

GAHC010075272024



**THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT**  
**(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)**

**Case No. : Review.Pet./54/2024**

ANOWARA KHATUN @ ANOWARA KHATOON  
WIFE OF ABDUL MAZID, DAUGHTER OF ALIMUDDIN @ ALIMUDDIN SK.  
PERMANENT RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- BHAKUAMARI, P.S.- SALBARI IN  
THE BAKSA DISTRICT OF ASSAM.

VERSUS

THE UNION OF INDIA AND 5 ORS.  
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,  
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS, NEW DELHI. PIN -110001.

2:THE ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA  
REPRESENTED BY THE CHIEF ELECTION COMMISSIONER.  
NEW DELHI- 110001.

3:THE STATE OF ASSAM  
REPRESENTED BY THE COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY TO THE  
GOVERNMENT OF ASSAM

HOME DEPARTMENT  
DISPUR  
GUWAHATI- 781006.

4:THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER  
BAKSA  
MUSHALPUR  
781372.

5:THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE (B)  
BAKSA  
MUSHALPUR  
781372.

6:COORDINTOR  
NATIONAL REGISTER OF CITIZENS  
BHANGAGARH  
GUWAHATI-4

**Advocate for the Petitioner** : A W AMAN, MR. D K AGARWALA,MR SARFRAZ NAWAZ,MS  
SURAYA RAHMAN,MR S A BARBHUYAN

**Advocate for the Respondent** : DY.S.G.I., GA, ASSAM,SC, F.T,SC, ECI

Linked Case : WP(C)/7467/2023

ANOWARA KHATOON @ ANOWARA KHATUN  
WIFE OF ABDUL MAZID

DAUGHTER OF ALIMUDDIN @ ALIMUDDIN SK.  
PERMANENT RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- BHAKUAMARI

P.S.- SALBARI  
IN THE BAKSA DISTRICT OF ASSAM.

VERSUS

THE UNION OF INDIA AND 5 ORS  
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

NEW DELHI. PIN -110001.

2:THE ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA  
REPRESENTED BY THE CHIEF ELECTION COMMISSIONER.  
NEW DELHI- 110001.

3:THE STATE OF ASSAM  
REPRESENTED BY THE COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY TO THE  
GOVERNMENT OF ASSAM

HOME DEPARTMENT  
DISPUR  
GUWAHATI- 781006.

4:THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER  
BAKSA  
MUSHALPUR  
781372.

5:THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE (B)  
BAKSA  
MUSHALPUR  
781372.

6:COORDINATOR  
NATIONAL REGISTER OF CITIZENS  
BHANGAGARH  
GUWAHATI-4.

-----  
Advocate for : MR A W AMAN  
Advocate for : DY.S.G.I. appearing for THE UNION OF INDIA AND 5 ORS

**BEFORE**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANASH RANJAN PATHAK**  
**HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MITALI THAKURIA**

**ORDER**

**02-08-2024**

*(M.R.Pathak, J)*

- 1)** Heard Mr. A W Aman, learned counsel for the review petitioner/writ petitioner, Mr. J Payeng, learned standing counsel, Home Department, Assam for the respondent Nos. 3 & 5 and Mr. R Talukdar, learned Government Advocate, Assam for the responded No. 4.
- 2)** Aggrieved with the ex-parte order /opinion dated 23.12.2019 passed by learned Foreigners Tribunal, Baksa in FT Case No. 42/BAKSA/2019 declaring her to be a Foreigner who had illegally entered into the territory of India (Assam) from the specified territory on or after 25.03.1971. Pursuant to the said order of the learned Foreigners Tribunal, Baksa dated 23.12.2019 passed in FT Case No. 42/BAKSA/2019, the petitioner was taken into custody on 31.10.2023, after three years ten months and kept her in the detention camp at Matia, District-Goalpara.
- 3)** Thereafter, the petitioner on 19.12.2023 filed a Writ Petition being WP(C) No. 7467 of 2023 challenging the said order dated 23.12.2019 of the learned Foreigners Tribunal, Baksa in said F.T.

