

GAHC010141002008



THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT AT GUWAHATI
(The High Court of Assam, Nagaland, Mizoram and Arunachal Pradesh)
PRINCIPAL SEAT AT GUWAHATI

Crl.A.100/2008

1: SURESH GOALA and ORS

2: ANIL GOWALA
BOTH SONS OF BHIBHISAN GOWALA
R/O MAJULIGARH TEA ESTATE
UNDER BISWANATH CHARIALI P.S.
DIST. SONITPUR
ASSAM

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM

..... Appellants

..... Respondent

BEFORE
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUSMITA PHUKAN KHAUND

Advocate for the Appellants : Mr. P. Kataki, Advocate
Advocate for the Respondent : Ms. N. Das, Addl. PP

Date of Hearing : 13.06.2023
Date of Judgment : 10.11.2023

JUDGMENT & ORDER (CAV)

1. Heard Mr. P. Kataki, learned counsel for the appellants and Mr. N. Das, learned Addl. P.P. for the State of Assam.
2. This appeal arises from the judgment and order dated 10.04.2008 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, FTC, Biswanath Chariali, Sonitpur, in connection with Sessions Case No.

23/2006 convicting Sri Suresh Gowala and Sri Anil Gowala (hereinafter referred as A1 and A2 respectively) u/s 326 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC for short) and sentencing them to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for 2 years and fine of Rs. 1,000/- with default clause.

3. The prosecution case as unfolded from FIR (Ext.-2) is that on 21.10.2005 at about 6:30 PM, Prem Thakur was called by the appellants A1 and A2 to take back Rs. 25,000/- borrowed by them from Prem Thakur. Both the appellants then attacked Prem Thakur (hereinafter referred to as the victim) with a sharp weapon and caused grave injuries on his head. On receiving information about the incident the victim's father Sri Siteswar Prasad Thakur rushed to the place of occurrence (PO for short) and found his injured son in Pawan Ghatowal's house. His son was forwarded for treatment. This caused the delay in lodgment of the FIR. The FIR dated 24.10.2005 was forwarded to the Baihata Chariali P.S. from the Balichang OP after registration of BLC PP G.D. Entry No. 368 dated 24.10.2005. The FIR was thereafter registered as Baihata Chariali P.S. Case No. 231/2005 u/s 326/307/34 IPC and the Investigating Officer (IO in short) embarked upon the investigation.

4. The Medical Officer (MO in short) Dr. Lakheswar Bhuyan (PW-14) found the following injuries on examination of the victim:-

“Findings:-

Alleged assault around 7 p.m. on 21-10-05. The Patient is on shock.

Sharp cut Lt. fronto parietal region 6" x 1" x ½ "bone underneath incised partially.

Sharp cut . parietal region 3"x½ "x½ "x ½ "x ½ "

Sharp cut Rt. suprecilliary border 1 x ½ "x ½ "

Sharp cut Rt. forehead 2" x ½ " x ½ "

Sharp cut occipital region 2" x ½ " x ½ " x 1" x ½ " x ½ " x 1" x ½ " x ½ "

Sharp cut Rt. face 4" x 1" x ½ "
 2" x ½ " x ½ "
 1 x ½" x ½ "

CT scan brain :- Bilateral parietal bone fracture.

Opinion :-

- Fresh
- Sharp
- Grievous.”

5. On obtaining the medico legal report and after completion of investigation, the IO submitted charge-sheet against the appellants. On appearance of the appellants, copies were furnished and this case was committed for trial. At the commencement of trial a formal charge u/s 307 IPC was framed and read over and explained to the appellants, who abjured their guilt and claimed innocence. To connect the appellants to the crime the prosecution adduced the evidence of 15 witnesses and the defence cross-examined the witnesses to refute the charges. On the incriminating circumstances projected through the evidence, several questions were asked to the appellants u/s 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Cr.PC for short) and the tone and tenor of the answers depict a plea of total denial. Their answers were in evasive manner.

6. The learned trial Court relied strongly on the evidence of the injured victim and the evidence of the Medical Officer and held the appellants guilty of offence u/s 326 IPC. It was held that the intention to commit murder was not proved by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt.

