



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 30TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2024

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SREENIVAS HARISH KUMAR

AND

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE UMESH M ADIGA

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 2092 OF 2017 (A)

BETWEEN:

ANAND SHETTY
S/O LATE MAHALINGA SHETTY,
AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS,
RESIDING AT THENKODGI HOSAMANE,
VANDSE VILLAGE,
KUNDAPUR TALUK,
UDUPI DISTRICT-576 201.

...APPELLANT

(BY SRI. RAJU C.N, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. MAHESH NANIGA
S/O VASU GANIGA,
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS
RESIDING AT THENKODGI ABBI,
VANDSE VILLAGE,
KUNDAPURA TALUK
UDUPI-576 201.
2. MANJUNATHA @ MANJUNATH DEVADIGA,
ALIAS C.D.MANJA,
AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS,
RESIDING AT HIJANA SHARKE,
CHITTU VILLAGE,
KUNDAPURA TALUK
UDUPI-576 201.
3. STATE BY P.S.I., KOLLUR POLICE
UDUPI, REPRESENTED BY
SPP, HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA,



BANGALORE - 560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.V.S. VINAYAKA, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. HAREESH BHANDARY T., ADVOCATE FOR R1 AND R2,
SRI. RAJAT SUBRAMANYAM, HCGP FOR R3)

THIS CRIMINAL APPEAL IS FILED U/S.372 CR.P.C BY THE
ADVOCATE FOR THE APPELLANT PRAYING THAT THIS HON'BLE
COURT MAY BE PLEASED TO SET ASIDE THE JUDGMENT OF
ACQUITTAL DATED 04.10.2017 PASSED BY THE ADDITIONAL
DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE, UDUPI (TO SIT AT KUNDAPURA),
KUNDAPURA IN S.C.NO.01/2016 - ACQUITTING THE
RESPONDENTS/ACCUSED NO.1 AND 2 FOR THE OFFENCE P/U/S
341,504 AND 307 R/W 34 OF IPC.

THIS APPEAL, HAVING BEEN RESERVED FOR JUDGEMENT,
COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT THIS DAY, **UMESH M. ADIGA,
J.,** PRONOUNCED THE FOLLOWING:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SREENIVAS HARISH KUMAR
and
HON'BLE MR JUSTICE UMESH M ADIGA

CAV JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE UMESH M ADIGA)

This appeal is by the victim/complainant in
S.C.No.1/2016 on the file of Additional District and
Sessions Judge, Udupi, sitting at Kundapur, (for short 'trial
court') challenging the impugned judgment passed by the
said court dated 4.10.2017 acquitting the accused for the
offences punishable under Sections 341, 504 and 307 read
with Section 34 of IPC.



2. We refer to the parties as per their ranks before the trial court.

3. It is the case of prosecution that prior to the incident, accused Nos.1 and 2 were eve-teasing the daughter of complainant-PW1, Ananda Shetty. Therefore, PW-1 warned both the accused and directed accused not to tease his daughter PW-2 – Nirmala. Due to the same, accused developed enmity against Ananda Shetty. On 01.12.2014 around 9.15 p.m, PW-1 was returning home from Wandse market; at that time, both the accused came on a motor bike bearing registration No.KA-25-K841, intercepted PW-1 and wrongfully confined him. Thereafter, they abused PW-1 in filthy language, assaulted him with wooden club and long (talwar), on his head, left ear, left cheek and attempted to murder him. Due to the same, PW-1 sustained bleeding injuries and fell down. Both the accused thought that he was dead. Both of them put PW-1 in a pit situated at side of the road and left the spot of the incident, on the same motor cycle. After some



time, PW-1 came out of pit, went to his house, situated about 20 mtrs away from the spot of the incident. Looking to the bleeding injuries sustained by PW1, members of his family raised hue and cry. His neighbors gathered in his house. PW-1 was shifted to Adarsha Hospital at Udupi, in a car, wherein he was admitted as inpatient. The hospital authority sent email to Kolluru Police station. There after SHO of the Kollur police station, on 02.12.2014 went to Adarsha Hospital, recorded statement of PW-1 as per Ex.P1 and on that basis, registered a case in Cr.No.75/2014 for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 504 and 307 read with Section 34 of IPC.

