

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (DB) No.114 of 1994

-
1. Wazul Miyan @ Anjul Miyan, son of S.K. Isha, resident of Village-Barahi Jagdish, P.S.-Purnaia, District-Sitamarhi
2. Dukhan Sahni, son of Lal Chand Sahni, resident of Village-Belwa, P.S.-Piprarih, District-Sitamarhi

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Prasoon Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Dilip Kumar Sinha, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.M. BADAR

And

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
CAV JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR)

Date : 01-12-2021

Heard Mr. Prasoon Sinha, learned counsel for the appellants and Mr. Ajay Mishra, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The appellants in this appeal have challenged the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 3rd of February 1994 passed by the learned 2nd Additional Sessions Judge, Sitamarhi in connection with Sessions Trial No. 229 of 1992/9 of 1993, arising out of Sitamarhi P.S. Case No. 168 of 1992.

3. By the aforesaid judgment dated 3rd of February, 1994, the appellants have been convicted for the



offences punishable under Section 302 read with section 34 of the Indian Penal Code and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for life. The appellant no. 2 namely Dukhan Sahni has further been convicted under Sections 307 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 4 years for the offence under Section 307 of the Indian Penal Code and further sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for two years for the offence under Section 27 of the Arms Act. The Trial Court, however directed that all the sentences shall run concurrently.

4. The prosecution case is based on the *Fardbeyan* of the informant, namely, Pramod Chandra Jha, who alleged that on 07.06.1992, the deceased Mohan Singh, a co-villager of the informant had requested the informant to bring money from his brick kiln. On the same day, at about 4:00 P.M, he brought a sum of Rs. 13,000/- from his brick kiln and delivered it to him at Ranjit Medical Hall. Thereafter, Mohan Singh went to pay the money to the coal dealer and informant came back to his residence. The further case of the prosecution is that on the same day again



at about 9:30 P.M. Mohan Singh along with the coal dealer namely, Ghoghar Mishra @ Baba came at the residence of the informant and talked for some time and thereafter Ghoghar Mishra left the house of the informant. Mohan Singh, thereafter asked the informant to accompany him up to his residence. Accordingly, the informant started accompanying Mohan Singh but as soon as they reached near Kiran Chowk, Mohan Singh (deceased) asked the informant to bring cigarette for him. Mohan Singh himself kept standing near Suman's Betal Shop and the informant went to bring the cigarette from the shop of Harni @ Netaji situated by the side of Suman Betal Shop and asked the shopkeeper to give him a cigarette. In the meantime, the appellants along with other accused persons namely, Raghunath Singh @ Raghunathia, Jagdish Singh, Dukhan Sahni, Anjul Mian @ Wajul Mian and two unknown persons came from the side of Singwahini market. The accused Raghunath Singh asked Mohan Singh to settle some accounts, upon which Mohan Singh asked him to come at his house next morning for settling the account. The accused, Jagdish Singh started abusing Mohan Singh



and said that they had to settle a number of accounts with him. In the meantime, these appellants namely Dukhan Singh and Anjul Miya caught hold Mohan Singh and the accused Raghunath Singh & Jagdish Singh brought out his pistol and opened fire in quick succession at Mohan Singh. The informant rushed towards them, raising an alarm but by that time Mohan Singh had fallen down after having been injured by the gun shot. The informant tried to lift Mohan Singh up in order to save him but he was caught by Raghunath Singh, who asked Dukhan Sahni (appellant) to kill him otherwise it would be proved dangerous for him in future. The informant was fired at by the appellant Dukhan Sahni but the shot got misfired and the informant, getting benefit of the misfire, got himself released and fled towards the hospital road. The accused again fired at the informant from his back which did not hit him. The informant managed to hide himself in the clinic of Dr. Nawal Kishore where the compounder of that clinic as well as the attendants of the patients saved the life of the informant. After hearing the sound of firing, several persons of the vicinity assembled over there and thereafter the informant



came out from the clinic and saw the accused persons, fleeing towards the river Lakhan Dei. The informant and Anil Kumar, brother-in-law of the deceased kept Mohan Singh on a “Thela” and took him to Sitamarhi Hospital where the doctor declared him dead.