7. The learned counsel for the appellants laid stress in his argument that the PW-1 had failed to identify his assailant as it was dark at night and it had been admitted by PW-1 when his deposition was recorded in the Court. It is also argued that PW-1 has not specifically incriminated who caused the grievous hurt. He was attacked from backside and both the appellants cannot be held guilty for intentionally causing grievous hurt on the victim leave alone of having any *mens rea* to commit murder. It is averred that while proceeding together with PW-1 on the bicycle, the appellants were not armed with a dao. The chappal, the dao (machete), and rope alleged to have been seized in connection with this case were not identified by the seizure witnesses. The G.D. Entry dated 21.10.2005 was not produced in the Court nor did the Court made any endeavour to call for the extract copy of the G.D. Entry. The FIR was not lodged instantly but was lodged on 26.10.2005 after recovery of the victim. There was no proof of any loan being borrowed by the appellants from the victim nor any document

was exhibited to substantiate the same. The trial Court did not believe that the *dao* was used in connection with the offence but how could the Court hold the appellants guilty of causing grievous injuries if the Court did not believe that *dao* was not used to cause the injuries. The delay in lodgment of the FIR extends the benefit of doubt to the appellants. The appellants calling the PW-1 to take back the amount of money borrowed by the appellants from PW-1 was not substantiated by the evidence of the other witnesses and thus this claim pales into insignificance. It has not been proved that PW-1 is the owner of any grocery shop nor did his father and nephew mention about an amount of Rs. 25,000/- being lent by the PW-1 to the appellants. As the injured victim has foisted a case against the appellants, they have not challenged the acquittal of the appellants u/s 307 IPC. No specific or overt act was attributed to each of the accused and the PW-1 deposed for the first time that he was proceeding along with A-2 on his cycle.

8. The learned counsel for the appellant also laid stress in his argument that the appellant's appeal has been pending for a prolonged period of time since 2008 and the appellants will be prejudiced if they are forwarded to custody for 2 years. The incident occurred when the appellants were young lads and now the appellant are middle aged citizens and they have mellowed over the years and at the hindsight, the evidence of PW-1 is unreliable. The appellants can be sentenced to the period of custody already undergone by them during investigation and trial.

9. Per-contra the learned Addl. P.P. laid stress in his argument that there is no question of identifying the appellants in the dark because the evidence is loud and clear that PW-1 was proceeding along with A-2 on the same cycle and they were also accompanied by A-1. A-1 called PW-1 to return the money borrowed by him from PW-1.

10. The learned trial Court has relied on the decision of the Hon'ble the Supreme Court in *Kedar Singh v. State of Bihar*, reported in *1999 CrL. L.J. 601* wherein it has been observed and held that :-

“It is a legally accepted position that even on a full dark night there is never total darkness and identification is possible through shape of body, clothes, gait, manner of walking, voice etc.”

11. It is also emphasized by learned Addl. PP that the learned trial Court has rightly held by relying on the decision of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in *Shivaji Sahabro Bobade and others v. State of Maharashtra*, reported in *1973 CrL. L.J. 1783* that:-

“Even if the case against the accused hangs on the evidence of a single eye witness it may be enough to sustain the conviction...”

12. It was further argued that the victim's evidence cannot be discarded on the ground that there are some minor contradictions in the evidence of the witnesses. It has been held in *Bonkya v. State of Maharashtra*, reported in (1995) 6 SCC 447 by Hon'ble the Supreme Court that:-

“The presence of the injured witness at the scene of occurrence cannot be doubted and being victim himself he would not leave out real assailants and substitute them with innocent person. PW-1 deposed in most natural way and his version is cogent, consistent and inspires confidence in the mind of the Court and therefore, there is no reason to disbelieve his version.”

13. It is submitted that considering the facts and circumstances of this case, the appellants were let off by a very lenient decision of the learned trial Court.

14. On the anvil of these submissions the question that falls for consideration is that whether the learned trial Court erred in convicting the appellants u/s 326 of the IPC.