4. PW-11 – Jayantha, the Sub-inspector of Police, investigated the case and submitted charge sheet against the accused for the above said offences.

5. The learned JMFC, Kundapura took cognizance of the offence. The offence punishable under Section 307 of IPC is triable by court of Sessions, therefore, case was committed to court of Sessions, Udupi, that was registered



as S.C.No.1/2016. The case was tried by Additional District and Sessions judge, Udupi, (sitting at Kundapura).

The learned Sessions Judge, after hearing both the parties, framed charges for above offences and the accused pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

6. The prosecution examined PW-1 to PW-11 and got marked Exs.P1 to P19 and M.Os.1 to 7 and closed its evidence. The learned sessions Judge examined accused Nos.1 and 2 under Section 313 of Cr.P.C. and their answers were recorded. The accused did not lead any defence evidence, but got marked one document as per Ex.D1.

7. The learned Sessions Judge after hearing both the side and appreciating the evidence on record, acquitted the accused of the alleged offences by impugned judgment dated 04.10.2017.

8. We have heard the arguments.



9. The learned counsel for the appellant has vehemently contended that learned trial Judge has totally ignored the evidence of the victim PW-1, which is corroborated by medical evidence i.e. evidence of PW10 and evidence of investigating officer-PW-11. Admittedly there are no eye witness to the incident. The victim alone was going on the road in the night at that time, both the accused came in the motor cycle and assaulted him with the deadly weapons. PW-1 has sustained grievous injuries, which is corroborated by PW-10, M.Os-1 and 2 were seized by PW-11 on the confession of accused Nos.1 and 2. Both M.Os.1 and 2 were blood stained. Other witnesses are not material witnesses. The learned trial Judge did not appreciate the evidence of PW-1, 10 and 11 properly. The learned trial Judge has given much importance to other two persons, who came to spot of incident along with the accused on another motor cycle. It is pertinent to note that the said two persons were not at all involved in the offence and they have not assaulted on PW-1. Both the said persons were not charge sheeted by



the police, cannot be a ground to acquit accused Nos.1 and 2. PW-1 had specifically stated in his evidence that accused Nos.1 and 2 assaulted him and caused the injuries. They had enmity against PW-1 since he warned them for teasing his daughter. Said facts are not at all considered by the learned trial Judge. PW-1 in his cross-examination has stated that he saw the face of accused Nos.1 and 2 through moonlight and even in Ex.P1, said fact is stated. The learned trial Judge has not accepted the same and held that there was no light at the time of incident and PW-1 did not say how he could see the face of the accused. Therefore, his evidence was disbelieved by the trial court. The said findings are erroneous and hence prayed for allowing the appeal by convicting the accused for the above said offences.

10. The learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 and 3 supported the impugned judgment. The learned counsel has further submitted that PW-1 is interested witness and his evidence is not reliable. PW-10 is the Medical officer of



a private hospital and moreover he has not treated the victim. PW-11, though in the FIR referred about the presence of four persons but he did not even enquire with PW-1 as to who were the other two persons and no investigation was done by him according to his cross-examination. Said facts were considered by the learned trial Judge. According to the case of the prosecution, there was enmity between accused and PW-1. It is defense of the accused that they were informer to the forest department about illegal activities of the people in the forest area. PW-1 felled the trees in forest area and was involved in committing the forest offences. These facts were informed by both the accused to forest department. Therefore, PW-1 was angry against accused Nos.1 and 2. On the alleged day of incident, PW-1 was heavily drunk and he fell in a pit situated at the side of the road and sustained injuries. Misusing the same, he has filed false complaint against both the accused. The learned trial judge has considered these facts and rightly acquitted the accused for the alleged offences. The said



findings do not call for any interference by this court. With these reasons, prayed for dismissal of the appeal.

11. Following point emerges for our determination:

Whether the learned trial judge is justified in acquitting the accused of the offences punishable under Section 341, 307 and 504 read with section 34 of IPC?