5. The Fardbeyan of the informant was recorded at Sitamarhi Sadar Hospital on 07.06.1992 by Shri Praduban Singh, the then Sub-Inspector of Police, posted at Sitamarhi police station and on the basis of the fardbeyan, a formal F.I.R. being Sitamarhi P.S. Case No. 168 of 1992 was registered against the appellants and other accused persons.

6. It has been mentioned by the informant in the fardbeyan that the motive for the murder of Mohan Singh a dispute between one Amrendra Mishra and the accused Raghunath Singh with regard to the partnership in which the Mohan Singh (deceased) had done panchayati against the accused Raghunath Singh.

7. The Investigating Officer thereafter started investigating the matter and after completion of the investigation, charge-sheet has been submitted against the



F.I.R. named accused persons including the appellants.

8. On receipt of the charge-sheet, learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sitamarhi took cognizance of the offence, sent summons to the accused persons and after complying with the statutory requirements of Section 207 of the Cr.P.C, committed the case to the Court of Sessions for trial.

9. The charges were framed against all the accused persons for the offences punishable under Section 302 read with Sections 149, 148 and 307/34 of the Indian Penal Code. Further charges against the appellants, namely, Raghunath Singh, Dukhan Singh and Jagdish Singh have also been charged for the offence punishable under Section 27 of the Arms Act. The charges were read over and explained to the accused to which they pleaded not guilty and preferred to face the trial.

10. During trial, altogether ten witnesses were examined in order to prove the charges levelled against the accused persons. Out of them P.W. 1, Anil Kumar singh is a hearsay witness. Three witnesses have claimed themselves to be the eye witnesses of the alleged occurrence. P.W. 2.



Rajeshwar Singh is a co-villager of the deceased. P.W. 5., Arjun Singh is the brother-in-law of the deceased and P.W.6, Pramod Chandra Jha is the informant himself. P.W. 7, Krishna Nandan Prasad is the doctor, who conducted postmortem of the dead body of the deceased and prepared the postmortem report at 8:45 p.m. on 08.06.1992. P.W. 3 & 4 namely, Raju Kumar Singh & Sateyendra Singh are the formal witnesses alleged to be the witnesses on the inquest report. P.W. 8, Shri K.D. Ram is the Investigating Officer and then Officer in-charge of Sitamarhi police Station. P.W. 9, Ramasis Roy is the Head Clerk in legal section of Sitamarhi Collectorate and he has proved the sanction for prosecution of the accused under the Arms Act and P.W. 10, is the second Investigating Officer of the case.

11. The prosecution has also proved the following documents during trial :-

Sr.No.	Exhibits	Description
1.	1 & 1/1	Signature of Raju Singh and Satyendar Singh on inquest report
2.	2	Inquest Report
3.	3	Fardbeyan
4.	1/2	Signature of informant on fardbeyan
5.	4	Post-mortem report



6.	5	Seizure list
7.	6	Endorsement upon fardbeyan
8.	3/1	Formal F.I.R
9.	6	FSL (serologist report)
10.	8	Sanction order of the D.M.
11.	7/1	FSL report

12. On behalf of the defence, altogether 7 witnesses have been examined and some documentary evidence have also been exhibited on behalf of the defence.

13. D.Ws. 1, 3, 5 and 6 are staffs of the Bihar State Electricity Board Power Sub-station. They have been examined to show that in the night of 07.06.1992, there was no supply of electricity in Sitamarhi from 20.35 hours till 2 p.m. of the next day. D.W. 2 is Dr. Mahesh Thakur, Medical Officer of District Board Hospital, Saura. He has deposed that Raghunath Singh was treated by him with effect from 06.06.1992. He has stated that there was no arrangement for endorse patients in his hospital but arrangement for treatment of Raghunath Singh was made by outside. He has proved Ext-A, the relevant entry in hospital register. He has stated that Raghunath Singh was admitted at 11 a.m. on 06.06.1992 and he was discharged on 09.06.1992 at 3 p.m. The O.D. slip is marked as Ext.-B. The



prescription granted by him is marked as Ext.-C and certificate granted by him is marked as Ext.- D and signature of the accused on the certificate is marked as Ext.- E. D.W. 4 is a Sarpanch of village Sudama lying under P.S. Malangawa (Nepal). He has come to say that accused Jagdish Singh was in his village in connection with his election work from 28.05.1992 to 10 p.m. of 07.06.1992. D.W. 7 has been examined to show that informant namely Promod Chandra Jha was a 'Sipahi' of Satyendra Vastralaya whose duty was to collect dues from the customers.

