

**De Facto IAS**  
Criminal Law Judgement Writing

---

In March 2021, 'A', a 28-year-old accountant, was accused of the murder of 'B', a colleague from the same firm. The prosecution claims that 'A' and 'B' had a history of workplace disputes and altercations, leading to a motive for the murder. The key piece of evidence presented by the prosecution is security camera footage showing 'A' entering the building where 'B' was found dead, shortly before the time of death estimated by the medical examiner.

'A' has pleaded not guilty, providing an alibi supported by two witnesses who claim 'A' was at a nearby cafe at the time of the murder. Furthermore, 'A's defence argues that the security camera footage is grainy and does not conclusively prove 'A's presence at the scene. The defence also suggests that there could have been other individuals in the building who had similar motives for harming 'B'

During the trial, forensic experts testified about the time of death, the nature of the injuries sustained by 'B', and the analysis of the security footage. Both the prosecution and defence have submitted their final arguments.

As the judge presiding over this case, you are required to draft a judgement.

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS, DISTRICT COURT**

State vs. 'A'  
Session Case No.: XYZ of 2021  
Under Section: 302 of the Indian Penal Code  
Date of Judgment: [Insert Date]  
Presiding Judge: Hon'ble Justice [Insert Name]

Prosecution: Government of [State]  
Accused: 'A'  
Charge: Murder of 'B'

**JUDGMENT**

The matter before this court pertains to the alleged murder of 'B', a colleague, by the accused 'A', a 28-year-old accountant. The prosecution has charged 'A' under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC), which pertains to the punishment for murder.

**Background**

The prosecution claims that a history of workplace disputes and altercations between 'A' and 'B' culminated in the murder of 'B'. Central to the prosecution's case is the security camera footage that ostensibly shows 'A' entering the building shortly before the time 'B' was found dead. The prosecution posits that this footage, along with the history of disputes, establishes a motive and opportunity for 'A' to commit murder.

**Defence**

The defence has contested the charge on several grounds. Firstly, 'A' has presented an alibi supported by two witnesses, who testified that 'A' was at a nearby cafe at the critical time. Secondly, the defence argues that the security footage is too grainy to conclusively identify 'A'. Lastly, the defence highlighted the possibility of other individuals with motives to harm 'B'.

**Evidence and Analysis**

**Evidence Presented:**

Security Footage (Section 65B of the Indian Evidence Act): The footage presented is argued to be critical. However, the resolution and quality have been questioned by the defence. The prosecution relied on expert testimony under Section 45 of the Indian Evidence Act to assert that the person in the video was indeed 'A'.

Alibi (Section 11 of the Indian Evidence Act): 'A' presented an alibi supported by two witnesses, claiming that he was at a cafe several blocks away from the crime scene. The defence submitted receipts and digital evidence (under Section 65B of the Evidence Act) to corroborate this claim.

Forensic Evidence (Sections 45 and 57 of the Indian Evidence Act): The forensic experts provided insights into the nature of the injuries sustained by 'B', suggesting a time of death that could potentially align with 'A's presence at the cafe.

**Legal Analysis**

Assessment of Evidence: The security footage, while pivotal, lacks the clarity required for conclusive identification under the rigorous standards of criminal proof. The defence's challenge under Section 114 of the Evidence Act about the graininess and ambiguity in the footage holds merit.

Evaluation of Alibi: The alibi is strongly backed by electronic evidence and witness testimony, which stands scrutiny under cross-examination. This creates reasonable doubt about 'A's presence at the crime scene.

Burden of Proof (Section 101 of the Indian Evidence Act): The burden rests upon the prosecution to establish the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt. Given the evidential gaps and the effective alibi, this burden has not been met.

**Conclusion**

Considering all the evidence and arguments, this court finds that the prosecution has failed to establish beyond a reasonable doubt that 'A' committed the murder of 'B'. The alibi provided by 'A' introduces substantial doubt into the prosecution's narrative.

**Order**

The court upholds the acquittal of 'A' under Section 302 of the IPC. The appeal filed by the State is dismissed.

This judgement is delivered in open court.

Delivered by:

[Insert Judge's Name]

[Insert Judicial Title]

[Insert Date of Judgement]