12. Our finding to the above said point is partly-in-the-affirmative, for the following reasons:

Ex.P1 is statement of PW-1 recorded by police on next date of incident at Adarsha hospital in Udupi. In Ex.P1, PW-1 has stated that on 01.12.2014 during late evening he went to Wandse market to buy milk and while returning home from the market, there was sufficient moon light. When he was going from Nujadi cross to Tenkodgi towards his house, two motor cycles having four riders came from his hind side and both of them stopped the respective motor cycles ahead of him. Accused Nos.1



and 2 were on one motor cycle and the other two riders of the motor cycle were unknown to him. Accused Nos.1 and 2 were holding talwar (sickle) and wooden club. They abused him in filthy language and assaulted him with talwar and club, due to which he fell down. Both accused thought that he was dead and hence put his body in the pit situated at the side of the road and left the spot of incident, on their motor cycle. After some time, PW-1 came out of the pit and went towards his house. Thereafter, he was taken by one Gopala Shetty to Chinmaya hospital at Kundapura and for further treatment he was shifted to Adarsha Hospital at Udupi. Accused No.1 – Mahesha was eve-teasing his daughter. He warned him and directed not to repeat the same. Hence, accused No.1 was angry against him. To take revenge against him, accused Nos.1 and 2 assaulted him with deadly weapons, with an intention to murder him.

13. During evidence, PW-1 has reiterated the said facts before the court. He identified accused Nos.1 and 2



and also identified weapon i.e. M.Os. 1 and 2 as the weapon used by accused Nos.1 and 2 to assault him. His clothes were blood stained and they were seized by the police. He identified them as M.Os.4 and 5. He has stated that he has taken treatment as in-patient in the hospital for 12 days. He has also stated that accused No.1 was teasing his daughter and when he objected for the same, accused Nos.1 and 2, with an intention to kill him, assaulted him.

14. In his cross-examination, PW-1 has stated that incident had taken place about 10 days after full moon day. Rider of both the motor cycle came from his back side and went ahead of him and stopped their vehicles. Immediately he could not identify the riders of the motor cycle and thereafter he identified the riders of one motor cycle, who are accused Nos.1 and 2. Riders of other motor cycle were unknown to him. PW-1 in his cross-examination denied that accused Nos.1 and 2 were informer to the forest department about forest offences.



He also denied that both accused informed to the forest department about illegal acts committed by him in the forest. He denied the suggestions of the accused that he had enmity against both accused Nos.1 and 2, therefore, he lodged false complaint against accused Nos.1 and 2. He also denied suggestions that he was in the habit of consuming liquor. He denied that on the day of incident, he was highly drunk and fell down in a pit, since he could not control himself and sustained injuries. He denied that misusing the same, he filed false case against the accused. No materials are placed on record to show that accused were informer to the forest department about the offences committed against the forest. Whatever suggestions made by both the accused, were denied by PW-1 and there were no materials to probabalise the defense of the accused or disbelieve the evidence of PW-1. His evidence is reliable.



15. PW-10 – Medical officer, who has given Ex.P12 – wound certificate, wherein it is mentioned that PW-1 sustained following injuries.

1. Incised wound of 4cm x 1cm x bone deep on the right side of top of head.
2. Incised wound of 3cm x 1cm x bone deep on the left side of top of head.
3. Incised wound of 5cm x 1cm x bone deep on the right side of top of head.
4. Chop wound of 5cm x 1cm x bone deep on the left side of lower part of head with transaction of left ear pinna into upper and lower half.
5. Incised wound of 8cm x 2 cm x bone deep on the margin of left jaw.
6. Laceration of 4cm x 2cm x bone deep on the back of left elbow with X ray No.7461 showing comminuted fracture of olecranon process of ulna.

16. PW-10 identified M.Os. 1 and 2 and stated that they were sent to him by police to give opinion. He verified them with the injuries found on PW-1 as well as Ex.P12 and gave certificate as per Ex.P13 , stating that by assaulting with such weapons, injuries found on PW-1 could be possible. The said certificates are at Exs.P13 and 14.



In the cross-examination of PW-10, he has elaborated about the injuries sustained by PW-1 and also stated that injuries could be possible by assaulting with M.Os. 1 and 2. He denied the suggestions of the accused that if a person falls in a pit containing stones and mud, such injuries could be possible. He has stated that if a person falls on the road, he may sustain injuries mentioned in serial No.6 of Ex.P12. Therefore, evidence of PW-1 regarding injuries are corroborated by PW-10.