14. Exts. F and F/1 are the writing of Jawahar Pd. Chowdhury and Bramdeo Mandal, switch board operators in Dumra Power sub-station. According to D.W. 5, there was no supply of electricity in Sitamarhi town from 21.15 hours of 07.06.1992 till 9.15 hours of 08.06.1992. Ext.-G is an endorsement by D.W.-6 to the effect that at 19.10 hours and 19.20 hours he tried to give electric supply to Dumra feeder but it did not hold and only Sitamarhi feeder was in operation.

15. We now proceed to discuss and legally evaluate the prosecution evidence adduced in this case in



order to examine as to whether the alleged complicity of the accused persons-appellants can be said to be proved by acceptable and reliable legal evidences or not.

16. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellants has argued that judgment of conviction and order of sentence passed by the learned Trial Court is bad in law as well as on fact, the court below has failed to consider the evidence on record in its true perspective which vitiates the finding completely.

17. The further contention of the learned counsel for the appellants is that the learned court below has committed gross error in disbelieving the evidences of the employees of the Electricity Board. There is no reason for the Court below to disbelieve the records of the Electricity Board which are maintained by the public servants in the official register of the board while performing their official duties.

18. *Per-contra*, learned Additional P.P. on behalf of the State argued that the prosecution has proved the prosecution case beyond reasonable doubts with consistent evidence adduced by the prosecution witnesses



and as such, the appeal of the appellants is fit to be dismissed.

19. Firstly, it would be seen that whether the death of deceased Mohan Singh is homicidal or not. From perusal of the postmortem report as well as evidences of P.W. 7, doctor, who conducted the post-mortem, it becomes clear that the death of Mohan Singh is homicidal. Injuries were of fire arms and were sufficient to cause death and the death was caused due to shock and hemorrhage.

20. P.W. 1 Anil Kumar Singh is the hearsay witness. He has deposed that on the alleged night of the occurrence at about 10 p.m. he had gone to the residence of Mohan Singh but he was not present at his residence. Then in search of Mohan Singh, he reached Kiran Chowk through Singvahini Market and in the electric light he saw that Mohan Singh was laying in a pool of blood just west to Kiran Chowk Golambar. Pramod Chandra Jha arrived there and he told him that two minutes before the appellants caught Mohan Singh, whereupon accused Raghunath Singh and Jagdish Singh fired from their pistols in quick succession on deceased Mohan Singh who fell on the



ground. The informant Pramod Chandra Jha was also chased and fired but the bullet did not hit him. He further stated that he and Pramod Chandra Jha put Mohan Singh on a 'Thela' and took him to Sadar Hospital, Sitamarhi where the doctor declared him dead. During cross-examination, he admitted that he, Mohan Singh (deceased) and his brother Sohan Singh and Arjun Singh (P.W.5) had criminal antecedents. In para 5 of his cross-examination, he admitted that Jamadar of Sitamarhi police station had arrived near the dead body when they were preparing to take the body to hospital and Pramod Chandra Jha (P.W.6) got his statement recorded to that Jamadar about the manner of occurrence and he also signed on that paper as a witness. He further deposed that in the process of putting Mohan Singh on 'Thela' blood stains were caused on his hand and cloths. He went to hospital with body of Mohan Singh and remained there for an hour and during that period the informant, Arjun Singh, Gangadhar Jha, Awadhesh Singh and Rajeshwar Singh were also present. It would be proper to mention here that Gangadhar Jha and Awadhesh Singh have not been produced by the prosecution as a witness



though they were charge sheeted witnesses and they were given up.

