *Suspicion however strong cannot take the place of proof and that an accused is presumed to be innocent unless proved guilty beyond reasonable doubt. It was further held that Suspicion, however grave it may be, cannot take the place of proof, and there is a large difference between something that 'may be' proved, and something that 'will be proved'. In criminal trial, suspicion no matter how strong, cannot*

*and must not be permitted to take place of proof. This is for the reason that the mental distance between 'may be' and 'must be' is quite large, and divides vague conjectures from sure conclusions. In a criminal case, the court has a duty to ensure that mere conjectures or suspicion do not take the place of legal proof.*

35. Having found the law that the suspicion how grave or strong, cannot be allowed to take the place of legal proof. From the case in hand, it appears that the prosecution evidence is totally silent about the fact that if the accused is involved in murder of her husband. Participation in leading to discovery of weapon to I.O. does not mean to arrive at the conclusion that the accused is guilty of murder of her husband in absence of cogent evidence. Rather, it creates doubt as to why the accused participated in leading to I.O. to discovery of weapon in absence of evidence on record that she murdered her husband. In view of doubt appears in the evidence of the prosecution witnesses, the accused is entitled to get the benefit of such doubt. Accordingly, the accused is given benefit of such doubt.

36. Under the above facts and circumstances of the case, it is found that the prosecution has failed to prove its case against the accused beyond all reasonable doubt. Hence, the accused is held not guilty **u/s 302 IPC** and she is

acquitted and set at liberty. Her bail bond shall however, remain in force **u/s 437A CrPC**. The seized article shall be destroyed in due course of time. Forward a copy of judgment to the District Magistrate, Tinsukia **u/s 365 CrPC**. Before parting with the case, this court recommends payment of compensation to the victim of crime **u/s 357 CrPC** r/w Assam Victims Compensation Scheme by the DLSA, Tinsukia, after find out the right victim person after drawing an inquiry.

37. Given under the hand and seal of this court on this the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of May, 2022.

Dictated & corrected by:

Sessions Judge  
Tinsukia

**(C. Das)**  
Sessions Judge  
Tinsukia

**A P P E N D I X**

## LIST OF PROSECUTION/DEFENCE/COURT WITNESSES

**A. Prosecution:**

<b>RANK</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>NATURE OF EVIDENCE</b>
PW1	Sri Dul Bahadur Kharka	Complainant
PW2	Sri Basulal Nag	Independent
PW3	Dr. Prasanta Borgohain	M.O.
PW4	Sri Pulop Praja	Independent
PW5	Sri Satrugghan Bhuyan	Brother of the deceased
PW6	Sri Keshab Mohan	I.O.

**B. Defence Witnesses, if any:**

<b>RANK</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>NATURE OF EVIDENCE</b>
NA	NA	NA

**C. Court Witnesses, if any:**

<b>RANK</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>NATURE OF EVIDENCE</b>
CW1	Shri Sunil Bhuyan	Son of deceased

## LIST OF PROSECUTION/DEFENCE/COURT EXHIBITS

**A. Prosecution:**

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Exhibit Number</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>1</b>	Exhibit 1	Ejahaar
<b>2</b>	Exhibit 2	Inquest report
<b>3</b>	Exhibit 3	Seizure list
<b>4</b>	Exhibit 4	Postmortem report
<b>5</b>	Exhibit 5	Sketch map
<b>6</b>	Exhibit 6	Charge sheet

**B. Defence:**

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Exhibit Number</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>NA</b>	NA	NA

**C. Court Exhibits:**

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Exhibit Number</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>NA</b>	NA	NA

**D. Material Objects:**

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Exhibit Number</b>	<b>Description</b>
1	Material Object 1	Dao/machete

Sessions Judge  
Tinsukia