

GAHC030001022021



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

Case No. : CRL.A(J)/6/2021

Liansawmkima
Central Jail Aizawl

VERSUS

State of Mizoram and Anr.
Aizawl2:Smt. Lalthanglian

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr Lalchhanliana Khiantge (Amicus Curiae)

Advocate for the Respondent : P.P./Addl.PP, Mizoram

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE MARLI VANKUNG

JUDGEMENT & ORDER (ORAL)

Date : 24-09-2024

Heard Mr. Lalchhanliana Khiantge, learned Amicus Curiae for the appellant along with Mrs. Linda L. Fambawl, learned Public Prosecutor for the State respondents and Mr. Lalrokunga Pautu, learned Legal Aid Counsel for respondent No. 2.

2. This is a jail appeal against the Judgment & Order dated 24.08.2020 passed by the Court of Special Judge under POCSO Act, 2012, Aizawl in SC No. 17/2017

in connection with Crl.Tr. No. 186/2017, wherein the appellant was convicted under Section 4 of the POCSO Act and sentenced to undergo Simple Imprisonment for 7 years and pay a fine of Rs. 1000/-, i.d. to undergo Simple Imprisonment for one week vide Sentence Order dated 26.08.2020.

3. Brief facts of the prosecution case is that on 26.09.2016, an FIR was received from the informant to the effect that her daughter aged 14 years went for a picnic with her friends at LAD Park, Lengpui. On that day, the taxi driver (accused) on the pretext of dropping her home took her to Buichali road and raped her inside his taxi. The informant had asked for the phone number of the taxi driver from their daughter's friend. However, the taxi driver had refused to pick up his phone even though they made several phone calls. He brought their daughter home at around 1:30 AM and their daughter informed them of the incident. They prayed that the legal action should be taken against the person who had raped their daughter. Accordingly, the case was registered as Sairang PS Case No. 33/2016 dated 26.09.2016 under Section 4 of the POCSO Act. After due investigation, a *prima facie* case was found against the accused/appellant and an FIR was duly submitted for trial before the Special Judge, POCSO Act, Aizawl. On 26.09.2016, a charge was framed under Section 342 IPC r/w Section 4 of the POCSO Act, to which the accused/appellant pleaded not guilty and asked for trial. During trial, as many as 13 prosecution witnesses were examined and the accused/appellant was examined under 313 CrPC. The accused prosecutrix also produced one defence witness. The learned Trial Court after considering the evidence adduced by the prosecution and the defence, acquitted the appellant/accused of the charge under Section 342 IPC, however, the learned trial court convicted the accused/appellant under Section 4 of the POCSO Act on 24.08.2020 and sentenced him to undergo S.I for 7 years and to

pay a fine of Rs. 1000/-, i.d. S.I for one week vide its Order dated 26.08.2020. Aggrieved, the instant appeal has been filed.

Submissions made by the learned Amicus Curiae

4. Mr. Lalchhanliana Khiangte, learned Amicus Curiae submits that there are sufficient grounds for setting aside the impugned Judgment & Order dated 24.08.2020 and the Sentence Order dated 26.08.2020 on the following grounds.

5. The learned counsel submits that on the reading of the statement of the prosecutrix recorded under Section 164 CrPC and on perusal of her deposition made before the Court, there are many discrepancies in the two statements and therefore, she is not a reliable witness. He submits that because of these discrepancies, the appellant should be given the benefit of doubt since a doubt has been created, whether the incident as narrated by her, had taken place or not. The learned counsel has pointed out that in her statement made under 164 CrPC, the prosecutrix had mentioned that three men were also in the taxi belonging to the appellant. He has also pointed out the difference in the place where they had drank liquor as per her statement made under 164 CrPC and her deposition. He further submits that the prosecutrix in her deposition had mentioned that the tire of the taxi got punctured and the appellant had repaired the punctured tire, which was not mentioned in the 164 statement. There is also a difference in the time when she was supposed to reach home.

6. The learned Amicus Curiae further submits that it was mentioned by PW No.7, that the blood sample of the appellant was drawn by Dr. C. Lalchhandama, while it has also been mentioned that the blood sample was drawn by a

technician. The learned Amicus Curiae also pointed out that though the prosecutrix in her deposition mentioned that she did not know the appellant before the incident, however, in the cross examination of the defence witness No. 2, the defence witness had clearly stated that the prosecutrix and the appellant were known to each other. He further submits that the appellant in his examination under Section 313 CrPC had also mentioned that the prosecutrix and the appellant were known to each other for the past 3 years.