21. P.W. 2, Rajeshwar Singh, who claims to be the eye witness of the occurrence has stated that the occurrence took place between 9.30 and 10 p.m. on a Sunday night. He, Janardan Jha and Awadhesh Singh had taken their meal at Ashoka Hotel and had arrived to take betel at the shop of Haruni. He saw the occurrence and identified the accused persons in the electric light of electric pole. Accused Raghunath Singh asked from Mohan Singh about the accounts upon which Mohan Singh asked him to come to his residence next day and then Jagdish Singh using abusive language stated that they had to settle several accounts from him and then accused, Dukhan Sahni and Wajul Mian caught Mohan Singh and Raghunath Singh and Jagdish Singh fired at Mohan Singh (deceased) with Nalkatua in quick succession as a result of which Mohan Singh fell down and Promod Jha rushed towards him and wanted to lift Mohan Singh but Raghunath Singh caught Pramod Chandra Jha and stated that he should also be killed otherwise he will prove dangerous and Dukhan Sahni



brought out a Nalkatua and fired at Pramod Jha but it was misfired and then Pramod Jha managed to get him free and fled towards north and then accused chased him firing. He further stated that Pramod Jha and Anil Singh put Mohan Singh on a 'Thela' and went to hospital. But later on, he heard that Mohan Singh expired. These witnesses admitted vide paragraph -5 in his cross examination, he as well as Gangadhar Jha, the informant (P.W. 6) and deceased are residents of same village Chiraiya. He further admitted that he was also accused along with the deceased and informant in Purnahia P.S. Case No. 13/83 under Section 27 of the Arms Act. He was also accused in a case under Section 395 of the Indian Penal Code along with the accused persons. In his cross examination vide paragraphs No. 7, 8 & 9, the defence tried to show that this witness had no need to go to Ashoka Hotel for taking meal as so many hotels are there near Mahsaul Chowk as well as east to Mehsaul Chowk which would have been nearer to the house of this witness.

22. It is strongly argued on behalf of the appellants that this witness is not trustworthy as he has changed his version in Court from what he stated before the



Investigating Officer. He stated in his evidence that accused Raghunath Singh and Jagdish Singh fired in quick succession, but from the evidence of P.W. 8, Investigating Officer in paragraph-18, he (P.W.2) deposed before the Investigating Officer that accused Raghunath Singh fired towards the right side of head of Mohan Singh from a very close range and who fell on the ground, then accused Jagdish Singh put his small arm just near the neck of Mohan Singh and fired.

23. P.W. 5, Arjun Singh, claims to be the eye witness and brother-in-law of Mohan Singh (deceased). He deposed that on 07.06.1992 between 9.30 to 9.45 p.m. he was at the residence of Mohan Singh. An electric bulb was lightening on a pole, at that time four accused persons and two unknown persons, who had put gamcha around their mouth arrived there and enquired from him and his sister about Mohan Singh. They told that Mohan Singh must be in market and then those persons went towards town through Singwahini market. He got suspicious and followed them and reached near Praveen store then he saw that accused persons went near his brother-in-law Mohan Singh. He



further deposed about the manner of occurrence in similar way as stated by P.W. 2. He has stated that he along with Pramod Jha and Anil Singh took Mohan Singh to Hospital where Mohan Singh was declared dead. He deposed about his involvement in Sitamarhi P.S. Case No. 66 of 1988, in which, he, Mohan Singh & Anil Kumar Singh (P.W. 1) were accused.

24. The contention raised by the learned counsel for the appellants is that if P.W. 5 was present at the place of occurrence, there was no reason that he should not have been cited as a witness in the fardbeyan. When F.I.R. was written, no statement of this witness was recorded by the Investigating Officer (vide para 14 of P.W.8). This witness, vide paragraph No.8 has not stated that he has seen the occurrence. This witness have not signed as a witness upon the fardbeyan. Vide paragraph-18 of P.W. 8, this witness has stated to the Investigating Officer that the firing by Raghunath Singh was made from point blank range at the head of Mohan Singh and then Mohan Singh fell down and immediately Jagdish Singh fired at his neck from point blank range.



25. P.W. 6, Pramod Chandra Jha, informant of this case claims to be the eye witness of the occurrence. He alleged to be the star witness of the case. He deposed about the time, place and manner of occurrence, as mentioned in fardbeyan (Ext- 3). In para 21, P.W. 8 has stated that the informant Pramod Chandra Jha had stated before him that Raghunath Singh and Jagdish Singh fired at Mohan Singh from point blank range and had not stated that they fired in quick succession.

26. P.W. 7, is the doctor, who found following *ante-mortam* injuries on the body of the deceased :-

“(I) There was an oval wound size 1’ on the left side of neck with inverted margin with greasing base and smoke. The wound had bleeding clots. This was wound of entrance.

(ii) There was irregular margin everted wound on the right side of skull with fracture of right temporal frontal and parietal bones in pieces, the brain matter was in torn condition & blood clots were seen. This was wound of exit – size 3’.

(iii) The left upper inciser teeth was fractured, broken at the level of gum. On opening the skull, the brain matter was found torn from left base to right upper temporal region which was full of blood clots, the right temporal frontal and parietal bones were fractured in multiple pieces; the occipital bone was also fractured on the left side. On opening



the neck the big vessels of left side was found torn & muscles were lacerated and neck was full of blood clots. The trachea & oesophagus was also torn and blood clots were present.

27. According, to the doctor, injury no. (I) found near the neck was wound of entry and injury no. (ii) found on the right side of skull was wound of exit. According to him these injuries were of fire arm and were sufficient to cause death and the death was caused due to shock and haemorrhage.

28. P.W. 8 is the Investigating Officer of the case, who proceeded for the place of occurrence at 11.30 p.m. at about 11.40 p.m. He again took the statement of informant at the place of occurrence. He also examined Rajeshwar Singh, Gangadhar Jha, Awadhesh Singh and Anil Kumar. According to him, S.I. Balbhadra Singh prepared seizure list on his instruction and he signed the seizure list. The seizure list is signed by witnesses Raj Kumar Prasad and Mahendra Raut, who has a hotel near P.O. who have not been examined in this case. Balbhadra Singh, S.I. of police has also not been examined. The seizure list is marked as Ext .5. In cross- examination in paragraph -11, he has stated that he has not noted in the diary about the source of



information on which S.I. Praduman Singh went to Sadar Hospital and recorded fardbeyan. He further stated that he did not examine the 'Thelawala' on whose 'thela' Mohan Singh (deceased) was taken to hospital. He also did not examine any person of Randhir Meidical Hall.

29. We have gone through the entire evidences available on record which has been adduced on behalf of the prosecution as well as defence side. On behalf of the appellants, it is argued that ocular evidence of witnesses was not consistent with the injury found on the person of the deceased. In the fardbeyan as well as evidence during trial, the prosecution story is that Mohan Singh was given two shots by fire arms. All the eye witnesses including the hearsay witness P.W. 1 had deposed before the Investigating Officer that firstly, the revolver was fixed by one accused on the head of the deceased and it was fired and then deceased fell down and thereafter, another accused fixed his revolver on the neck of Mohan Singh and fired. But during trial, the witnesses have denied their earlier statements made before the Investigating Officer and all of them stated that firing were made in quick succession



by two accused persons. The Medical Officer P.W. 7 has stated that the injury was found on the body of the deceased on the neck where the injury of entrance and injury found on the head was the injury of exit. It was a case of solitary shot. It clearly falsifies the story of the witnesses and proves that none of the witnesses had seen the occurrence. In a case cited in 1980 Cri. L.J, Page 1298, it is observed by the Hon'ble Apex Court vide paragraph -13, the version of prosecution witnesses with regard to the vital fact was inherently improbable and intrinsically incredible. It could not be accepted in preference to the evidence of the medical expert.

30. It is argued on behalf of the appellants that on behalf of the defence as many as 7 D.Ws have been examined and some documents have also been filed. D.W.s 1, 3, 5 and 6 are staffs of Bihar State Electricity Board Power sub-station. They have been examined to show that in the night of 07.06.1992, there was no supply of electricity in Sitamarhi Town from 20.35 hours till 2 p.m. of the next day. Ext.s F and F/1 are writings of Jawahar Pd. Chowdhary and Brahmhdeo Mandal, Switch Board



Operators in Dumra Power sub-station. According to D.W. 5, there was no supply of electricity in Stamarhi town from 21.15 hours of 7.6.1992 till 9.15 hours of 8.6.1992.