17. PW-11 in his evidence has stated that both the accused surrendered before him and he arrested them and recorded their confession statement as per Exs.P16 and P17 leading to discovery of place where they hid M.Os 1 and 2. (The learned sessions Judge has marked entire confession statement of the accused as Exs.P16 and 17. The said procedure is totally incorrect. Entire confession statement, admitting the guilt is not admissible as per Section 25 of the Indian Evidence Act. The learned sessions Judge ought to have marked only the portion of



statement, leading to discovery of the place, wherein they have hidden the weapon). PW-11 has stated that both the accused took PW-7 and 8 and police to the place where they have hidden M.Os.1 and 2 and showed the place. He seized M.Os.1 and 2 from the said place in the presence of PWs-7 and 8, under mahazar as per Ex.P8 and took the photographs as per Ex.P10. PW-7 and 8 have turned hostile and both of them have stated that they have signed on Exs.P-8 and P-9 in Kolluru police station. But they admitted that their photos are found in Exs.P10 and P2. PWs-7 and 8 do not disclose as to where the said Ex.P2 and P-11 were taken. On perusal of Exs.P-2 and P-11, it does not appear that it was taken in police station. From their evidence, it can be inferred that, PW-7 and 8 are not deposing true facts before the court. Therefore, on the basis of evidence of PW-7 and 8, the case of prosecution cannot be thrown out of the court.

18. PW-11 – the investigating officer has stated about seizure of M.Os.1 and 2 as well as motorcycle i.e.



M.O.3 under Exs.P8 and 9. Nothing is brought out in his cross-examination, to disbelieve his evidence. Merely PW-11 is a police officer does not mean that his evidence is not reliable. Therefore, seizure of M.Os.1 and 2 is proved by the prosecution. PW-1 identified M.Os.1 and 2, which were used to assault him by accused Nos.1 and 2.

19. The other witnesses are not material witnesses. According to PW.1, there were no persons at the time of incident. He was the injured. His evidence is not corroborated by other witnesses cannot be a ground to reject or disbelieve the evidence of PW-1. The suggestions of accused to PW-1 are not probable. Within short period from the incident, PW-1 went to hospital. Medical officer has not stated in the certificate that PW-1 was under influence of alcohol. PW-1 is the victim of the incident and he sustained injuries in the incident. Evidence of PW-1 is corroborated by medical evidence and also by PW-11. They are sufficient to hold that the



accused have committed an offence punishable under section 324 read with Section 34 of IPC.

20. The prosecution contended that both the accused intended to murder PW-1 but said contention is not substantiated. If both the accused really intended to murder PW-1 then there were no hindrance for them to materialize their intention. Motive for the incident, according to the case of prosecution is that, accused Nos.1 was teasing the daughter of PW-1 and therefore PW-1 warned him. Because of the same, incident had taken place. It is difficult to believe that for silly reasons, the accused intended to murder him. Therefore, the contention of the prosecution that both the accused intended to murder PW-1 is not acceptable. The acts of accused amounts to an offence punishable under Section 324 of IPC.

21. The learned trial Judge acquitted the accused on two grounds; one is that according to Ex.P1 as well as evidence of PW-1, four persons came to the spot of



incident on two motor cycles, but only two accused are charge sheeted by the police and there was no investigation in respect of other two accused. Therefore, he suspected the case of prosecution. It is pertinent to note that PW-1 in his evidence has not at all made any allegation against the riders of another motor cycle. They have not assaulted him and even they were not known to PW-1. Under such circumstances, other two accused were not charge sheeted cannot be a ground to disbelieve the evidence of PW-1 or acquit accused Nos.1 and 2. For the sake of discussion, even if we believe that there were four accused, that cannot be a ground to acquit the remaining two accused on the ground that police were not able to arrest other two accused involved in the incident. The said reason is perverse.

22. The learned trial Judge also doubted the case of the prosecution of the ground that PW-1 during the evidence has not stated how he identified accused Nos.1 and 2 in the dark. The said reason is also not acceptable.



Admittedly, accused Nos.1 and 2 were residing nearby house of PW-1 and both of them were known to him. PW-1 in his statement before the police has stated that on that day by moonlight he could see the accused. In his cross-examination, it was brought out that few days after the full moon day, the incident had taken place. When both accused Nos.1 and 2 are very well known person to PW-1 and he says that he could identify them at the spot of the incident, that is sufficient to believe that he could see the accused at the spot of incident. Only on that ground, the evidence of PW-1 cannot be discarded. It is pertinent to note that during trial the learned public prosecutor should have asked the questions to PW-1 regarding the said fact and it is lapse on the part of the learned public prosecutor, not questioning PW-1 as to how he could see the faces of the accused in the dark. It is a settled law that due to defects in the investigation or lapses of the prosecutor cannot be ground for acquittal of the accused. Therefore, that cannot be a proper ground for acquittal of the accused.



23. PW-11 in his cross-examination has stated that even he has not tried to investigate about the other two persons, who came to the spot of incident on another motor cycle. It indicates his carelessness in the investigation of the case. PW-10 in his evidence has stated that he sent information about admission of PW-1 through email. It appears till the next day, it was not seen. And SHO sent police to record statement only on the next day afternoon PW-11 has not stated as to at what time he received the email. He did not bother to explain the same in such grave offence. M.Os.1 and 2 were sent to Forensic Science Laboratory for giving serology report regarding the blood stains found on the said weapons. It appears that till the conclusion of the trial, the said report was not at all placed on record. These facts indicates the negligence of investigating officer in investigating the case. As already stated above, they are not the grounds for acquittal of the accused. There are no sufficient materials to convict accused for the offences punishable under Sections 341 and 504 of IPC.



24. We are aware that while reversing the judgment of acquittal, the appellate court has to take proper care and caution. If the trial court has committed any grave error, then only appellate court can interfere in such findings of acquittal. If two views are possible, then, the view taken by the trial court or the view which is favourable to the accused, is to be accepted. In this case, as discussed above, only one view is probable and that is accused committed the murder under Section 324 of IPC. The reasons assigned by the trial court to acquit the accused are not in accordance with law. The Hon'ble Apex Court time and again held that in appropriate cases where injustice or miscarriage of justice has caused or the findings of the trial Judge are against the provision of law and perverse, the appellate court shall interfere and reverse the said findings of acquittal.

25. In the case of **Guru Dutt Pathak –vs- State of Uttar Pradesh¹**, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that:

¹ (2021) 6 SCC 116



" Each and every ground on which trial court acquitted accused was elaborately dealt with by High Court. On reappreciation of entire evidence on record, High Court specifically concluded that findings recorded by trial court were perverse. Therefore, High Court was right in interfering with judgment and order of acquittal passed by trial court and convicting accused under Ss. 302/34 IPC. No interference with impugned judgment and order passed by High Court is warranted herein. Hence, conviction of accused under Ss. 302/34 IPC, stands confirmed".

26. In the case of ***Siju Kurian -vs- State of Karnataka***², it is held that (we quote):

" 16. It need not be restated that it would be open for the High Court to re-appraise the evidence and conclusions drawn by the Trial Court and in the case of the judgment of the trial court being perverse that is contrary to the evidence on record, then in such circumstances the High Court would be justified in interfering with the findings of the Trial Court and/or reversing the finding of the Trial Court. In Gamini Bala Koteswara Rao v. State of Andhra Pradesh, (2009) 10 SCC 636, it has been held by this Court as under:

" 14. We have considered the arguments advanced and heard the matter at great length. It is true, as contended by Mr.Rao, that interference in an appeal against an acquittal recorded by the trial court should be rare and in exceptional circumstances. It is, however, well settled by now that it is open to the High Court to reappraise the evidence and conclusions drawn by the trial court but only in a case when the judgment of the trial court is stated to be perverse. The word "perverse" in terms as understood in law has been defined to mean "against the weight of evidence". We have to see accordingly as to whether the judgment of the trial court which has been found perverse by the High Court was in fact so."

² 2023 SCC Online SC 429



17. *The Appellate court may reverse the order of acquittal in the exercise of its powers and there is no indication in the Code of any limitation or restriction having placed on the High Court in exercise of its power as an Appellate court. No distinction can be drawn as regards the power of the High Court in dealing with an appeal, between an appeal from an order of acquittal and an appeal from a conviction. The Code of Criminal Procedure does not place any fetter on exercise of the power to review at large the evidence upon which the order of acquittal was founded, and to reach the conclusion that upon that evidence the order of acquittal should be reversed.*

18. In the case of *Sheo Swarup v. King Emperor*, AIR 1934 PC 227, the Privy Council held as under:

"But in exercising the power conferred by the Code and before reaching its conclusions upon fact, the High Court should and will always give proper weight and consideration to such matters as:

- a) The views/opinion of the trial judge as to the credibility of the witnesses;*
- b) The presumption of innocence in favour of the accused;*
- c) The right of the accused to the benefit of any doubt; and*
- d) The slowness of an appellate court in disturbing a finding of fact arrived at by a judge who had the advantage of seeing the witnesses.*

27. In the case of ***Chandrappa and others –vs- State of Karnataka***³ reiterated the legal position as under:

³ (2007) 4 SCC 415: (2007) 2 SCC (Cri) 325



'42.... (1) An appellate court has full power to review, reappreciate and reconsider the evidence upon which the order of acquittal is founded.

(2) The Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 puts no limitation, restriction or condition on exercise of such power and an appellate court on the evidence before it may reach its own conclusion, both on questions of fact and of law.

(3) Various expressions, such as, "substantial and compelling reasons", "good and sufficient grounds", "very strong circumstances", "distorted conclusions", "glaring mistakes", etc. are not intended to curtail extensive powers of an appellate court in an appeal against acquittal. Such phraseologies are more in the nature of "flourishes of language" to emphasise the reluctance of an appellate court to interfere with acquittal than to curtail the power of the court to review the evidence and to come to its own conclusion.

(4) An appellate court, however, must bear in mind that in case of acquittal, there is double presumption in favour of the accused. Firstly, the presumption of innocence is available to him under the fundamental principle of criminal jurisprudence that every person shall be presumed to be innocent unless he is proved guilty by a competent court of law. Secondly, the accused having secured his acquittal, the presumption of his innocence is further reinforced, reaffirmed and strengthened by the trial court.

(5) If two reasonable conclusions are possible on the basis of the evidence on record, the appellate court should not disturb the finding of acquittal recorded by the trial court.

We have kept in mind the law laid down in this regard before reversing the judgment.

28. The prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt that accused Nos.1 and 2 have committed an



offence punishable under Section 324 read with Section 34 of IPC. Accordingly, we pass the following:

ORDER

The appeal is ***allowed in part.***

Judgment of acquittal of accused Nos.1 and 2 of the offences punishable under Sections 341 and 504 read with Section 34 of IPC is confirmed and acquitting the accused Nos.1 and 2 of the offence punishable under Section 307 of IPC is reversed with modification.

Accused Nos.1 and 2 are convicted of the offence punishable under Section 324 read with Section 34 of IPC.

Sd/-
(SREENIVAS HARISH KUMAR)
JUDGE

Sd/-
(UMESH M ADIGA)
JUDGE



SHKJ & UMBAJ
06.11.2024

ORDER ON SENTENCE

We have received report from Probation officer, Udupi and perused the same.

Looking to the offences committed by the offenders, report of the probation officer and character and conduct of the offenders, we deem it appropriate to give the benefit of probation of offenders Act to them.

Accordingly, both the offenders be released on each entering into a bond for Rs.50,000/- with one surety for likesum amount to the satisfaction of the trial Court, to appear and receive sentence, when called upon during the period of one year from the date of execution of the bond with the following conditions:

- a) They shall not involve themselves into any criminal offences.
- b) They shall maintain peace and good behaviour in the locality.



During the above said period of one year, they shall remain under the supervision of probation officer, Udupi. The probation officer shall submit report regarding violation of any of the above conditions by the offenders to this Court.

**Sd/-
(SREENIVAS HARISH KUMAR)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(UMESH M ADIGA)
JUDGE**

AG
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 2