Case No.42/BAKSA/2019. After hearing the learned counsels for the parties and considering the materials in it, this Court by order dated 07.03.2024 dismissed the said WP(C) No. 7467/2023 of the petitioner.

**4)** The petitioner has now, filed this Review Petition on 06.04.2024 seeking review of the Order dated 07.03.2024 passed by this Court in said WP(C) No. 7467/2023 on the following grounds, along with an interlocutory application being I.A.(Civil) No. 1108/2024 praying for a direction to release the petitioner from Matia Detention Centre. The Grounds taken by the petitioner for review of said Order dated 07.03.2024 passed in WP(C) No. 7467/2023 as been set forth and typed in the present Review Petition are as follows:

- A. Because the Hon'ble High Court ought to have considered the evidence and exhibits brought on record by the Petitioner here in.
- B. Because the Hon'ble High Court failed to appreciate the evidence and exhibits in proper perspective and pass the impugned judgment without applying its judicious mind an erroneously declared the Petitioner to be a foreigner under section 2(a) of the Foreigners Act,1946.
- C. Because the Hon'ble High Court failed to appreciate that the petitioner is a citizen by birth by virtue of Section 3(1)(a) of the Citizenship Act. The petitioner was born on 01.01.1970 as such she is citizen by birth.
- D. Because the Hon'ble High Court failed to appreciate that the petitioner being a citizen of India before 1985 is exempted from the provision AB section 6A of the Citizenship Act, 1955 by virtue of provisions of section 6A(7)(a) of the Citizenship Act, 1955.
- E. Because the Hon'ble High Court failed to appreciate that the Notice and Reference was issued against the petitioner to prove that she was a foreigner of 01.01.1966 and 25<sup>th</sup> March,1971 stream, but the Ld. Tribunal passed an ex-parte order holding that the petitioner is foreigner of post 1971 stream. This is judicial overreach and clear manifestation and non-application of mind by the Ld. tribunal.
- F. Because the Hon'ble High Court failed to appreciate that the petitioner had no intention to flee the proceedings but the exceptional circumstances could not allow

her to present before the Ld. Tribunal to adduce her Written Statement [Refer: Asor Uddin Vs. Union of India Order dated 9/9/2021 in WP(C)/6544/2019.

- G. Because the Petitioner has a good case on merits, and the Ld. Tribunal order dated 23.23.2019 has caused irreparable damage to the petitioner. Mere technicality should not be relied on to deny the natural rights of the petitioner.
- H. Because the Hon'ble High Court failed to appreciate the principle of waiver of rights as specified in the legal maxim of "vigilantibus et non dormientibus jura subveniunt" do not attract in the case because the Citizenship is a public right as envisaged in the constitution of India and the aforesaid principle is only applicable to private rights emerging from the contracts of two private parties.
- I. Because the Hon'ble High Court has failed to appreciate that the ex-parte order by the Ld. Tribunal will have a dipropionate effect on the petitioner leading it to the violation of Article 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

**5)** Placing the copy of the Reference dated 08.09.2010 made by the Superintendent of Police (Border), Baksa (BTAD), Assam to the Foreigners Tribunal, Nalbari, Annexure-3 to this Review Petition, Mr Aman learned counsel for the petitioner stated that the concerned referring authority itself stated that the petitioner entered into Assam after 1st January 1966 and before 25<sup>th</sup> March 1971 illegally and on the basis of said reference dated 08.09.2010 only, the learned Foreigners Tribunal Baksa registered the FT Case No. 42/BAKSA/2019 against the petitioner in which notice was issued to her on 06.06.2019.

**6)** Mr. Aman also placed the copy of the Notice dated 06.06.2019 issued by the said Foreigners Tribunal to the petitioner that she received, Annexure-4 to this petition, to show that the said notice itself reflects that the Tribunal while asking her to show cause, it stated that she had illegally entered into Assam without any valid document between 01.01.1966 and 24.03.1971 and residing in Assam, underlining the said period from 01.01.1966 and 24.03.1971. In that regard Mr. Aman, learned Counsel on behalf of the petitioner also placed the original copy of the said Notice relating to FT Case No. 42/BAKSA/2019 dated 06.06.2019 that was served on her by the Foreigners Tribunal, Baksa. *However, on its perusal of the same we found it to be a carbon copy.*

**7)** Mr. Aman, learned counsel stated that in spite of the above, the Foreigners Tribunal, Baksa

by an ex-parte order dated 23.12.2019 opined/declared the petitioner to be a foreigner who had illegally entered into India (Assam) on or after 25.03.1971. Mr. Aman submitted that said action in passing the order dated 23.12.2019 by the Foreigners Tribunal, Baksa clearly showed its judicial overreach, clear manifestation and non-application of mind.