7. The learned Amicus Curiae thus submits that conviction can be made against the accused only when the guilt of the appellant is proved beyond reasonable doubt. The appellant is entitled to be given the benefit of doubt due to the said inconsistencies found in the prosecution evidence. In support of his submission, the learned counsel has cited the decision of a Coordinate Bench of this Court in ***Lalbiakliana Vs. State of Mizoram & Anr.*** in Criminal Appeal No. 19/2020 dated 14.09.2021, wherein a Coordinate Bench of this Court had set aside the conviction of the appellant by giving the appellant the benefit of doubt due to the inconsistencies in the evidence of the prosecutrix in her statement given under 164 CrPC and her deposition before the Court. The learned Amicus Curiae submits that the same may be applied for the appellant in the instant case.

Submissions made by the learned counsels for the respondents.

8. Mrs. Linda L. Fambawl, learned Public Prosecutor, on the other hand submits that on reading of the statement of the prosecutrix under Section 164 CrPC and deposition before the Court, it is clearly established that they have gone to the LAD Picnic Spot located beyond Lengpui. The accused/appellant in

his examination under 313 CrPC has also did not denied that they had gone to LAD Picnic Spot. The fact that the prosecutrix had returned late in the night is also proved by the statement of the mother of the prosecutrix, PW-1, who stated that she was dropped at around 1:30 AM. PW-1 had also stated that the prosecutrix had gone with her friends to LAD Picnic Spot at around 2:00 PM on 25.09.2016.

9. The learned Public Prosecutor further stated that on perusal of the medical evidence, it is seen that there were marks of violence on the body of the prosecutrix, wherein it is mentioned that there is linear abrasion of 6 cms at the shin and 2 cms on the right middle finger. There was also bruising of the external genitalia of 0.5 cms linear abrasion on the lower side of introitus. The hymen is also said to be not intact. The report also says that there is semen stain in the underwear. The learned Public Prosecutor further submits that this semen stain is proved to belonged to the appellant in the results of the examination, which is exhibited as Exhibit P 9-A, wherein the conclusion is that the semen stain from the underwear of the victim was that of the appellant (Exhibit B). The learned Public Prosecutor also pointed out that on the medical examination of the appellant, it is seen that there were bite marks on his delta and thumb marks on the side of his chest along with scratch marks on his left arm. He stated that the prosecutrix in her examination under Section 164 CrPC had clearly mentioned that she had bitten the appellant on the day of the incident. The deposition and the statement of the appellant also shows that she had struggled and had also slapped the appellant. With regards to the drawing of the blood, PW-16 is Dr. C. Lalchandama, who had clearly stated that he had drawn the blood of the accused and the victim in the case of alleged sexual assault for DNA analysis. He had further explained in his cross examination that

the blood samples were drawn by the Lab Technician under his supervision. She further submits that this is also corroborated by the seizure witness PW-7 & 8.

10. The learned Public Prosecutor also submits that the Birth Certificate is exhibited as Exhibit P-2, wherein the date of birth of the prosecutrix is shown as 13.09.2002 and therefore, the prosecutrix is below the age of 18 years.

11. Mr. LalrokungaPautu, learned counsel for respondent No. 2 submits that the prosecutrix and the accused were not acquainted before the incident which is clear from the contradictions in the statement of the accused himself, wherein in his appeal application, he had mentioned that they had known each other for the past 8 months, while in his statement on examination under 313 CrPC, he had mentioned that they had known each other for the past 3 years. He further submits that there is no discrepancy in the statement made under Section 164 CrPC and the deposition of the prosecutrix in the Court with regards to the incident that had taken place, wherein it is clearly proved that the appellant had sexually assaulted the prosecutrix on 25.09.2016. The learned counsel further submits that from the statements made by the prosecutrix, she can be termed as a sterling witness and her statement can be relied upon for the conviction of the appellant. In support of his submissions, he has cited the decision of the Apex Court in ***Rai Sandeep Vs. State (NCT of Delhi)***, reported in **(2012) 8 SCC 21** and ***State of Punjab Vs. Gurmit Singh & Ors.***, reported in **(1996) 2 SCC 384**.

Deposition of the witnesses

12. Having heard the submissions made by the learned counsels for both the

parties, this Court find it fit to briefly reproduced the evidence adduced by the witnesses before the learned Trial Court for proper appreciation and analysis of the submissions made by the learned counsels for both the parties.

13. Pw-1- Lalthangliani stated that she knew the accused person only after the instant case. The prosecutrix is her daughter who was born on 13.09.2002. On 25.09.2016, her victim daughter and her friend went to LAD Park, and since she did not return home till night time, she was worried so she went to the house of her friend Lalfaki. Lalfaki was drunk and was asleep, she woke her up and asked her the where about of her daughter but Lalfaki stated that she did not know the where about of her daughter. She again searched for her daughter with other family members. At about 1:30 AM, her daughter returned home and immediately went inside her bedroom and she followed her and she asked her what happened to her. Her daughter started crying and stated that the accused assaulted her near Lengpui Air-Port and near Buichali Bridge, she further stated to her that the accused forcibly took her in his taxi and sexually assaulted her. She also stated that her friends Zorinpuii and Lalfaki left her at LAD Park and she boarded the accused taxi and the accused without dropping her at their residence took her to different place and sexually assaulted her. On being informed of the incident, she decided to submit FIR so they went to Sairang P.S. and submitted FIR to the Police. During cross examination, her deposition was not shaken.

14. Pw-2 Prosecutrix deposed to the effect that she never knew the accused Liansawmkima before the incidence. On 25.09.2016 (Sunday) herself and her friend Zorini went to LAD Park after Church Service, in the afternoon @ 3:00pm U Afaki came to Park and joined them. After sometime, the boyfriend of U Afaki came to the Park and they drank beer and liquor. When they were ready to go

home, Afaki and Zorini left with the boyfriend of Afaki on his scooty. The scooty could not accommodate her and Afaki told her to ride home on the taxi. The prosecutrix boarded the taxi with the accused as a driver. She sat on the backseat of the taxi. When they reached the Village Lengpui, the accused refused to drop her at her house and continued to drive his vehicle. The accused stopped his vehicle near Lengpui Airport and at that time it was already getting dark; the accused sat on the backseat and he hugged her and tried to kiss her. The prosecutrix resisted him, but he forcibly took her in his arms and removed her pants and underwear and she cried out for help, but the accused covered her mouth with his hand. The prosecutrix slapped him on his face, but he continued to assault her. The accused took out his penis and inserted it inside her private part. It was very painful and some liquid came out from his penis. After that, the accused again stopped his vehicle towards Buichali Bridge. After sometime they reached a remote area and the accused inserted his penis into her private part. The tire of the vehicle was punctured and the accused repaired it, and they reached home at 1:00 AM. When the prosecutrix reached her residence, she told her mother what the accused had done to her. Her parents decided to submit FIR to the Police and she was taken to Medical Officer for examination. Her deposition was not shaken during cross examination. She also denied the suggestion that she had sex with the accused/appellant with her consent.

15. Pw-4 Lalfakkimi, deposed to the effect that she knew the accused only after the alleged incident. The victim in the instant case was her friend. On 25.09.2016, it was Sunday, she along with the prosecutrix and Zorinsangi went to Pukpui. When they reached Pukpui, they saw the accused and his friend. They along with the accused and his friend went near LAD Park, Petrol Pump.

After a short while, their friend Zorinsangi went home and they again went towards Airport Road. When they reached a place near Lengpui Airport, she rode in a Scooty with Muana and the prosecutrix was inside a taxi driven by the accused. She called her friend (the victim) to get down from the taxi but she refused and her friend Muana dropped her home. At night, the prosecutrix's mother and her elder sister came to her house and asked her the where about of the prosecutrix. She told them that she did not know anything about her and that she thought she was already at home.

16. Pw-5, Raldoliana deposed that he knew the accused person after the present case. The prosecutrix was his daughter. On 27.9.2016, he accompanied his daughter to Aizawl, Police Station along with his wife in connection with the present case. His wife produced the underwear of his victim daughter and her birth certificate to the Police. And the Police seized the said underwear and birth certificate. The Police prepared seizure memo and he put his signature at the seizure memo as the seizure witness.

Exbt. P-2 was the seizure memo

Exbt. M-1 was the seized underwear.

Exbt. M-2 was the birth certificate.

17. Pw-7, Jeremy R. Lalrinchhana and Pw-8 Dr. Lalawmpuii Pachuau deposed that during the year 2016, they were working at Dept. of Pathology On 1.11.2016, the Police produced an alleged sexual assault accused prosecute Liansawmkima and the prosecutrix to their Dept. to draw their blood sample. Accordingly, Dr. C. Lalchhandama drew the blood sample of the accused and the victim in their presence, which were sealed and packed and seized from the possession of Dr. C. Lalchhandama. The Police prepared seizure memo and they

put their signatures as a seizure witness on Exbt. P-2 and Exbt. P-3

18. Pw-9, Dr.Lalremruati Hmar deposed that during the year 2016, she was posted as consultant at Civil Hospital, Aizawl. On 26.9.2016, she received the requisition from Sairang P.S. for the medical examination of 14 years old alleged victim of sexual assault. Before conducting the examination, she took the prosecutrix's consent in writing. The prosecutrix was physically and mentally fit at the time of examination. She saw that there were seminal stains on the prosecutrix's underwear. There was a linear abrasion measuring about 6cms on her right shin and about 2 cms linear abrasion on the prosecutrix's right middle finger. On the lower side of the introitus (vaginal opening) there was linear abrasion of about 0.5cm. The hymen was not intact. A smear was taken from the vagina to test for the presence of semen. It was sent along with the underwear to the Hospital Laboratory to be tested for semen. Her findings were in her report at Exbt.- P-4. Nothing was brought out during the cross examination to doubt the correctness of the above deposition.

19. Pw-10, Dr. Lalthanzuali deposed that in 2016, she was posted as Head of Department of the Blood Bank at Civil Hospital, Aizawl. On 26.09.2016, she received a requisition from Sairang P.S. for the blood grouping of the blood of a 14 years old girl, who was allegedly a victim of sexual assault. A Technician Thuami drew the blood sample for testing. They conducted the blood grouping test and found that she had B+ve blood. Exbt. - P-4 was her report. Nothing was brought out during the cross examination to doubt the correctness of the above deposition.

20. Pw-11, Dr. V. Lalremruata deposed that in 2016, he was posted at the Emergency Dept. in Civil Hospital, Aizawl. On 20.09.2016, he received a requisition from Sairang P.S. to conduct the medical examination of the accused

in a case of alleged sexual assault. The accused who was produced by the Police for examination was a man aged about 22 years. He took his consent and conducted the examination. His physical and mental health appeared to be normal. There was a bite-mark on his left deltoid. There was also an impression of a thumb mark on the left side of his chest. There were scratch marks on his left fore-arm. His genital organs were fully developed and normal. He did not notice any scratches or lacerations on the genital organ. From the development of his sexual organs and from responses to questions put to him, he was capable of engaging in sexual intercourse normally. His examination report is exhibited as Exbt. P-5. Nothing was asked during the cross examination to doubt the correctness of the above deposition.

21. Pw-12, Dr. John Zohminga deposed that he was posted as Pathologist at Civil Hospital, Aizawl. On 27.9.2016, he received a requisition from Sairang P.S. to conduct a blood grouping test of the accused in a case alleged sexual assault. The test was conducted under his supervision by a Technician. He drew the blood and he examined it. The blood was found to be of A+ve group. Nothing was asked during the cross examination to doubt the correctness of the above deposition.

22. Pw-13, Lalchhanzova deposed that in 2016, he was posted at the Forensic Science Laboratory, Aizawl as Assistant Director. On 27.9.2016, he received a requisition from the SDPO Aizawi South to examine the underwear of the prosecutrix which stains for the presence of semen. The underwear was marked as Exbt. A. The stains were found to be semen of human origin and as it was requested that the exhibit should be preserved for DNA examination if found positive for semen, the underwear was preserved. The examination report is exhibited, Exbt. P-8.

23. On 1.11.2016, he received a further requisition from the SDPO, Aizawl North to test the blood samples of the prosecutrix and accused and to compare it with the DNA of the semen found in the preserved underwear. The DNA of the semen in the underwear was found to match the DNA of the blood sample of the accused.

His examination report is exhibited as Exbt. P-9. Nothing was asked during the cross examination to doubt the correctness of the above deposition.

24. Pw-15, R. Lalthanpuii, deposed to the effect that she knew the accused Liansawmkima. In 2016, she was posted at the IUCAW Cell, Aizawi as Sub-Inspector of Police. On 26.09.2016, an FIR was received at Sairang P.S. from Lalthangliani of Lengpui. She stated that her daughter aged about 14 had boarded a taxi at LAD Park between Sihmui and Lengpui to go home but instead of taking her to her destination, the driver took her along the Bulchali Road and sexually assaulted her inside the taxi. A case was registered at the Sairang P.S. u/s 4 POCSO Act R/W 342 IPC and it was referred to the IUCAW Cell by the Officer-in-Charge who endorsed the case to her for investigation. He examined the complainant at the Cell. After asking the prosecutrix and the complainant where they would like her to record the prosecutrix's statement, he recorded it at the IUCAW Cell as per their choice and volition. The prosecutrix was forwarded to Civil Hospital, Aizawl for a medical examination. As per the findings of the Doctor there was (1) Linear abrasion of about 6cms right shin (2) 2cms at right middle finger and (3) 0.5cm linear abrasion at lower side of introitus. The prosecutrix's hymen was not intact. Information was given to the child welfare committee about the offence. She arrested the accused and interrogated him. He admitted committing the offence. She sent the accused for a medical examination and he was found to be fit for custody and also capable of

engaging in sexual intercourse. The medical report showed that there was a bite mark on the left deltoid, a scratch mark on the left arm, and a thumb mark on the right side of the chest. She saw a Photostat copy of the victim's birth certificate in the presence of reliable witnesses; she also saw the underwear which was worn by the victim at the time of the incident. The underwear was sent as Exbt. A to the Forensics Science Laboratory (FSL) to examine whether or not there was semen present, and to preserve the underwear for DNA profiling if semen was found to be present. As from the report of the Forensics Science Laboratory (FSL), there was semen found in the underwear; she requisitioned that blood samples be drawn from the victim and the accused. The blood sample of the accused was marked as Exbt. B and the blood sample of the victim as Exbt. C. The two blood samples were sent to the Forensics Science Laboratory (FSL) for DNA profiling and to match it with the DNA profile of the semen in the victim's underwear. It was found that the DNA profile of the semen in the victim's underwear matched the DNA profile of the accused's blood sample. She forwarded the victim to court for her judicial statement to be recorded by Mr. T. Lalhmachhuana, Judicial Magistrate 1st Class. She visited the place of occurrence and examined two civilian witnesses from the investigation; it was found that a prima facie case u/s 4 POCSO Act R/w 342 IPC was well established against the accused, and she accordingly submitted charge sheet against him. The charge sheet submitted is exhibited as Exbt. P-2-10. Nothing was asked during the cross examination to shake the credibility of the above deposition.

25. On the examination of the accused appellant under section 313 Cr.P.C., he did not deny the evidence that on 25/05/2016 (Sunday) evening at 3:00 p.m the victim had boarded his taxi from LAD Park to go home. That she sat at the

backseat of the taxi he however stated that the victim/prosecutrix was known to him and that the victim/prosecutrix and 4 other persons boarded his taxi at Lengpui Village. He admitted the evidence that he had dropped the prosecutrix home on that day, however he stated that he along with his cousin had dropped the victim at her residence. He also admitted the evidence that he drove his taxi towards Buichali Bridge and that he had kissed the victim but he denied the evidence of having sexual intercourse with the prosecutrix on the alleged date of incident. He admitted the evidence that his taxi tire got punctured but it was not on the way to Lengpui but on his way home to Aizawl after dropping the victim at her residence. He denied the correctness of the medical examination which indicated that there was a bite mark on his left upper arm, an impression of thumb mark on the left side of his chest and scratch marks on his left forearm. He did not deny the fact that his blood sample was drawn and his blood group was A+ and his explanation is stated that the prosecutrix had informed him that she was 18 years of age and that both of them were in love with each other for the last 3 years.

Analysis of the evidence and Findings thereof.

26. On analysis of the evidence adduced, this Court finds that the fact that the prosecutrix was 14 yrs. of age at the time of the incident, as per her birth certificate, is not disputed. Further, the accused/appellant in his examination under Section 313 Cr.P.C, has not denied the evidence that on 25/05/2016 (Sunday) evening at 3:00 p.m, the victim had boarded his taxi from LAD Park to go home and that she sat at the backseat of the taxi. He admitted the evidence that he had dropped the prosecutrix home on that day. He also admitted the evidence that he drove his taxi towards Buichali Bridge and that he had kissed the victim. The prosecutrix has testified how the accused/appellant had sexually

assaulted her while she rode in his taxi near Lengpui Airport and later, the accused/appellant had drove his taxi towards Bawngkawn bridge and had again sexually assaulted her the second time. This incident has also been narrated by her in her examination under Section 164 Cr.P.C. This court finds that the prosecutrix discrepancies did not mention about three men who were initially also in the taxi belonging to the appellant and her deposition before the court and that there was difference in the place where they had drank liquor as per her statement made under 164 Cr.P.C and her deposition, however it is seen and the prosecutrix is consistent in her statement regarding the sexual assault committed against her by the appellant that while she rode in his taxi near Lengpui Airport and later, when the accused/appellant had drove his taxi towards Bawngkawn bridge and he had again sexually assaulted her.

27. The Apex Court in **Subodh Nath and Anr. Vs. State of Tripura**, reported in **(2013) 4SCC 122** has held that in the deposition of witnesses there are always normal discrepancies due to normal errors of observation, loss of memory, mental disposition of the witnesses and the like. Unless, therefore, the discrepancies are material discrepancies so as to create a reasonable doubt about the credibility of the witnesses, the Court will not discard the evidence of the witnesses. In view of the above, this Court finds that the discrepancies as noted above are minor discrepancies which do not caused this Court to doubt the veracity of the testimony of the prosecutrix with regards to the incident wherein it is also seen that the testimony of the prosecutrix is corroborated by the medical evidence of PW-9 Dr. Lalremruati Hmar, who conducted the medical examination of the prosecutrix show that there was linear abrasion measuring about 6cms on her right shin and about 2cms linear abrasion on the prosecutrix's right middle finger. On the lower side of the introitus (vaginal

opening) there was linear abrasion of about 0.5cm. The hymen was not intact. A smear was also taken from the vagina to test for the presence of semen which was sent along with the underwear to the Hospital Laboratory to be tested for semen.

28. The testimony of the prosecutrix is further corroborated by the result of the semen smear taken from the underwear of the victim girl which match the DNA of the blood sample of the accused/appellant as deposed by PW-13 Lalchhanzova, who is the Assistant Director, Forensic Science Laboratory (FSL), Aizawl. The medical examination of the accused/appellant, wherein, PW-11 Dr. V. Lalremruata had stated that "*There was a bite-mark on his left deltoid. There was also an impression of a thumb mark on the left side of his chest. There were scratch marks on his left fore-arm*" also corroborated the statement of the prosecutrix who had stated in her examination under 164 Cr.P.C that she had bitten the accused/appellant on his shoulder.

29. It is also seen that the accused in his examination under 313 CrPC had made an attempt to show that he and the prosecutrix had known each other for the last 3 years and were romantically involved. However, his examination under 313 Cr.P.C is again contradicted by the defence witness who had stated that he and the prosecutrix knew each other for the past 8(eight) months.

30. This court also finds that the facts and circumstances in the case ***Lalbiakliana Vs. State of Mizoram & Anr.(Supra)*** are different from the present case, wherein, in the cited case, the prosecution depended solely on the testimony of the prosecutrix and there was also significant discrepancies in the statements made by the prosecutrix in her statement recorded under section 164 Cr.P.C and her deposition in the court.

31. In view of the above findings and reasons, this Court finds that there are no grounds for setting aside the Judgment & Order dated 24.08.2020, passed by the Court of Special Judge under POCSO Act, 2012, Aizawl in SC No. 17/2017 in connection with Crl.Tr. No. 186/2017.

32. Accordingly, Crl.A. No. 6/2021(J) stands dismissed and disposed of.

33. In appreciation of the services rendered by the learned Amicus Curiae, he will be paid a fee of Rs. 7500/- through the Mizoram State Legal Services Authority, Aizawl.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant