

\$~

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **Crl. A. No.1236/2012**

% **Reserved on: 17th July, 2017**
Date of Decision: 25th August, 2017

RAM SURAT

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anil Aggarwal & Mr. Mahendra
Mishra, Advocates

Versus

THE STATE

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajat Katyal, APP for the State
along with Insp. C. R. Meena, P. S.
New Ashok Nagar in person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G. S. SISTANI

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDER SHEKHAR

CHANDER SHEKHAR, J.

The appellant has filed the present appeal under Section 374 of the Code of Criminal Procedure 1973 (Cr.P.C.) against the impugned judgment, dated 13.07.2012, and the order of sentence, dated 18.07.2012, respectively passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-II, North West Rohini Courts, Delhi in case FIR No.96/2011, P.S.-Ashok Vihar, whereby the appellant has been convicted under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC), 1860 and sentenced to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for life and fine of Rs.50,000/- and in default of payment of fine, further undergo simple imprisonment for a period of three months.

2. The case of the prosecution, as noticed by the Trial Court, is that, on 15.4.2011, DD No.8A was received at Police Station Ashok Vihar regarding a dead body lying near railway lines WPIA, Ashok Vihar, SS Nagar, pursuant to which SI Kundan Lal along with HC Ashok Kumar reached the spot i.e. Bank of Yamuna Canal, *Jhuggi* SS Nagar, WPIA Ashok Kumar, where they found a dead body lying on a *takhat* duly covered with a *chaddar*. SI Kundan Lal noticed that the head of the deceased had been smashed and a large amount of blood had come out which had soaked the bedding (*bistar*), including the pillow and a blood stained rock lying under the *takhat* on the side of head. One Manoj Kumar Shah met SI Kundan Lal, who informed the police that the dead body was of his father-in-law Veer Bahadur, who used to reside with him. Manoj Kumar Shah also informed the police that his father-in-law Veer Bahadur used to put a *rehri* of *Jalebi* on a *takhat* at the corner of the Prembari bridge for a month prior to the incident. Manoj Kumar Shah informed the police that Ram Surat had his *jhuggi* opposite his *jhuggi*, and was putting a *thaiya* for selling slippers near the *takhat* of Veer Bahadur. He further informed the police that Ram Surat had been claiming his right over the place near his *jhuggi* and the *jhuggi* of his brother's near the bank of canal. He further informed the police that Ram Surat had been objecting to Veer Bahadur, on his putting the *takhat* of *jalebi*. On 14.4.2011, Ram Surat had threatened his father-in-law Veer Bahadur, that he would kill him if he does not remove his *takhat*.

3. On 15.4.2011, at 5:40 AM, he informed the police that, when he was going from his *jhuggi* to attend the call of nature, he saw Ram Surat abusing Veer Bahadur who was sleeping on the *takhat* and Ram Surat was holding a heavy stone in his hands, with which he was hitting Veer Bahadur. On seeing him, Ram Surat ran towards Keshav Puram side. Thereafter Manoj Kumar Shah raised an alarm and the police was informed.

4. The manner in which the crime was detected and investigated stands detailed in Police Report filed under section 173(2) of the Cr.P.C. Thereafter on the basis of the statement of Manoj Kumar Shah investigation was held on 15.04.2011, thereafter on the basis of secret information, the appellant Ram Surat was apprehended from Ring Road, Prembari Bridge Canal at the corner of the canal. After completion of investigation, charge sheet was filed in the Court, appellant was charged u/s. 302 IPC. Appellant pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

5. In this case, on consideration of evidence and material placed on record and after considering the arguments advanced, we have found that the following circumstances were relied upon by the trial Court to convict the appellant:-

- (i) Deceased Veer Bahadur was the father in law of Manoj Kumar Shah (PW-17).
- (ii) Deceased Veer Bahadur used to put a *rehri* of *Jalebi* on a *takhat* at the corner of Prembari bridge for a month prior to the incident. The appellant Ram Surat who was having his *jhuggi*

opposite to the *jhuggi* of PW-17 Manoj Kumar Shah, was also having a *thaiya* for selling slippers near the *takhat* of Veer Bahadur.

- (iii) Appellant was claiming his right over the place near his *jhuggi* and the *jhuggi* of his brothers near the bank of canal.
- (iv) Appellant was objecting to deceased Veer Bahadur on his putting the *takhat* of *jalebi*.
- (v) PW-17 Manoj Kumar Shah stated that, on 14.4.2011 the appellant had threatened his father-in-law Veer Bahadur to kill him if he did not remove his *takhat*.
- (vi) PW-17 Manoj Kumar Shah, on 15.4.2011 at 05:30 a.m to 05:40 a.m. when he was going to attend the call of nature, saw that the appellant was abusing the deceased, who was sleeping on the *takhat* and the appellant was holding a heavy stone in his hands with which he was hitting the deceased.
- (iv) Dead body of the deceased was recovered and was sent to BJRM Hospital where the concerned doctor declared Veer Bahadur as brought dead.
- (v) Thereafter, a case under Section 302 IPC was registered.
- (vi) FSL report proves that the blood of the deceased was of 'B' Group.
- (viii) Recovery of blood stained pant, jacket, shoes of appellant Ram Surat which he was wearing at the time of commission of

crime, was also caught wearing the same clothes at the time of his arrest.

6. To bring home the guilt of the appellant, the prosecution examined 21 witnesses in all. Statement of the appellant was recorded under Section 313 Cr.P.C., wherein he pleaded false implication.

7. Learned counsel appearing for the appellant has strongly urged before this Court that the Trial Court has erred in passing the impugned judgment. It has wrongly appreciated the facts and passed the judgment and the order of sentence contrary to law. He also contended that the appellant has been falsely implicated in this case. It has been strongly urged by the learned counsel for the appellant before this Court that the deposition of PW-17, Manoj Kumar Shah, who is stated to be an eye witness in the present case, is in fact a planted eye witness, since the incident did not take place in his presence and also his evidence is not consistent and corroborated. He further submitted that there is a lot of dispute over the time of occurrence of the offence which is evident from the testimonies of PW-17 Manoj Kumar Shah, PW-13 Ct Kamal Singh and PW-3 Dr. Bhim Singh. He also submitted that the extraordinary promptness shows, that all the proceedings, including the FIR, were manipulated. Learned counsel for the appellant also submitted that the prosecution has failed to prove the motive of the appellant, to kill the deceased Veer Bahadur.

8. Learned counsel for the appellant also submitted that the so-called eye-witness PW-17 Manoj Kumar Shah, who, after seeing the dead body,

had rushed to his wife, who had been examined as PW-14 Smt. Sandhya that, at about 5:50 A.M., he came to her and told her that her father was lying dead on the *thaiya* and ‘somebody’ had killed him, therefore he did not mention the name of appellant.

9. The learned counsel for the appellant further submitted that PW-17 Manoj Kumar Shah had admitted in his statement that a large number of persons from *jhuggi* cluster go to the railway lines in the morning to attend the call of nature but none of them stopped the appellant and the deceased while they were quarrelling, however no such witnesses joined the investigation and nor were they examined by the police or the prosecution before the Court.

10. Per contra, Mr. Rajat Katyal, learned counsel for the State submits that the prosecution has been able to prove its case beyond any shadow of doubt.

11. Learned counsel for the State submitted that there was ample evidence on record to bring home the charges against the appellant, warranting conviction.

12. Let us deal with the first contention of the learned counsel for the appellant, who submitted that PW-17, Manoj Kumar Shah is a planted witness and he has not seen the occurrence of the incident. PW-17 has stated that firstly he had seen the dead body of the deceased Veer Bahadur, then he met his wife PW-14, Smt. Sandhya, thereafter he met the PCR van

officials, as reported in Ex.PW-13/A, and then met SI Kundan Lal, thereafter, he met the Investigating Officer, who had recorded the statement. Learned counsel for the appellant stated that, as per PW-17, on the next morning, on 15.4.2011, at about 5:30-5:45 am, when he was going to attend the call of nature, he saw that the accused Ram Surat was abusing his father-in-law, Veer Bahadur and he was holding a big stone in his hands and was hitting on the head of his father-in-law Veer Bahadur. After seeing him, he immediately threw the stone on the ground and ran away towards railway line, Keshav Puram area.

13. Learned counsel for the appellant has relied on the relevant portion of Exhibit PW-13/A-PCR information, which reads thus:-

“06:42:13 A/SHO with staff mauka pa hai blood se sana hua patthar 20-30 kg ka pass hi pada hua hai. Blood nikal kar bahar tak jama hua hai. Raat ko kaafi pehle ki vardat lagti hai. Iska damad mauka par hai.”

14. Learned counsel for the appellant has also relied on the postmortem report of the deceased Veer Bahadur, the relevant portion of which reads thus:

a) At the top left side- postmortem No.359/11 date 16.04.11 time 12:45 p.m. Right side bottom – Time since death about = 20 hours. Statement of PW-3, Dr. Bhim Singh “Injury No.1 was sufficient cause for the death in ordinary course of nature. Time since death was about 20 hours.” “The body was sent to me for postmortem at 12:45 p.m. and I started the postmortem then and there.” According to postmortem report, the death occurred on 15.04.2011 at about 4:45 p.m.”

15. Learned counsel for the appellant submitted that, no postmortem was conducted on the body of the deceased and the whole report was prepared by PW-3, based on the basis of an application for autopsy submitted by the Police (ex.PW-21/E). In the said document, the date and time of incident is shown as 15.4.2011 at about 5:40 pm, the date and time of death is also shown as 15.4.2011 at about 5:40 pm. The entire postmortem report was prepared mechanically, without any physical examination and solely on the basis of the application and brief facts. However, after analyzing the evidence of PW-17, Manoj Kumar Shah, and analysing the other documents placed on record, as well as taking into consideration the findings of the learned trial Court, we do not find any force in the contention of learned counsel for the appellant that PW-17 is a planted witness or that he had not seen the occurrence of the incidence. The very presence of PW-17, is corroborated by the fact that he was the one to make the PCR call. The official witnesses in this regard, have duly supported the fact that PW-17 was present at the spot when they reached there. It is also on record that the name of PW-17 is also transmitted by the PCR officials as recorded in the PCR form. The accused has been named at the first instance by the complainant in its complaint/*rukka* and he has also mentioned the shirt being worn by the accused. The accused was apprehended on the same day and was found wearing the same shirt as described in the FIR and further the FSL report has found human blood of 'B' group on the same and the appellant has not given any explanation in respect to the same in his statement under Section 313 Cr. PC. The paper on which the statement of the complainant was recorded was found to

contain blood stains and the same gives credence to the statement of PW-17, Manoj Kumar Shah, and the fact that the statement was recorded at the spot supports the case of the prosecution. The learned Trial Court has taken note of the fact that medically the average clotting time for human beings varies from less than a minute to 70-80 seconds depending upon various factors, i.e., level of calcium and vitamin K, platelet cells etc. In case of an accident or major vessel rupture, the clotting time would be much more, i.e., 15 to 20 minutes and therefore it is a circumstantial evidence which bears credence to the version given by PW-17, Manoj Kumar Shah. PW-17 in his deposition has stated that on seeing the incident, he immediately ran to his house and made a call on 100 number, it has also come on record that when the police reached the spot, blood was still oozing out from the body of the deceased and the clothes and bedding were still wet, thus, this demonstrates that the incident had taken place in the morning hours i.e. minutes before the police reached the spot and even before the blood could have clotted. It is clear from the evidence of PW-12, SI Kundan Lal and PW-19, HC Ashok Kumar that they had reached the spot around 6:15 am and PW-21, Inspector Vinod Kumar Sharma reached the spot around 6:22 am and the PCR reached the spot around 6:31 am as per the PCR chart. The PCR chart states that at 6:10 am, PCR relayed the information that they were trying to locate the address/spot and the caller is disconnecting the calls. It is also on record that at about 6:10 am they had found the spot and the call was true and gave the name of the deceased as Veer Bahadur. It is also placed on record that the PCR further relayed that, the son-in-law of the deceased who was sleeping in the jhuggi, had informed about the same.

The matter was being investigated by PW-21. Inspector Sharma and he was present at the spot before the arrival of the PCR, as stated by this witness.

16. It is to be taken note of the fact that the PCR officials were not investigating the case but were only relaying the answers to the queries as made from time to time from the Control Room in respect to the spot, incident, presence of local police etc. PW-12, SI Kundan Lal, PW-19, HC Ashok Kumar, PW-18 Constable Babu Lal, PW-20 Constable Mukim Zaved and PW-21, Inspector Vinod Kumar Sharma have duly stated that, the PW-17 in his examination-in-chief and PW-14 in her cross-examination had alleged the appellant as the perpetrator of the crime. It is proved that the *Rukka* PW-6/B was prepared based on the basis of the statement made by this eye-witness, PW-17, wherein he specifically accused Ram Surat as the person who had hit his father-in-law the deceased Veer Bahadur with a stone on his head. Even otherwise, the behaviour and the conduct of PW-17 seems to be most natural and probable, it is natural that every person who witnesses a crime or faces such a situation behaves in a different manner. If there were 5 or 10 persons, their narration of the incident and their conduct and behaviour would be different from one another. We do not find any substance in the arguments of learned counsel for the appellant that the behaviour of PW-17 was unnatural, as he had claimed that he had seen the accused lifting the stone and hitting his father-in-law from a distance of 15-20 feet but he did not run towards the place of occurrence nor attempted to stop the accused and not even tried to catch hold of him when the accused

was running after throwing the stone. Therefore, the conduct of PW-17 seems to be quite natural and we are not able to find any flaw therein. The *jhuggi* of PW-17 is hardly three to five meters away from the spot of the incident, on seeing the accused Ram Surat smash the head of his father-in-law with a rock stone, he raised an alarm and rushed inside his house to call his wife, which was just a couple of seconds away from the place from where he had seen the accused hitting the deceased while he was going to attend the call of nature towards the railway lines, thereafter, he had immediately made the PCR call from his mobile, he further explained that the reason for not calling the doctor was that he already knew that his father-in-law had died immediately, before he could even react. There is nothing in the cross-examination of this witness which stands the test of perversity. Hence, we do not find any reason to disbelieve the testimony of PW-17, his testimony already stands duly corroborated not only from the circumstantial evidence but also from the forensic evidence, which is placed on record. There is no force in the submission of the learned counsel for the appellant that PW-17 was a planted witness or that he had not seen the occurrence of the incident.

17. In *Namdeo v. State of Maharashtra, (2007) 14 SCC 150*, it is held as under:

“28...Our legal system has always laid emphasis on value, weight and quality of evidence, rather than quantity, multiplicity or plurality of witnesses. It is, therefore, open to a competent court to fully and completely rely on a solitary witness and record conviction.”

18. As far as the submission of learned counsel for the appellant regarding time of occurrence of the incident is concerned, we do not find any force in the said contention also. PW-17 had given the time of occurrence as 5:30-5:45 am. It is on the record that the statement of the complainant was recorded on a paper, which is found to have contained blood stains and it is also established that when the police reached the spot, blood was still oozing from the body of the deceased, and the clothes and bedding lying around it was still wet. The learned Trial Court has taken note of the fact that medically the average clotting time of human beings varies from less than a minute to 70-80 seconds depending upon the various factors, i.e., level of calcium and vitamin K, platelet cells etc., in case of an accident or major vessel rupture, the clotting time would be much more, i.e., 15 to 20 minutes. Thus, it stands established on the record that the incident had not taken place much before when the police had arrived at the spot. There appears to be some discrepancy with respect to the time given in brief history for conducting the post-mortem of the body and the resultant post-mortem report. The time of death has been written as 5:40 pm instead of 5:40 am and it is only a clerical error. We do agree with the contention of learned counsel for the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State that there is a clerical error regarding the time of death which has been written as 5:40 pm instead of 5:40 am. Hence, we do not find any substance in the submission of learned counsel for the appellant that there is a doubt about the time of occurrence. The said submission does not bear any substance.

19. Learned counsel for the appellant also submitted that the prosecution has shown extraordinary promptness which shows that all the proceedings, including the FIR, are ante-timed, however, again, we do not find any force in the said submission of learned counsel for the appellant. It is a case where the Police had promptly lodged the FIR, the incident had taken place at about 5:30-5:45 am on 15.4.2011, when the eye witness PW-17, Manoj Kumar had seen Ram Surat smashing the deceased Veer Bahadur with a rock/stone on his head/face. Immediately, a call was made to the PCR at 5:55 AM, pursuant to which the local police was informed at about 6:00 AM. It is on record that the *Rukka*, Ex.PW21/A had been prepared at the spot itself on the statement of Manoj Kumar Shah, showing the time of incident as 5:40 am. Pursuant to the PCR call, the local police reached the spot at 7:00 AM and the FIR was registered at 7:45 am, wherein the name of the accused was specifically mentioned. Learned counsel for the appellant has failed to point out existence of any motive for promptness shown in this regard or that the proceedings, including the FIR, are ante-timed, rather, the evidence demonstrates that when the police reached the spot the blood was oozing out from the body and had soiled the bedding i.e. *chaddar* and other clothes and also the rocks and stones around the place of the incident. The fact that the *rukka* had been prepared at the spot itself stands confirmed because the paper on which original statement of PW-17 Manoj Kumar Shah was recorded contained stains of blood. Had the incident been old or the statement recorded later, the blood would have clotted but the testimony of the complainant and police witnesses, photographs placed on record and the circumstantial evidence indicate that

the blood had not yet clotted and it is perhaps for this reason that the said blood had come on the hands of the first Investigating Officer also and on the papers which he was carrying on which he recorded the statement of the complainant, thereby proving its authenticity to the prosecution case. Learned APP also submitted that the manner of reading the PCR form (Ex.PW-13/A) by the appellant is erroneous. Hence, we do not find any force in the contention of learned counsel for the appellant that there was any extraordinary promptness in lodging the FIR or that all proceedings, including the FIR, are ante-timed. It is a settled law that the promptness of lodging of FIR justifies the inference that the story is not concocted. In this regard, the Apex Court, in ***Bhag Singh v. State of Punjab, 1971 Cr. LJ 903***, has observed as under:

“.... The promptness in lodging report justifies the inference in the circumstance of the case that the report was not a concocted story. Where soon after occurrence FIR is lodged, it is difficult to believe that false story was cooked up.....”

In the present case, the First Information Report was promptly registered, without any delay. Thus, the contention of false implication by the eye-witness is ruled out. There is no scope for embellishment in the prosecution story. Sufficient motive stands established in this case, since prior to the death of the deceased, frequent quarrels had taken place between Veer Bahadur and Ram Surat, regarding Veer Bahadur keeping his *takht* in front of the *jhuggi* of the accused. There is nothing on record to disbelieve the ocular testimonies or documentary evidence on the record.

The deceased had received the unequivocal threats from the accused, he had threatened to kill him.

20. The next contention of learned counsel for the appellant is that there was no motive for the accused to commit the crime. The learned trial Court has dealt with the question of motive at great length and we do not find any flaw or infirmity in the findings of the learned trial Court. PW-14, Mrs. Sandhya, PW-15, Prakash and PW-16, Sadhu Saran Yadav have duly stated about the quarrels that had taken place between the accused and the deceased and nothing is on record to discredit the same. The appellant in his arguments or in the findings before the learned trial Court has not challenged the stance of previous quarrels at all. The evidence on record, and more so, the testimony of the witness, i.e., PWs 15, 16 and 17 which were known to accused, it stands established that quarrel that had taken place between the accused and the deceased over the *thaiya* was a regular affair. There is no history of any kind of animosity/ dispute between them and the accused Ram Surat, nor is there any reason, to have falsely implicated the accused Ram Surat. It is writ large from their testimonies that the quarrel between the accused and the deceased over putting the *Thaiya* of the deceased was a regular affair. It has been duly proved by Ms. Sandhya (PW14), Prakash (PW15) and Sadhu Saran (PW16) that even a day prior to the incident, a quarrel had taken place between the accused and the deceased wherein the accused Ram Surat had threatened the deceased Veer Bahadur either to remove the *Thaiya* or else he would kill him. Further, the motive for the killing of the deceased was the fact that the

accused Ram Surat felt highly aggrieved because of the occupation of the land in front of his *jhuggi* by the deceased where the deceased had put his *Thaiya* and had started selling *jalebi*. The entire area around the railway line near the canal is a government land and the *jhuggis* situated in the area are unauthorized, there is no formally elected Pradhan though most of the people are known to each other and hence in the eventuality of any dispute, the issues are mutually sorted out with the intervention of neighbours. This being the background, non reporting of such disputes to the police is a normal affair. In the present case the deceased had only come to stay with his daughter on temporary basis and was to return to his village. He in the meanwhile involved himself in the job of selling *jalebi* on temporary basis which was objected by the accused Ram Surat who was exercising his absolute right over the place leading to frequent quarrels between the two. Even a day prior to the incident, the accused had threatened the accused either to remove his *Thaiya* or else he would be killed. Henceforth, we do not find any force in the said contention of learned counsel for the appellant.

21. In *Haru Ghosh v. State of W.B. (2009) 15 SCC 551*, it is held as under:

“17... if there was enmity between the parties, then that would bring a clear cut evidence of the motive.”

22. The next submission of learned counsel for the appellant, that the place of occurrence was a thickly populated *jhuggi basti* and it was used as

passage to go to railway lines and it is categorically stated by PW-17 that a large number of persons from *jhuggi cluster* go to the railways lines in the morning at 5:30 am to attend the call of nature but none of them stopped when the quarrel was going on. He had seen the incident from a distance of 15-20 feet and he had also raised an alarm but nobody came for help. The police came to the spot within half an hour after making the call. All the seizure memos were prepared, however, no public witness joined the said proceedings, except PW-17, who is a star witness in this case. It is a matter of fact that this Court can take notice, that generally public persons do not come forward to depose, moreover, the non-joining of the public witnesses is not fatal to the prosecution in this case in view of the evidence already read and discussed.

23. As per the appellant, the reaction of the main eye witness, PW-17 was unnatural in the event of crime and hence he is a planted witness. In contradiction to this, Criminal Courts should not expect a set reaction from any eye witness on seeing an incident like murder. If five persons witness one incident there could be five different types of reactions from each of them. It is neither a tutored impact nor a structured reaction which the eye witness can make. Unless the reaction demonstrated by an eye witness is so improbable or so inconceivable from any human being pitted in such a situation, it is unfair to dub his reactions as unnatural.

24. PW-3 Dr. Bhim Singh, MD Forensic Medicine, I/C Mortuary, BJRM hospital, Delhi deposed that, on 16.04.11, he had conducted the postmortem

on the body of Veer Bahadur, report Ex.PW3/A. The cause of the death in this case was due to cranio-cerebral damage consequent upon head injuries via injury No.1 [Crushed injury with disfigurement of head and face on right side with multiple lacerated wounds measuring 4 cm x 2cm x bone deep, 4cm x 1 cm x bone deep, 2cm x 1cm (eye brow), 1cm x 1cm x 5cm (right ear), 5cm x 0.5cm x bone deep (right forehead) with multiple contused abrasions measuring 2cm x 1cm and 1cm x 1 cm]. All injuries were anti mortem and were fresh in duration and could have been caused by any hard blunt object and this injury No.1, as aforesaid, was sufficient cause for the death in ordinary course of nature. He further deposed that, on 02.05.2011, he had received a request from the Investigating Officer seeking opinion about the weapon of offence in this case and also received two sealed packets with the seal of KL. According to him, on opening the *pullandas* (packets), one blood stained stone measuring 26 cms, 24 cms, 23 cms, weighing about 22.870 Kg was found and on opening the other *pullanda*, one uneven surface cemented stone, weighing about 3.660 kg, was found. He further testified that the injuries mentioned in postmortem report, Ex.PW3/A on the body of Veer Bahadur and the injury Nos. 1 and 2 could be possible by the above examined weapon.

25. The learned trial Court has held that the prosecution has proved the identity of the accused, the manner in which the offence was committed, place of commission of the offence, the investigation including the documents prepared, postmortem report, etc. beyond any shadow of doubt. All the prosecution witnesses have materially supported the prosecution

case and the testimonies of the prosecution witnesses do not suffer from any infirmity, inconsistency or contradiction and are therefore consistent and corroborative. We also do not find any reason, flaw or infirmity to differ or hold otherwise as held by the Trial Court.

26. In the light of the above discussion, we hold that the prosecution has established its case beyond any shadow of doubt against the appellant and we are in agreement with the conclusion arrived at by the learned Trial Court, consequently, the appeal is held to be devoid of any merit and is accordingly dismissed.

27. Copy of this judgment be sent to the Jail Superintendant Central, Tihar Jail, Delhi for updating the jail record.

28. Trial Court Record be sent back along with a copy of this judgement.

(CHANDER SHEKHAR)
JUDGE

(G. S. SISTANI)
JUDGE

25th August, 2017/b/tp