

Before Rajiv Sharma, A.C.J. & Harinder Singh Sidhu, J.

RUPINDER SINGH—*Petitioner*

versus

STATE OF PUNJAB—*Respondents*

CRA-D-No. 1349-DB of 2014

October 03, 2019

Indian Penal Code, 1860—S.302—Medical Jurisprudence—Difference—Hanging And Strangulation—To arrive at a conclusion—Death due to strangulation—Necessary to note effects of violence in underlying tissues—In addition to ligature mark or bruise marks caused by fingers of by foot, knee and other appearances of death from asphyxia—Strangulation—Injury to muscles of neck—Common and carotid arteries, internal coats ordinarily ruptured—Hanging—Neck stretched and elongated; injury to muscles of the neck is rare—Held, case of strangulation—Tongue swollen, bruised and protruding.

Held that, in a Textbook of Medical Jurisprudence and Toxicology, 24th Edition, Reprint 2012, Modi has stated that the neck and its structures should be examined after removing the brain and the chest organs, thus allowing blood to drain from the neck to the blood vessels. There is extravasation of blood into the sub-cutaneous tissues under the ligature mark or finger marks, as well as in the adjacent muscles of the neck, which are usually lacerated. The cornua of the hyoid bone may be fractured also the superior cornua of thyroid cartilage but fracture of the cervical vertebrae is extremely rare. To arrive at a conclusion that death was due to strangulation, it is necessary, therefore, to note the effects of violence in the underlying tissues in addition to the ligature mark or bruise marks caused by the fingers or by the foot, knee and other appearances of death from asphyxia. The differences between hanging and strangulation have been explained by Modi in tabulated form as under :

	Hanging		Strangulation
1.	Mostly suicidal.	1.	Mostly homicidal
2.	Face-Usually pale and petechiae rare.	2.	Face-Congested, livid and marked with petechiae.
3.	Saliva-Dribbling out of the mouth down on the chin and chest.	3.	Saliva-No such dribbling.

4.	Neck-Stretched and elongated in fresh bodies.	4.	Neck-Not so.
5.	External signs of asphyxia, usually not well marked.	5.	External signs of asphyxia, very well marked (minimal if death due to vasovagal and carotid sinus effect).
6.	Ligature mark-Oblique, non-continuous placed high up in the neck between the chin and the larynx, the base of the groove or furrow being hard, yellow and parchment-like.	6.	Ligature mark-Horizontal or transverse continuous, round the neck, low down in the neck below the thyroid, the base of the groove or furrow being soft and reddish.
7.	Abrasions and ecchymoses round about the edges of the ligature mark, rare.	7.	Abrasions and ecchymoses round about the edges of the ligature mark, common.
8.	Subcutaneous tissues under the mark-White, hard and glistening.	8.	Subcutaneous tissues under the mark-Ecchymosed.
9.	Injury to the muscles of the neck-Rare.	9.	Injury to the muscles of the neck-Common.
10.	Carotid arteries, internal coats ruptured in violent cases of a long drop.	10.	Carotid arteries, internal coats ordinarily ruptured.
11.	Fracture of the larynx and trachea-Very rare and may not be found that too in judicial hanging.	11.	Fracture of the larynx trachea and hyoid bone.
12.	Fracture-dislocation of the cervical vertebrae-Common in judicial hanging.	12.	Fracture-dislocation of the cervical vertebrae-Rare.
13.	Scratches, abrasions and bruises on the face, neck and other parts of the body-Usually not present.	13.	Scratches, abrasions fingernail marks and bruises on the face, neck and other parts of the body-Usually present.
14.	No evidence of sexual assault.	14.	Sometimes evidence of sexual assault.
15.	Emphysematous bullae on the surface of the lungs-Not present.	15.	Emphysematous bullae on the surface of the lungs-May be present.

(Para 24)

Vinod Ghai, Senior Advocate with
Kanika Ahuja, Advocate
for the appellant.

Suveer Sheokand, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

RAJIV SHARMA, ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

(1) This appeal is instituted against the judgment dated 11.08.2014 and order dated 14.08.2014, rendered by learned Sessions Judge, Hoshiarpur, in Sessions Case No. 43 of 17.12.2013, whereby appellant Rupinder Singh, who was charged with and tried for the offence punishable under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code, was convicted thereunder and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for life and to pay a fine of Rs.50,000/-, failing which to undergo rigorous imprisonment for three years.