15. To decide this appeal in its proper perspective the evidence is reappraised.

16. Prem Thakur is the injured victim and he testified as PW-1 that on the evening of 21.10.2005, the appellants called him to take back the amount of Rs. 25,000/- the appellants owed him. Suresh Gowalla purchased groceries from his (PW-1's shop) on credit to start a hotel at the time of Durga Puja festival. The appellant Suresh Gowalla (A-1) had purchased articles worth Rs. 25,000/- on credit from his (PW-1's shop). He (PW-1) went to Suresh Gowalla's house to receive the money, but Suresh Gowalla requested him to proceed to another person's house at Dalanguri where he had arranged for the repayment.

17. PW-1 further deposed that on good faith, he accompanied both the appellants to Dalanguri and he along with A2 were proceeding on the same cycle but, before reaching Dalanguri both the appellants assaulted him with dao near the water supply at Borpathar. He sustained three injuries on his head and also injuries on his forehead and he was knocked unconscious by the impact. On regaining consciousness, he went to the house of Paban Ghatowal and informed him about the incident. He also requested Juntu Borah to inform his family members about the incident. His brothers (cousins) Joy Prakash Thakur and Abhoy Thakur came immediately and took him to Balichang OP and thereafter to Balichang hospital, and from thereon he was forwarded to Biswanath Chariali Civil Hospital and finally he was shifted to Tezpur Civil Hospital where he underwent treatment for 4/5 days. His father lodged the FIR and he gave his statement before the Magistrate. He proved his statement as Ext-1.

In his cross-examination he deposed that both the appellants assaulted him and he proceeded to

Dalanguri on the bicycle of Anil Gowala (A2).

18. This evidence of PW-1 is corroborated by the evidence of Abhoy Thakur and Joy Prakash Thakur who deposed as PWs-2 and 3 respectively. They deposed that after receiving the information of the incident, they rushed to Paban Ghatowal's house and asked their injured brother (PW-1) about the incident. Their cousin (PW-1) informed them that the appellants hit him on his head and face. They noticed the injuries sustained by their brother (cousin). They informed the police and shifted their brother to the Biswanath Chariali Civil Hospital. Their cousin was taken to Tezpur Civil Hospital for better treatment.

All the witnesses PWs-1, 2 and 3 were cross-examined in extenso. No contradiction could be elicited as per Section 145 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 (Evidence Act for short) qua Section 162 Cr.PC.

19. Sri Ranjan Chandra Sarmah is the IO who deposed as PW-15. The cross-examination of PWs-1, 2 and 3 vis-à-vis the cross-examination of the IO does not transpire any contradiction.

20. The informant testified as PW-4 that as soon as they received the information that his son (PW-1) was assaulted, his nephews went to Paban Ghatowal's house where his son was lying in an injured condition. His nephews PWs-2 and 3 did not return that night. On the next morning, he learnt from PW-3 that the appellant assaulted his son Prem Thakur (PW-1). He also came to know that his son was admitted in Civil Hospital. There was a delay in lodging the FIR as they were busy with the treatment of his son.

21. The learned counsel for the appellants laid stress in his argument that the evidence of PW-4 is contradictory to his FIR. In his FIR he mentioned that as soon as he received information from Jayanta Bora about the incident, he immediately rushed to Paban Gatowal's house and found his son in an injured condition. This is indeed a contradiction which cannot be ignored. But it is manifest that PW-1 is not the scribe of the FIR. PW-4 proved the FIR as Ext.-2 and Ext.-2(1) as his signature. It is apparent from the Ext.-2 that PW-4 did not write the FIR. He affixed his signature on the FIR in Hindi. His attention was not drawn by the defence towards the contradiction in his statement vis-à-vis the contents of the FIR. Moreover, the evidence of the injured witness clearly depicts that the appellants assaulted him. His statement u/s 164 Cr.PC is consistent to his testimony in the Court. He proved his statement u/s 164 Cr.PC as Ext.-1 and Ext.-1(1) and 1(2) as his signatures.

Thus it is clear that the evidence of PW-1 is buttressed by his statement u/s 164 Cr.PC and is also

corroborated by the evidence of PWs-2, 3 and 4.

