



accused/respondent No.1. She in her evidence before this Court categorically denied that the complainant was dispossessed by the accused persons, rather she deposed that the complainant since her child hood indulged in leaving the house on and off. Although, she was cross-examined by the learned counse<sup>31</sup> for the complainant at length, however, her testimony remained stead-fast and no incriminatory fact brought on record during her cross-examination, which brings her statement shaky.”

Perusal of above paragraph reflects that matter pertains to family issue between the parties. Appellant present, confirms that his ex-wife and only one kid/daughter are residing in the subject matter premises. Accordingly, this is not a case of forcibly dispossession; hence, instant Crl. Acquittal Appeal is dismissed. Appellant would be at liberty to avail remedy before the Civil Court.

JUDGE