(2) The case of the prosecution, in a nutshell, is that on 10.08.2013, a medical slip without number was received from Civil Hospital, Garhshankar, concerning Rajwinder Kaur. Thereafter, SI Mohinder Singh along with other police officials reached at Civil Hospital, Garhshankar. Shingara Singh son of Bachan Singh met the police party. His statement was recorded. According to the statement made by Shingara Singh, Rajwinder Kaur was his daughter. She had love affair with the accused. She was residing with accused for the last 2-3 years. However, some days earlier to the recording of statement of the complainant, the accused had been taking steps to get rid of Rajwinder Kaur. Accused brought Rajwinder Kaur on some pretext to Oasis Hotel, Garhshankar. There, she was killed by pressing her neck. From the mobile phone of Rajwinder Kaur, the accused informed the complainant that his daughter was in serious condition in Civil Hospital, Garhshankar. He reached the hospital. He found the dead body of his daughter Rajwinder Kaur lying in the hospital. Inquest report was prepared. FIR was registered. Post mortem was got conducted. The investigation was completed and challan was put up after completing all the codal formalities.

(3) The prosecution examined as many as fifteen witnesses in support of its case. The appellant was also examined under Section 313 Cr.P.C. According to him, on the request of Rajwinder Kaur, he took her to Mata Chintpurni for paying obeisance, but they happened to halt at Oasis Hotel, Garhshankar. According to him, Rajwinder Kaur entered in the toilet and locked herself from inside. He heard cry of Rajwinder Kaur and knocked at the door of the toilet. He called the Manager of the hotel immediately. Thereafter, Omkar Sharma, Manager of the hotel, along with a waiter came to his room. They started giving pushes to the door of the toilet. It was broken. Rajwinder Kaur was

found hanging in the toilet with Geysar. He brought her down with the help of waiter. She was taken in his car to Civil Hospital, Garhshankar. The doctor on duty declared her dead. According to the appellant, it was a case of suicide and not murder. He did not lead any evidence.

(4) The appellant was convicted and sentenced, as noticed herein- above. Hence, this appeal.

(5) Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant has vehemently argued that the prosecution has failed to prove its case against his client. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State has supported the judgment and order of the learned Court below.

(6) We have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the judgment and record very carefully.

(7) PW.1 HC Mohinder Pal deposed that he was posted at Police Station Garhshankar on 10.08.2013. Omkar Sharma, Manager of Oasis Hotel, Garhshankar, produced photostat copies of page No. 441 and 442 of the booking register of the hotel pertaining to room No. 103, the photostat copy of Driving Licence of Rupinder Singh and one CD, which was got prepared from the footage of CCTV Camera. All these articles were taken into possession by the Investigating Officer vide memo Ex.P1. The accused was arrested on 11.08.2013. The Investigating Officer took into possession Tata Safari. On 12.08.2013, accused Rupinder Singh suffered disclosure statement Ex.P5 to the effect that he had kept concealed one string along with the mobile phone of Rajwinder Kaur in the cannabis plants near Civil Hospital, Garhshankar. Accused got recovered the string and mobile phone from the disclosed place. These were taken into possession vide memo Ex.P6. He identified the accused present in the court. In his cross-examination, he deposed that it came to his knowledge that from the hotel, accused had taken Rajwinder Kaur to the hospital, where she was admitted. The mobile and string were kept in a polythene bag.]

(8) PW.2 Shingara Singh is the father of the deceased Rajwinder Kaur. According to him, his daughter Rajwinder Kaur had studied upto MBA. He did not know if his daughter was having love affair with any one. No one was residing with his daughter. He was declared hostile and was cross-examined by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor. In his cross- examination by learned Additional Public Prosecutor, he deposed that he had not made statement Ex.P14. He also denied the supplementary statement made before the police Mark P-15. According to him, his signatures were obtained on blank

papers. A court question was also put to him by the trial court, to which he answered that he did not know as to how death of his daughter took place, because he just got the dead body of his daughter from the hospital.

(9) PW.4 Omkar Sharma was Manager of Oasis Hotel, Garhshankar. According to him, on 10.08.2013, Rupinder Singh and his wife Rajwinder Kaur came to the hotel. After verifying identification on production of Driving Licence, room No. 103 was allotted to them. Entry in this regard was made in the register maintained in the hotel. Entry was made by Rupinder Singh. He did not produce the register. However, attested copy of the register entry was proved as Ex.P18. CD of footage of CCTV Camera was prepared by him. Same was handed over to the police. The CD is Ex.P8. A query was put to him by the trial court. In reply to the query, he identified accused Rupinder Singh present in the court, who came in the hotel. At the time of his re-examination, he produced the entry register. On page No. 441 and 442 of the register, entry regarding arrival of Rupinder Singh son of Bhagat Singh along with his wife was made. He deposed that waiter came to him at about 5.00 PM and told that Madam of room No. 103 had fell down and door of the bathroom was not opening. He gave pushes to open the door. He noticed that the girl was lying on bed. He did not know whether she was conscious or unconscious. He did not hear shrieks of the girl. He was declared hostile and was cross-examined by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor. In his cross-examination by learned Additional Public Prosecutor, he admitted that room No. 103 was allotted to Rupinder Singh and his wife. He was confronted with his statement Ex.P26. He admitted that CCTV camera in the hotel records every person entering and departing the hotel. CD was played in the court. On playing CD, PW.4 Omkar Sharma admitted accused, present in the court, going upstairs at 3.17 PM on 10.08.2013. In his cross-examination by the learned defence counsel, he deposed that Arjun waiter came to him. He informed that girl was in the bathroom. She was not responding to him to open the door. On his advice, accused and Arjun waiter gave pushes to the door of the bathroom. The lock broke and door opened. The girl was found lying unconscious in bathroom. She was taken out of the bathroom by Arjun waiter and the accused. She was shifted to hospital. As the girl committed suicide in the bathroom, she fell in the bathroom becoming unconscious. A query was put to him by the trial court. He admitted in reply to the query that when he went in room No. 103, then wife of accused was lying unconscious on bed.

(10) PW.6 Arjun Khanna prepared scaled site plan Ex.P23. In his cross-examination, he deposed that height of room No. 103 was about 10 feet. No bathroom or toilet was attached with room No. 103. He had visited the other rooms. Even in those rooms, he did not notice any bathroom or toilet.

(11) PW.7 Gurwinder Singh identified the dead body. In his cross-examination, he admitted that Rajwinder Kaur was not keeping good health and she used to remain under depression.

(12) PW.8 Daljit Singh is the owner of Oasis Hotel, Garhshankar. He testified that on 10.08.2013, Omkar Sharma, Manager of the hotel, informed him that one girl had become unconscious in room No. 103 in their hotel. She was taken to Civil Hospital, Garhshankar. He did not know who accompanied the girl in the room. He was declared hostile and was cross-examined by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor. In his cross-examination by learned Additional Public Prosecutor, he admitted that he had got recorded his statement with the police. CCTV Cameras were installed in their hotel. Videos automatically snapped all the visitors to their hotel through CCTV Cameras. In his cross-examination by the learned defence counsel, he deposed that Hotel Oasis was luxurious. Toilet and bathroom were attached with all the rooms of the hotel. Even toilet and bathroom was attached with room No. 103. The height of the room as well as of the attached bathroom was 10 feet. Geyser in the bathroom-cum-toilet of room No. 103 was at the height of less than 8 feet. He did not know the cause of death of Rajwinder Kaur. He learnt from others that Rajwinder Kaur had committed suicide.

(13) PW.12 SI Mohinder Singh is the Investigating Officer. He deposed that on 10.08.2013, Shingara Singh met him along with Jaswant Singh Bharta in front of the gate of Civil Hospital, Garhshankar. Shingara Singh got recorded his statement vide Ex.P14. FIR Ex.43 was registered. The dead body was identified by Gurwinder Singh and Shingara Singh. It was sent for post mortem examination. He also recorded supplementary statement of Shingara Singh vide Mark P-15. He went to the place of occurrence. He prepared site plan Ex.P45. Omkar Sharma, Manager of the hotel, produced photostat copy of booking register Ex.P18, Driving Licence Mark-P17 and CD Ex.P8. These were taken into possession vide memo Ex.P1. He recorded statements of the witnesses. The accused made a disclosure statement that he had kept concealed a rope along with mobile phone of the deceased. He could get the same recovered. The disclosure statement is

Ex.P5. The accused took the police party to the disclosed place and got recovered rope and mobile phone of the deceased. He also moved application before the DTO, Mohali, to know the ownership of Tata Safari. In his cross-examination, he deposed that the police received information at 7.00 PM on 10.08.2013. He categorically stated that he had not shown any bathroom or toilet in room No. 103 in site plan Ex.P45. The mobile phone and rope were lying on the ground.

(14) PW.13 Munish Bindra proved the call details vide Ex.P54. He produced certificate issued under Section 65-B of the Indian Evidence Act vide Ex.P55.

(15) PW.5 Dr. Kavita Bhatia led her evidence by filing affidavit Ex.P19. She along with Dr. Joginder Singh and Dr. Parminder Singh conducted post mortem examination on the body of Rajwinder Kaur. They noticed following injuries on the person of the deceased :-

- (1) Ligature Mark present on neck at the level of larynx extending from 2.5 cm away from angle of mandible right side running obliquely upward extending below left mastoid process 6 cm towards left occipital bone of size 18.5 cm x 0.6 – 0.8 cm, reddish brown in colour.
- (2) Small red contusion present on left mandible 4 cm away from angle of mandible of size 1 cm x 0.3 cm.
- (3) Red abrasion of size 1.5 cm x 0.5 cm present on antero medial aspect of right leg (middle).
- (4) Red contusion of size 2.5 cm x 1.0 cm present on just below left knee joint.

On dissection of neck underlying skin soft tissue muscles were crushed and lacerated under ligature mark. Underlying blood vessel were lacerated and crushed. Larynx hyoid bones were congested and lacerated. Tracheal rings were also congested and lacerated.

The injuries were ante-mortem in nature. The probable time between injuries and death was within few minutes and between death and post- mortem examination was within 24 hours. PW.5 Dr. Kavita Bhatia was re- called for further examination-in-chief on 16.04.2014. According to her, as per the Chemical Examiner report, Ex.P27, no poison was detected in preservative stomach and its contents, parts of small and large intestine, lungs, heart, liver, spleen,

kidneys and blood. Spermatozoa was detected in swabs, slide, underwear and undershirt. According to her, the deceased was subjected to sexual inter-course. In her opinion, the cause of death was due to asphyxia due to constriction of neck. In her cross-examination, she deposed that she did not find any sign of struggle. The clothes of the deceased were not torn, mouth was not gagged, limbs were not tied. No injury was found on the face and knot was not tied at the back of neck of the deceased. From the symptoms, the possibility of death of deceased by suicide could not be ruled out. There was more possibility of the death of deceased by suicide.

(16) PW.11 Dr. Narinder Kumar testified that he was on duty in Civil Hospital, Garhshankar, on 10.08.2013. The dead body of Rajwinder Kaur was brought in the hospital. Entry in this regard was made by him in the Emergency OPD register at serial No. 3321. In his cross-examination, he deposed that when Rajwinder Kaur was brought to the hospital, she was already dead.

(17) PW.14 Dr. Joginder Singh along with Dr. Kavita Bhatia and Dr. Parminder Singh conducted post mortem examination on the body of Rajwinder Kaur. He deposed that in their opinion, the death was due to asphyxia due to constriction of neck. It was also opined that Rajwinder Kaur was also subjected to sexual inter-course. In his cross-examination, he deposed that most likely, the cause of death of Rajwinder Kaur was suicide. Presence of constriction of neck (ligature mark) was due to hanging of the dead body.

(18) PW.15 Dr. Parminder Singh medically examined accused Rupinder Singh. According to him, there was nothing to suggest that Rupinder Singh was impotent. He also deposed that he along with Dr. Kavita Bhatia and Dr. Joginder Singh conducted post mortem examination on the body of Rajwinder Kaur. According to their opinion, the cause of death was asphyxia due to constriction of neck. It was also opined that Rajwinder Kaur was also subjected to sexual inter-course vide Ex.P57. It was signed by all the members of the Medical Board, who conducted the post mortem examination. In his cross-examination by the learned defence counsel, he deposed that most likely, the death of Rajwinder Kaur was by suicide. Presence of constriction of neck (ligature mark) was due to hanging of the dead body.

(19) PW.2 Shingara Singh though has not supported the case of

the prosecution, but he being the father of the deceased got recorded two statements vide Ex.P14 and Mark P-15. He was confronted with these statements. His version that his signatures were obtained on the blank papers cannot be believed. Why the police would get signatures of father of the deceased on the blank papers. PW.4 Omkar Sharma, Manager of Oasis Hotel, Garhshankar, identified the appellant in the court, to be the same person who came in the hotel. He handed over to the police the CD of footage of CCTV Camera. He had allocated the room to the appellant after going through copy of his Driving Licence Mark P-17. In his re- examination, he categorically deposed that he saw the girl lying on the bed, but he did not know whether she was conscious or unconscious. He was declared hostile at the time of his re-examination and was cross-examined by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor. During the cross-examination by learned Additional Public Prosecutor, he admitted the presence of the appellant along with his wife Rajwinder Kaur entering the hotel through stairs. In his cross-examination by the learned defence counsel, he stated that the dead body was lying in the bathroom, but to the query put by the trial court, he again reiterated that when he went to room No.103, then wife of the appellant was lying unconscious on bed.

(20) According to the learned Senior Advocate appearing on behalf of the appellant, Rajwinder Kaur has committed suicide by hanging from a geyser in the bathroom attached to room No. 103. PW.6 Arjun Khanna prepared the scaled site plan Ex.P23. In his cross-examination, he categorically deposed that no bathroom or toilet was attached with room No. 103. Similarly, PW.12 SI Mohinder Singh, the Investigating Officer, also deposed that in his site plan Ex.P45, he had not mentioned any bathroom and toilet in the room. We have gone through both the site plans. No bathroom has been shown to be attached with room No. 103. PW.8 Daljit Singh, owner of the hotel, though stated that every room in the hotel was having an attached bathroom, but it is belied from the statement of PW.6 Arjun Khanna. In case, there was bathroom attached to the room, geyser should have been shown in the site plan. The height of the room, according to PW.8 Daljit Singh, was 10' and geyser in the bathroom-cum-toilet of room No. 103 was at the height of less than 8'. As per the post mortem report Ex.P22, height of the deceased was 5 feet 5 inches. In these circumstances, Rajwinder Kaur could not commit suicide by hanging from such a short height.

(21) The appellant had taken Rajwinder Kaur to the room. It was for him to explain under what circumstances she died. His defence that

she committed suicide is contrary to the evidence brought on record by the prosecution. The height of the girl was 5 feet 5 inches. She was 24 years old. In case, she would have hanged with geyser, it would have collapsed. PW.4 Omkar Sharma, when re-examined, deposed in his examination-in-chief that he saw that the girl was lying on bed, but he did not know whether she was conscious or unconscious. However, in reply to a query put by the trial court during cross-examination he admitted that wife of the appellant was lying unconscious on bed.

(22) Learned Senior Advocate appearing on behalf of the appellant has relied upon the statement of PW.7 Gurwinder Singh, who stated that the deceased was suffering from depression. However, no medical evidence has been brought on record in this regard. The case of the appellant before the trial court was that he along with Rajwinder Kaur had gone to Mata Chintpurni to pay obeisance. The fact of the matter is that as per the Chemical Examiner report, duly corroborated by the medical evidence, Rajwinder Kaur was subjected to sexual intercourse. There was no occasion for her to commit suicide. In the hotel record, she was shown as wife of the appellant. The entry in the register maintained in the hotel was duly proved. In the CCTV footage played in the court, the appellant was seen with Rajwinder Kaur in the hotel. The rope and mobile phone of the deceased were got recovered at the instance of the appellant.

(23) PW.5 Dr. Kavita Bhatia and PW.14 Dr. Joginder Singh only on the basis of the external appearance had opined that it was a case of death due to hanging. There is a detailed procedure and the manner, in which dissection of neck is required to be taken by the doctors at the time of post-mortem examination. According to the affidavit of PW.5 Dr. Kavita Bhatia, Ex.P19, ligature mark was present on neck at the level of larynx extending from 2.5 cm away from angle of mandible right side running obliquely upward extending below left mastoid process, 6 cm towards left occipital bone of size 18.5 cm x 0.6 cm - 0.8 cm, reddish brown in colour. On dissection of neck, underlying skin soft tissue muscles were crushed and lacerated under ligature mark, underlying blood vessel were lacerated and crushed. Larynx hyoid bones were congested and lacerated. Tracheal rings were also congested and lacerated.

(24) In a Textbook of Medical Jurisprudence and Toxicology, 24th Edition, Reprint 2012, Modi has stated that the neck and its structures should be examined after removing the brain and the chest organs, thus allowing blood to drain from the neck to the blood vessels.

There is extravasation of blood into the sub-cutaneous tissues under the ligature mark or finger marks, as well as in the adjacent muscles of the neck, which are usually lacerated. The cornua of the hyoid bone may be fractured also the superior cornua of thyroid cartilage but fracture of the cervical vertebrae is extremely rare. To arrive at a conclusion that death was due to strangulation, it is necessary, therefore, to note the effects of violence in the underlying tissues in addition to the ligature mark or bruise marks caused by the fingers or by the foot, knee and other appearances of death from asphyxia. The differences between hanging and strangulation have been explained by Modi in tabulated form as under :

	Hanging		Strangulation
1.	Mostly suicidal.	1.	Mostly homicidal
2.	Face-Usually pale and petechiae rare.	2.	Face-Congested, livid and marked with petechiae.
3.	Saliva-Dribbling out of the mouth down on the chin and chest.	3.	Saliva-No such dribbling.
4.	Neck-Stretched and elongated in fresh bodies.	4.	Neck-Not so.
5.	External signs of asphyxia, usually not well marked.	5.	External signs of asphyxia, very well marked (minimal if death due to vasovagal and carotid sinus effect).
6.	Ligature mark-Oblique, non-continuous placed high up in the neck between the chin and the larynx, the base of the groove or furrow being hard, yellow and parchment-like.	6.	Ligature mark-Horizontal or transverse continuous, round the neck, low down in the neck below the thyroid, the base of the groove or furrow being soft and reddish.
7.	Abrasions and ecchymoses round about the edges of the ligature mark, rare.	7.	Abrasions and ecchymoses round about the edges of the ligature mark, common.
8.	Subcutaneous tissues under the mark-White, hard and glistening.	8.	Subcutaneous tissues under the mark-Ecchymosed.
9.	Injury to the muscles of the neck-Rare.	9.	Injury to the muscles of the neck-Common.
10.	Carotid arteries, internal coats ruptured in violent cases of a long drop.	10.	Carotid arteries, internal coats ordinarily ruptured.
11.	Fracture of the larynx and trachea-Very rare and may not be found that	11.	Fracture of the larynx trachea and hyoid bone.

	too in judicial hanging.		
12.	Fracture-dislocation of the cervical vertebrae-Common in judicial hanging.	12.	Fracture-dislocation of the cervical vertebrae-Rare.
13.	Scratches, abrasions and bruises on the face, neck and other parts of the body-Usually not present.	13.	Scratches, abrasions fingernail marks and bruises on the face, neck and other parts of the body- Usually present.
14.	No evidence of sexual assault.	14.	Sometimes evidence of sexual assault.
15.	Emphysematous bullae on the surface of the lungs-Not present.	15.	Emphysematous bullae on the surface of the lungs-May be present.

(25) It is evident from the differences between hanging and strangulation in tabulated form, reproduced above, that in the case of 'strangulation' injury to the muscles of the neck is common and carotid arteries, internal coats are ordinarily ruptured. In the case of hanging, neck is stretched and elongated; injury to the muscles of the neck is rare; and carotid arteries, internal coats are ruptured in violent cases of a long drop. In the instant case, injuries to the muscles of the neck were noticed in the post- mortem report. The neck was not elongated. The height of the deceased was 5 feet 5 inches and the geyser was only at the height of 7'-8', even as per the statement of owner of the hospital. According to Modi, in the case of 'strangulation', tongue is often swollen, bruised and protruding. In the instant case also, as per the post mortem report, tongue was protruding. The probable time between injuries and death was within few minutes and the time between death and post-mortem was within 24 hours. All the injuries were ante-mortem in nature. All the signs of medical dissection of the deceased led to only one conclusion that it was a case of strangulation and not hanging.

(26) Accordingly, the prosecution has proved its case against the appellant beyond reasonable doubt. There is no merit in this appeal and same is dismissed. The impugned judgment dated 11.08.2014 and order dated 14.08.2014 are upheld.

Shubreet Kaur