22. Sri Jinku Kurmi deposed as PW-5 that on the day of occurrence at 6/6:30 PM he was in Dalanguri Tiniali. At that time Rabin Ghatowal came, and raised alarm and informed him that Prem Thakur was assaulted by somebody and he was in an injured condition in the house of Paban Ghatowal. He immediately went to the house of Paban Ghatowal and saw Prem Thakur sitting in the varandah in an injured condition. He came to know from two boys assembled at the place of occurrence that people assembled at Paban Ghatowal's house as the appellants assaulted Prem Thakur (PW-1).

Thus the evidence of PW-5 also fortifies the evidence of PWs-1, 2, 3 and 4.

23. The key witness is Paban Ghatowal and he testified as PW-6 that on the fateful night at about 7 PM, he heard a sound at his door. He opened the door and saw Prem Thakur bleeding profusely. Prem Thakur informed him that the appellant assaulted him. He then sent Jayanta and Guddu to inform Prem Thakur's family about the incident.

Similarly the evidence of PW-7 also supports the evidence of the other witnesses PWs-1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

24. The learned counsel for the appellant laid stress in his argument that the evidence of PWs-5 and 9 cannot be admitted being hearsay evidence. They have mentioned that they heard about the incident from two boys but they have not mentioned the names of the boys who informed them about the incident.

25. Sri Ajoy Thakur, PW-9 stated that he heard that somebody assaulted Prem Thakur and then he went to Paban Ghatowal's house and saw his brother (PW-1) lying in an injured condition.

26. This argument of the learned counsel for the appellants holds no water. Both PWs-5 and 9 have not mentioned about the boys who have informed them about the incident, but the evidence of PWs-5 and 9 clearly depicts that the injured person sustained injuries and he was taking shelter in Paban Ghatowal's house. It is needless to say that the evidence of PWs-5 and 9 substantiates the evidence of the other witnesses. The evidence of PW-6 corroborates and substantiates the evidence of the other witnesses PWs-1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.

27. The learned counsel for the appellants laid stress in his argument that the evidence of PWs-7, 8 and 10 cannot be stretched to such an extent as to be connected to this case.

28. Gopal Kavar testified as PW-7 that about a year ago (from the date of his deposition) one morning while he was fishing at Kumbha-Dubi Bill, a *dao* was caught in his fishing net. He took the

dao to his house and on the next day the police came and seized the *dao* vide Ext-3.

29. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the appellants that this evidence of PW-7 is too farfetched and sketchy. This *dao* cannot be considered as the weapon of offence. The prosecution failed to prove that this *dao* is the same weapon of offence and a stray incident of pulling out a *dao* from a pond cannot be linked to the instant case. Similarly, the recovery of *chappals* at the Kumbha-dubi bridge was also not properly proved by the prosecution.

30. Manuj Thakur deposed as PW-8 that on learning about the assault of Prem Thakur (PW-1) he went to Paban Ghatowal's house. While returning from Paban's house he saw a pair of *chappal* and a rope lying near Kumbha-dubi bridge, which were seized by the police about 6/7 days after the incident. It is argued that this pair of *chappals* has not been identified by the victim or his family members.

31. PW-10 Motilal Khodal deposed that about a year ago, at about 9 AM, he was fishing under the Kumbha bridge. At that time the police came along with the accused Anil Gowala (A-2) and asked him where he had kept the *dao*. The accused Anil Gowala pointed towards the water and told the police that the *dao* was thrown into the water. The accused searched for the *dao* in the field as well as in the water but the *dao* could not be recovered. At that time Gopal Kavar (PW-7) was fishing and the *dao* was brought out. He informed the police and the police seized the *dao* vide Ext.-3. PW-10 however stated that he did not affix his signature on Ext.-3. Thus the seizure of *dao* was not proved by PW-10, but PW-11 Subhas Kavar admitted the factum of recovery of a *dao*. However PW-11 too did not prove the seizure of a *dao*. He admitted in his cross-examination that the *dao* was not seized in his presence.

32. The evidence of Jayanta Bora, PW-12 corroborates the evidence of PW-4. PW-12 stated that he informed about the incident to Prem Thakur's family members. PW-4, informant also stated that Jayanta Bora and Subha informed him that his son was assaulted and was lying in an injured condition.