31. It is argued on behalf of the appellants that learned lower court has committed an error in not relying the evidence in respect of disconnecting of the power supply at the time of occurrence which are well proved by the defence side. It is further argued that the prosecution has failed to prove the alleged motive for the murder of Mohan Singh. It is submitted that when motive is asserted, it is to be proved. The alleged motive in this case is a dispute between one Amrendra Mishra and accused Raghunath Singh for a partnership in which deceased, Mohan Singh had done Panchayti against Raghunath Singh. P.W. 6, the informant, in paragraph -16 has admitted that he did not mention the date, time and place of so-called panchayti in the first information report and no ocular or document evidence has been adduced to corroborate the panchayti, that no memorandum of panchayti was produced. It was therefore submitted that the prosecution is failed to establish the alleged motive.



32. The further contention of the appellants is that the prosecution has also failed to prove the place of occurrence. P.W. 7, doctor has stated that the left upper incise tooth of the deceased was found fractured and broken at the level of gum but no trace of broken teeth was found on the alleged place of occurrence. The doctor, P.W. 7 further stated that at the exit point of injury no. II bone of 3” diameter was found missing but no such bone was found on the alleged place of occurrence. P.W. 6 in paragraph – 18 has admitted that at the time of alleged occurrence deceased Mohan Singh was wearing a leather chappal but on the alleged place of occurrence or in the inquest report, there is no mention that any chappal was found. The Investigating Officer (P.W. 8) in paragraph – 16 in his evidence has admitted that he did not find any broken teeth or bone of scalp or any chapal at the alleged place of occurrence. For want of any explanation and for the absence of these articles, the alleged place of occurrence become doubtful. Further contention on behalf of the appellants is that the seizure of blood from the alleged place of occurrence was highly suspicious because the seizure list witness, Raj



Kumar Prasad and Mahendra Raut have not turned up to prove the seizure. They have not come to say that the seizure list was prepared by S.I. Balbhadra Singh & P.W. 8, the investigating Officer in paragraph – 14 has admitted that there was no mention in the case diary that he directed Balbhadra singh to prepare seizure of the blood. The seizure list (ext. -5) does not bear the signature of Balbhadra Singh. P.W. 8 in paragraph -18 has admitted that there was no mention in the case diary that blood stains was kept in malkhana of the police station.

33. Having considered the above submissions made on behalf of the parties, it is clear that prosecution has failed to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt in respect of place of occurrence, manner of occurrence and explanation of the injuries sustained by the person of the deceased. Motive has not proved as asserted by the prosecution. Learned lower court had committed wrong in respect of not relying the non-supply of electricity at the time of occurrence as prosecution witnesses has seen the occurrence in the light of electricity.

34. In this case, it is admitted fact that



prosecution witnesses and accused persons have inimical terms with each other and the accused persons fired at the deceased before the presence of the informant, Pramod Chandra Jha, who also has inimical terms with the accused persons. It is candid that accused persons were on inimical terms from before with the informant, deceased and their companions, We find no possibility that he (informant) could have been allowed by the accused persons to escape unscathed from the place of occurrence for becoming the star witness of the prosecution case.

35. All the prosecution witnesses i.e. P.Ws. 2, 5 & 6, who claims to be eye witnesses are interested witnesses and related to each other. After scrutinizing their evidence with care and caution, we find that they suffered from infirmities. There is no consistency in the evidence of the prosecution witnesses with respect to place, time and manner of occurrence.

36. In that view of the matter and for the reasons aforesaid, the judgement of conviction and order of sentence dated 3rd of February 1994 passed by the learned 2nd Additional Sessions Judge in connection with Sessions



Trial No. 229 of 1992/9 of 1993 arising out of Sitamarhi
P.S. Case No. 168 of 1992 is set aside.

37. The appeal is allowed. The appellants are
acquitted of all the charges.

38. Since the appellants have been released
on bail, they are therefore, discharge from the liabilities of
their bail bonds.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

A.M. Badar, J

(A. M. Badar, J)

Jagdish/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	24/11/2021
Uploading Date	02/12/2021
Transmission Date	