**8)** Mr. Aman, also stated that at the time of filling the writ petition WP(C) No. 7467/2023, the petitioner did not have the said copy of the Reference dated 08.09.2010 made by the Superintendent of Police (Border) and that copy of the said reference dated 08.09.2010 as well as the said copy of the Notice dated 06.06.2019 served upon her by the Foreigners Tribunal, Baksa were received by the landed counsels from the petitioner only after filing the said writ petition by her.

**9)** In support of his argument made on behalf of the review petitioner, Mr. A W Aman, learned counsel relied upon the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of (i) *Uma Nath Pandey and Others Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and Another* reported in (2009) 12 SCC 40, (ii) *Jagmittar Sain Bhagat Vs. Director, Health Services, Haryana and Others* reported in (2013) 10 SCC 136 and (iii) *Rahim Ali @ Abdur Rahim Vs. State of Assam and Others* [Civil Appeal No. \_\_\_\_\_ of 2024 @ SLP (Civil) No. \_\_\_\_\_ of 2024 @ Diary No. 20674 of 2017 decided on 11.07.2024].

**10)** Mr Aman also stated in the recent judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of *Rahim Ali @ Abdur Rahim* (supra), its earlier decisions in the cases of *Abdul Kuddus Vs. Union of India*, reported in (2019) 6 SCC 604, *Sarbananda Sonowal Vs. Union of India*, reported in (2005) 5 SCC 665 as well as *Sarbananda Sonowal (II) Vs. Union of India*, reported in (2007) 1 SCC 174 have also been considered.

**11)** Rebutting the arguments of Mr. Aman, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. J Payeng, learned Standing counsel for the Foreigners Tribunal and Home Department of the State, appearing for the respondent Nos. 3 & 5 submitted that the Foreigners Tribunal issues show cause notice to the person concerned to whom the question relates as required under Order 3 of the Foreigners (Tribunals) Order 1964 enabling the said person to file reply and to produce evidence to prove his or her nationality within time specified as envisaged under the said 1964 Order. Mr. Payeng also submitted that such Notice is issued by the Foreigners Tribunal to the person to whom such question relates only after considering the reference made by the concerned referral authority, i.e., the Superintendent of Police (Border) and the reports of the

concerned officer(s) relating to the investigation of the person concerned whose name is forwarded to it to determine and to give opinion as to whether the said person is or is not a foreigner under the Foreigners Act, 1946 that are forwarded by the said referral authority along with its reference.

**12)** The Superintendent of Police (Border), Baksa by communication dated 08.09.2010 while referring the matter relating to the review petitioner Musstt. Anuwara Khatun to the Foreigners Tribunal, Nalbari seeking opinion as to whether she is a foreigner or not, though stated that she appears to be a foreigner who had entered into Assam after 1<sup>st</sup> January, 1966 and before 05.03.1971 illegally, Mr. Payeng submitted that, from the interrogation/ investigation/inquiry report dated 25.08.2010 with regard to the review petitioner, submitted by the concerned Investigating/Inquiry Officer containing the signatures of the concerned Officers as well as the concerned Superintendent of Police annexed by the petitioner herself as Annexure-3 at Pages-89 and 94, clearly indicates that after such interrogation/investigation/ inquiry the petitioner was found to be a suspected illegal foreigner who had entered into India after 25.03.1971 without any valid document. Mr. Payeng further pointed out that the order of the Superintendent of Police in the said report specifies that it appears to the said authority in a prima-facie manner that the petitioner is suspected to be a foreigner who had entered into India illegally and therefore, the case was referred to the Foreigners Tribunal, Nalbari for trial.

**13)** Mr. Payeng, placing the inquiry report of the Inquiry Officer dated 08.09.2010 Annexure-3 at Page-101, annexed by the petitioner to her Review Petition, that from the interrogation/investigation/inquiry report relating to the petitioner, submitted by the concerned Inquiry Officer containing its signatures and also of the Superintendent of Police, wherein it is clearly indicated that petitioner was found to be a suspected foreigner who entered into India illegally and therefore, the case was referred to the Foreigners Tribunal, Nalbari for necessary opinion.

**14)** In that regard, Mr. Payeng, standing counsel, Foreigners Tribunal and Home Department of the State placed the records in original relating to Case No.42 Baksa/2019 containing the original reference letter dated 08.09.2010 of the Superintendent of Police (Border), Baksa; original report relating to Foreign National submitted by the concerned Inquiry Officer containing its signature as well as the signature of the Superintendent of Police as reflected in the said Annexure-3 of the review petition. Mr. Payeng also placed the original copy of the notice issued by the Foreigners

Tribunal, Baksa in the Case No.42 Baksa/2019 dated 06.06.2019 containing her thumb impression, signature of the witness and report of the concerned process server regarding service of notice of the said case upon the petitioner.

**15)** Mr. Payeng, learned counsel for the Foreigners Tribunal and Home Department placed reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Kamlesh Verma Vs. Mayawati*, reported in (2013) 8 SCC 320, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court laid down all the points as to when a review petition should be considered and when should be rejected. Mr. Payeng also relied on the decision of a coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of *Rukia Begum Barbhuiya @ Rukia Begum Vs. Union of India and 5 Others*, [W.P.(C) No. 2297/2021] decided on 12.06.2023. Relying on those decisions Mr. Payeng submitted that prayer made by the petitioner in this review petition being not tenable should be rejected.

**16)** We have perused the records in original relating to Case No.42 Baksa/2019 submitted by Mr. Payeng containing the original reference letter dated 08.09.2010 of the Superintendent of Police (Border), Baksa; original Interrogation Report relating to the petitioner that was submitted by the concerned Inquiry Officer on 25.08.2010 containing its signature wherein the petitioner was found to be a suspected illegal foreigner who entered into India after 25.03.1971 without any valid document that was affirmed by the Superintendent of Police with his signature and finding that it appeared to him in a prima facie manner that the suspect Musstt. Anuwara Khatun (petitioner) is a foreigner who had entered India illegally and hence he referred the case to the Foreigners Tribunal, Nalbari for trial.

**17)** We have also seen from the said records in original placed by Mr. Payeng that the concerned Inquiry Officer after inquiry on 29.08.2010 submitted his report stating that during enquiry it appeared to him that in a prima-facie manner that Musstt. Anuwara Khatun (petitioner) was found to be a suspected illegal foreigner as she entered into India after 25.03.1971 without any valid document. From the said record we have also seen that the Superintendent of Police on 08.09.2010 endorsed the said report dated 29.08.2010 of the Inquiry Officer with his conclusion that it appeared to him in a prima facie manner that the suspect Musstt. Anuwara Khatun (petitioner) is a foreigner who had entered into India illegally and hence the case be referred to the Foreigners Tribunal, Nalbari for trial.

**18)** It is seen from the records that the interrogation/investigation/inquiry report of the concerned Inquiry Officer relating to the petitioner, clearly indicates that she was found to be a

suspected illegal foreigner who had entered into India after 25.03.1971 without any valid document and considering the said report, the concerned Superintendent of Police referred to the Foreigners Tribunal, Nalbari for trial.

**19)** While comparing with the Notice to the petitioner issued by the Foreigners Tribunal Baksa relating to the Foreigners Tribunal Case No.42 Baksa/2019 dated 06.06.2019, in original, placed by Mr. J Payeng, learned counsel for the Foreigners Tribunal and Home Department with that of the original Notice Copy dated 06.06.2019 received by the petitioner that is placed by her counsel Mr. Aman, it is seen that the original notice dated 06.06.2019 placed by Mr. Payeng reflects that it contains the thumb impression of the petitioner, signature of witness and report of the concerned process server with his signature wherein the period of "01.01.1966 and 24.03.1971" is found to be struck off and the period "post 24.03.1971" is found to be tick marked, whereas in the Notice Copy dated 06.06.2019 placed by Mr. Aman it is seen that it is a carbon copy of the Notice dated 06.06.2019 wherein the period of "01.01.1966 and 24.03.1971" appears to be underlined and the period "post 24.03.1971" figured in it is found to be tick marked.

**20)** Again from the said original copy of the notice dated 06.06.2019 of the Foreigners Tribunal, Baksa issued to the petitioner it can be seen that the petitioner by putting her thumb impression received the copy of the said notice in presence of a witness, where the note of the process server dated 21.06.2019 contents that on finding the person concerned in the address mentioned in the said notice, its contents was explained to her, served the copy (*nokol*) of the said notice upon her obtaining her thumb impression in the notice and returned the same to the concerned Tribunal.

**21)** From the Notice of the Case No.42 Baksa/2019 dated 06.06.2019 issued by the Foreigners Tribunal, Baksa to the petitioner, in original, placed by Mr. Payeng as well as the Notice copy of the said case placed by Mr. Aman for the petitioner, it is seen that both of them contents the tribunal issued the said notice under Order 3 (1) of the Foreigners (Tribunals) Order, 1964 asking her to appear in person or by a concerned lawyer engaged by her before the said Tribunal on 29.06.2019 at 10:00 AM and to show cause supported by valid documents as admissible to prove that she is not a foreigner/illegal migrant as required under Section 9 of the Foreigners Act, 1946.

**22)** It was already considered in our Order dated 07.03.2024 passed in her writ petition WP(C) No. 7467/2023 that the petitioner after receipt of said Notice dated 06.06.2019 from the Foreigners Tribunal, Baksa in Case No. 42/BAKSA/2019 through her counsel submitted

Vakalatnama before the said Tribunal on 29.06.2019 and on said date the petitioner remained absent before the Tribunal and her counsel sought time for her appearance and for filing of written statement and document by her, which the learned Tribunal considered and fixed the case on 22.07.2019.

**23)** On the dates fixed, i.e., on 22.07.2019 and 14.08.2019 the petitioner remained absent before the tribunal and her counsel prayed for time for appearance of the petitioner, for filing of written statement and document by her thatthe learned Tribunal considered and on 14.08.2019 the tribunal gave her last chance fixing the matter on 25.09.2019.

**24)** On 25.09.2019 and 21.10.2019, the dates fixed, the petitioner did not appear before the Tribunal and remained absent and her counsel prayed for time for appearance of the petitioner, for filing of written statement and document by her, whichthe learned Tribunal considered and accordingly fixed the matter on the dates fixed, noted above, with the observation that failure on her part to appear, file written statement and documents,the reference would be answered and on 21.10.2019 the Tribunal fixed the matter on 18.11.2019.

**25)** On 18.11.2019 also the petitioner did not appear before the Tribunal and remained absent and her counsel prayed for time for appearance of the petitioner, for filing of written statement and documents by her andthe learned Tribunal considered and accordingly fixed the matter on 23.12.2019 with the order that on 23.12.2019 failure on the part of the petitioner to appear, file written statement and documents,the reference shall be answered.

**26)** Even on 23.12.2019 the petitioner remained absent before the Tribunal and after hearing the Assistant Government Pleader the Foreigners Tribunal, Baksa considered the fact that the petitioner took several adjournments and she was given sufficient opportunities but she did not take any effective steps. Considering the provision of Section 9 of the Foreigners Act, 1946 as the burden of proving as to whether the petitioner is or is not a foreigner lies upon her, which she failed to prove before the Tribunal and voluntarily remained absent before it and that she did not prove her Indian citizenship from the relevant period in spite of granting more than sufficient time where the petitioner voluntarily did not file her written statement and documents, without appearing before the said Tribunal personally in any of the dates when the said case was fixed, therefore, the said Tribunal considered that it had no alternative and on 23.12.2019 passethe ex-parte order declaring the petitioner to be a foreigner who had illegally entered into the territory of India from the specified territory on or after 25.03.1971 as she miserably failed to establish her

presence in India on or before 25.03.1971. Thereby, the Foreigners Tribunal, Baksa by the said ex parte order dated 23.12.2019 gave its opinion against the petitioner.

**27)** In catena of decisions the Hon'ble Apex Court settled the Law that against any such order passed by a quasi-judicial authority like the Foreigners Tribunal, Baksa in the case in hand, in a writ petition filed by any aggrieved party against any such order passed by the Tribunal, the writ Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is required to consider the said order of the Tribunal under the Writ of certiorari only, i.e., as to whether the order of the Tribunal is good or bad in law. The Writ Court in exercise of the power under Article 226 of certiorari is not required to consider any such evidence which a party did not place before the Tribunal during its adjudication.

**28)** In the case in hand the petitioner received the notice from the Foreigners Tribunal and in spite of granting more than sufficient time, beyond the stipulated time as provided in the Foreigners (Tribunals) Order, 1964, the petitioner remained absent in the case and she neither filed her written statement nor any documents to prove her Indian nationality.

**29)** It is seen that the petitioner though aware of the said proceeding against her pending before the Foreigners Tribunal, Baksa she did not even bother to know the outcome of the said proceeding. It is only when she was taken into custody on 31.10.2023 pursuant to the said order dated 23.12.2019 passed by the learned Foreigners Tribunal, Baksa in said F.T. Case No.42/BAKSA/2019 and she was kept in the detention camp at Matia, Goalpara, the petitioner woke up from the deep slumber and filed the said WP(C) No. 7467/2023 on 19.12.2023 challenging the said ex parte order dated 23.12.2019 of the Foreigners Tribunal, Baksa. noted above.

**30)** After hearing the parties and considering all those facts, more particularly that in spite of granting opportunities, the petitioner did not avail her chance and that she had chosen to approach the Writ Court only after she was taken in to custody that too after about four years of the final order of the Foreigners Tribunal, Baksa passed on 23.12.2019 in said F.T. Case No.42/BAKSA/2019 and finding no such illegality in the said order of the Tribunal dated 23.12.2019, we dismissed the said Writ Petition, WP(C) No. 7467/2023 preferred by the petitioner on 07.03.2024.

**31)** Though petitioner stated that she could not provide the Notice of the case dated

06.06.2019 issued by the Foreigners Tribunal, Baksa, but she was fully aware of it and was also in possession of it, as she appeared before the said Tribunal on 29.06.2019 through her counsel in the said F.T. Case No.42/BAKSA/2019 as noted above.

**32)** Though the learned counsel for the petitioner stated that petitioner was not aware of the Annexure-3 (series) annexed to this review petition, but from the pages of the said annexure it can be notice that those are photostat copies of certified copy, which was procured on 09.11.2023 as seen from page No. 101 of this petition, that is much before filing the said WP(C) No. 7467/2023 on 19.12.2023, by the petitioner.

**33)** We have considered the judgments cited by Mr. Aman on behalf of the petitioner, which according to us are not applicable in the present case because of its facts and circumstances.

**34)** We found that the judgments cited by Mr. Payeng on behalf of the respondents are applicable in the present case.

**35)** Considering entire aspects of the matter and hearing the parties, the Court did not find any valid ground for review of the order dated 07.03.2024 passed earlier by this Court in WP(C) No. 7467/2023 dismissing the said writ petition of the petitioner and upholding the order/opinion of the Foreigners Tribunal, Baksa, dated 23.12.2019 passed in F.T. Case No.42/ BAKSA/2019.

**36)** We found that the grounds raised in this Review Petition did not establish any error apparent on record to justify interference with the order dated 07.03.2024 passed earlier by this Court in WP(C) No. 7467/2023 and warranting any review of the same.

**37)** Accordingly, this Review Petition is dismissed.

**38)** Return the respective records to A W Aman, learned counsel for the review petitioner/writ petitioner and Mr. J Payeng, learned standing counsel, Home Department, Assam for the respondent Nos. 3 & 5, as placed by them, noted above, obtaining their signatures with date, after keeping scan copy of those documents.

**JUDGE**

**JUDGE**

## **Comparing Assistant**