33. PW-12 Jayanta Bora deposed that on the day of the incident at about 10 PM, he met the helper of Paban Ghatowal in his house who informed him that a man was lying in Paban Ghatowal's house in an injured condition. He along with Jinju Kurmi and others went to Paban Ghatowal's house and saw Prem Thakur sitting in the varandah in an injured condition. Prem Thakur informed him that the appellants assaulted him near the Kumbha dalang. He along with Jinju Kurmi informed the family members of Prem Thakur about the incident. Prem Thakur (PW-1) was shifted to Biswanath Chariali Civil Hospital and from thereon to Tezpur Civil Hospital.

34. The evidence of all the witnesses PWs- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 clearly depicts that

PW-1 sustained grave injuries on his person. PW-1 was the injured person and he had implicated that the injuries were caused by the appellants. The MO's (PW-14's) evidence clearly reveals that PW-1 sustained grievous injury i.e. a bone fracture on his *fronto parietal* region. He also sustained several --

Sharp cut injuries on his parietal region measuring 3" x ½ " x ½ " x ½ " x ½ ".

Sharp cut Rt. Supreciliary border measuring 1 x ½ " x ½ "

Sharp cut Rt. forehead 2" x ½ " x ½ "

Sharp cut injuries on his occipital region measuring 2" x ½ " x ½ " x 1" x ½ " x ½ " x 1" x ½ " x ½ ".

Several slashes were also detected on his face measuring

4" x 1" x ½ "

2" x ½ " x ½ "

1" x ½ " x ½ "

The CT scan also reveals parietal bone fracture.

35. Although the injuries except the fracture on parietal bone were described to be simple in nature, yet it is apparent that the injured person was relentlessly and ceaselessly assaulted by the appellants. The injuries were also caused on a vital part of the body, being the victim's parietal and occipital region including his face. Relating to the injuries caused by *dao* on the vital parts of the victim's body the learned Addl. P.P. emphasised through his argument that the learned trial Court dealt leniently with the appellants. The appellants' ought not to have been discharged from the offence u/s 307 IPC. Their act speaks volumes. They assaulted the injured person near the water body at night. Their intention is very clear. They indeed attempted to commit murder but, they failed in their attempt. It is also submitted through their argument that the appellant had every intention to commit murder and dump the victim's body in the water body, but fortunately the victim survived the assault and the appellants had to dump the *dao* in the water body i.e. Kumbha-dubi.

36. This argument of the learned Addl. P.P. holds no water as the prosecution failed to connect the recovery of the *dao* to this case. The recovery was not made as per proper procedure. No disclosure statement was exhibited by the prosecution. Moreover the evidence of Gopal Kavar reveals that the *dao* got caught in his fishing net and he took the *dao* to his house whereas contrary to the statement of Gopal Kavar PW-10, Motilal Khodal stated that the appellant A2 led to the recovery of the *dao* and the

appellant showed the place where he concealed the dao and immediately Gopal Kavar (PW-7) brought out the dao with his fishing net. PW-10 also denied that he affixed his signature on the seizure list.

37. Although the recovery of the *dao* was not proved by the prosecution, yet the evidence of the injured witness transpires that the appellants assaulted him with a *dao*. The MO, PW-14's evidence fortifies the evidence of the injured witness. It is thereby held that the conviction of the learned trial Court is sustainable. The prosecution could prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the appellants, in furtherance of their common intention caused grievous injuries on the victim.

38. It, however, cannot be conjectured that the appellants intended to commit murder and dispose off the body in the Kumbha-dubi pond, but it is held that the appellant intentionally caused grievous injuries with a sharp weapon on PW-1. The learned trial Court has correctly held that the prosecution could prove beyond reasonable doubt that the appellants intentionally caused grievous hurt on the victim by means of a sharp weapon. The appellants have been leniently dealt with by the trial Court. The judgment and order of the trial Court is sustainable. The learned trial Court relied on the decision of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of *Sardul Singh (supra)* wherein it has been observed that the presence of witness who received injuries during the occurrence of incident cannot be doubted.

39. In *Bonkya's case (supra)* it was observed by Hon'ble the Supreme Court that the presence of the injured witness at the scene of occurrence cannot be doubted and being the victim himself he would not leave out real assailants and substitute them with innocent persons.

40. It is held that there is clinching evidence that the injuries sustained by PW-1 were inflicted by the appellants.

41. I record my concurrence to the findings of the learned trial Judge that PW-1 deposed in a spontaneous manner and his version was cogent, consistent and inspires confidence of the Court and therefore there is no reason to disbelieve his version. The evidence of PW-1 is fortified by the evidence of the Medical Officer (PW-14).

42. The learned counsel for the appellant has relied on the decision of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **Neelam Bahal and Another v. State of Uttarakhand**, reported in (2010) 2 SCC 229 wherein it has been held and observed that:-

“We have also gone through the evidence of Dr.S.M.Sehgal and find that he had admitted that he had not mentioned that the injury was dangerous to the life as he did not think it necessary to do so. At the same time we are unable to accept Ms. Jaiswal's statement that the case would fall under **Section 323** or 324 of the **IPC** but in the light of the statement of victim that he had remained in hospital for fifteen days due to the

injuries caused to him, makes out a case of grievous hurt. Rakesh Bahal alone should thus be held guilty under Sec.326 of the **IPC** simplicitor. We are told that he has already undergone almost one year of the sentence and in the light of the fact that the incident happened in the year 1987 when he was a young man of about 25 and now must be of middle age, we reduce the sentence to the period already undergone by him.”

43. The learned counsel for the appellants also relied on the decision of Hon’ble the Supreme Court in **Pashora Singh and Another vs. State of Punjab**, reported in **1993 Supp (2) SCC 33** wherein it has been observed that:-

“The State of Punjab filed an appeal and the Complainant filed a revision in the High Court against the aforesaid order of the Trial Judge. The High Court found both the accused persons guilty for offence under **Section 307** read with **Section 34** of the Indian Penal Code for injuries inflicted on Pal Singh. The High Court also affirmed the conviction of the accused persons under **Sections 447** and **324** of the Indian Penal Code. The High Court took into consideration the fact that the occurrence had taken place as back as on 27.8.1981 and the accused had undergone the agony of trial for more than a year before the Trial Court and the appeal against their acquittal remained pending in the High Court for the last eight years, as such sentenced both the accused to undergo rigorous imprisonment for three years and to pay a fine of Rs. 3,000 each under **Sections 307/34** of the Indian Penal Code. The High Court directed that out of the fine, if realised, Rs. 4,000 be paid to Pal Singh injured and Rs. 2,000 to Amar Singh injured by way of compensation. Both the accused were further sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for three months under **Section 447** and so far as Pashora Singh is concerned, he was also sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for six months under **Section 324** of the Indian Penal Code. All the substantive sentences of imprisonment were ordered to run concurrently.”

44. It has been fervently and vehemently argued by the learned counsel for the appellants that the incident occurred on 21.10.2005. It could not be established by the appellant Sri Anil Gowala that he was a minor at the time of the incident. The age of the other appellant Suresh Gowala was only 25 years at the time of the incident. Both the appellants were young lads at the time of the incident. They have endured the agony of the proceeding continuously from the year 2005 upto the year 2008. It is also submitted that the appeal was pending for a prolonged period since 2008.

45. Much water has flowed under the bridge. Both the appellants are now middle aged citizens and they have mellowed over the period of time. The learned counsel has prayed for reduction of the

sentence upto the period already undergone by the appellant considering the pendency of the appeal. At this age forwarding the appellants to custody is not warranted. In the light of the decision of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in *Neelam Bahal and Another (supra)* and *Pashora Singh and Another (supra)*, although the conviction of the appellants is upheld, the sentence u/s 326 of the Indian Penal Code is modified. The appellants A-1 and A-2 who are convicted u/s 326 IPC are sentenced to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for the period already underwent by the appellants in connection with this case during investigation and trial. The sentence of fine is modified and changed to Rs. 25,000/- each. The fine realised shall be paid as compensation to the victim PW-1 Sri Prem Thakur. The appellants were behind bars during investigation for more than one month. The appellants are directed to appear before the trial Court immediately, within a month from today and pay the fine and in default of payment of fine they are to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for 6 months. If the victim so deserves, the victim is also entitled to compensation under the Assam Victim Compensation Scheme, 2012 as notified on 05.03.2016 and revised on 01.10.2019.

46. Send back the LCR.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant