

Court No. - 77

Case :- APPLICATION U/S 482 No. - 7000 of 2024

Applicant :- Manoj

Opposite Party :- State of U.P. and Another

Counsel for Applicant :- Arjun Singh Yadav, Ramesh Pundir, Rekha Pundir

Counsel for Opposite Party :- G.A.

Hon'ble Samit Gopal, J.

1. List revised.

2. Heard Sri Ramesh Pundir, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Ajay Singh, learned A.G.A.-I for the State and perused the record.

3. This application under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been filed by the applicant Manoj with the following prayer:-

“It is, therefore, most respectfully prayed that this Hon’ble Court may graciously be pleased to allow this application and quash the impugned order dated 18.12.2023 passed by the Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Court No. 5, Meerut in Criminal Case No. 22986 of 2023, State vs. Manoj and others, arising out of case Crime No. 197 of 2023, under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B I.P.C., Police Station- Civil Lines, District Meerut.

It is, further prayed that this Hon’ble Court may further be pleased to stay the further proceedings of Criminal Case No. 22986 of 2023, State vs. Manoj and others, arising out of case Crime No. 197 of 2023, under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B I.P.C., Police Station- Civil Lines, District Meerut pending in the court of Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Court No. 5, Meerut during the pendency of instant application before this Hon’ble Court, otherwise the applicants shall suffer irreparable loss and injury. And/or pass such other and further order as this Hon’ble Court may deem fit and proper under the facts and circumstances of the case.”

4. The First Information Report was lodged on 28.06.2023 by Inspector Sunil Kumar against the applicant and 10 other accused persons on the basis of a recovery memo with regards to question papers, PAN Cards,

Driving Licence, Labour Card, Vehicle and arrest of three accused persons. The question papers so recovered was of Village Development Officer examination of which the police informer informed the police team that question paper has been taken out and there is bungling going on for it, on which the police apprehended the vehicle having Registration No. UP 15 AY 7902 standing by the side of road in which three persons were sitting. On inquiry, the person sitting at the driving seat disclosed his name as Manoj son of Jaiprakash (present applicant). Beside him the person sitting disclosed his name as Sandeep son of Sukhpal and the 3rd person sitting in the vehicle at rear seat disclosed his name as Udham Singh son of Sukhpal Singh. They disclosed that they were involved in solving of question papers and giving answer through electronic media.

5. The matter was investigated after which a charge sheet dated 17.09.2023 was submitted against the applicant under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B, 34 I.P.C. and three other accused persons namely Sandeep, Udham Singh and Ankit Punia under the said sections on which court concerned took cognizance upon the same. The applicant was granted bail vide order dated 27.7.2023 by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court passed in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 32894 of 2023 (Manoj Kumar Vs. State of U.P.). An application under Section 239 Cr.P.C. dated 18.12.2023 was moved by the applicant for discharge. The same stood rejected vide order dated 18.12.2023. The court concerned framed charges against the applicant Manoj Kumar, co-accused Sandeep, Udham Singh and Ankit Punia for the offence under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B/34 I.P.C. vide its order dated 29.1.2024. The present application under Section 482 Cr.P.C. thus has been filed before this Court with the aforesaid prayers.

6. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that on 27.06.2023 co-accused hired the vehicle of the applicant for dropping him to Saharanpur. It is submitted that the applicant who is registered owner of the said vehicle and also has valid driving license to drive it, uses his vehicle for transporting public and earn his livelihood from it and in due course of business, his vehicle was hired by the said co-accused persons. It is submitted that the applicant did not know that his vehicle would be used for any other purposes. Further it is submitted that the applicant does not know the co-accused persons and he has no relations with them. It is submitted that the vehicle was provided to them only for the purpose of earning money for transportation. It is submitted that rejection of the application under Section 239 Cr.P.C. for discharge vide order dated

18.12.2023 and then framing of charges against the applicant and other co-accused persons vide order dated 29.01.2024 by the court concerned are totally illegal and without evidence on record. It is submitted that the orders impugned be thus quashed and the applicant be discharged in the present matter.

7. Per contra, learned A.G.A. opposed the prayer.

8. After having heard learned counsels for the parties and perusing the records, it is evident that the vehicle of the applicant was apprehended by the police in which he was sitting at the driver seat along with two other accused persons and incriminating material was recovered from the vehicle. The case of the prosecution is of use of vehicle for illegal purpose of solving questions papers by solvers used in a competitive examination. The defence of the applicant that the vehicle in question was given on rent to co-accused persons can only be decided after evidence is led and his defence is taken and has to be considered by the trial court at the appropriate stage. The prosecution case is not disputed by the applicant but defence is being taken by him that the vehicle was given on rent to the co-accused persons which was being used for the said purpose, the same is sufficient for putting the applicant on trial.

9. The law with regards to discharge of accused and framing of charge is well settled.

10. An accused can also be discharged as per Section 227, 239 Cr.P.C. They reads as under:

“Section 227. Discharge - If, upon consideration of the record of the case and the documents submitted therewith, and after hearing the submissions of the accused and the prosecution in this behalf, the Judge considers that there is not sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused, he shall discharge the accused and record his reasons for so doing.”

“Section 239 Cr.P.C. Discharge – If, upon considering the police report and the documents sent with it under section 173 and making such examination, if any, of the accused as the Magistrate thinks necessary and after giving the prosecution and the accused an opportunity of being heard, the Magistrate considers the charge against the accused to be groundless, he shall discharge the accused, and record his reasons for doing so.”

11. The Apex Court, in the case of **Sajjan Kumar Vs. C.B.I. : (2010) 9 SCC 368**, held that at the time of framing of charge, the Court has to look at all the material placed before it and determine whether a prima facie case is made out or not, and the court is not required to consider the evidentiary value of the evidence as any question of admissibility or reliability of evidence is a matter of trial. The relevant portion of the judgment is reproduced below:

“21. On consideration of the authorities about scope of Sections 227 and 228 of the Code, the following principles emerge:

- (i) The Judge while considering the question of framing the charges under Section 227 of the Cr.P.C. has the undoubted power to sift and weigh the evidence for the limited purpose of finding out whether or not a prima facie case against the accused has been made out. The test to determine prima facie case would depend upon the facts of each case.
- (ii) Where the materials placed before the Court disclose grave suspicion against the accused which has not been properly explained, the Court will be fully justified in framing a charge and proceeding with the trial.
- (iii) The Court cannot act merely as a Post Office or a mouthpiece of the prosecution but has to consider the broad probabilities of the case, the total effect of the evidence and the documents produced before the Court, any basic infirmities etc. However, at this stage, there cannot be a roving enquiry into the pros and cons of the matter and weigh the evidence as if he was conducting a trial.
- (iv) If on the basis of the material on record, the Court could form an opinion that the accused might have committed offence, it can frame the charge, though for conviction the conclusion is required to be proved beyond reasonable doubt that the accused has committed the offence.
- (v) At the time of framing of the charges, the probative value of the material on record cannot be gone into but before framing a charge the Court must apply its judicial mind on the material placed on record and must be satisfied that the commission of offence by the accused was possible.

(vi) At the stage of Sections 227 and 228, the Court is required to evaluate the material and documents on record with a view to find out if the facts emerging therefrom taken at their face value discloses the existence of all the ingredients constituting the alleged offence. For this limited purpose, sift the evidence as it cannot be expected even at that initial stage to accept all that the prosecution states as gospel truth even if it is opposed to common sense or the broad probabilities of the case.

(vii) If two views are possible and one of them gives rise to suspicion only, as distinguished from grave suspicion, the trial Judge will be empowered to discharge the accused and at this stage, he is not to see whether the trial will end in conviction or acquittal.”

12. In Amit Kapoor Vs. Ramesh Chander : (2012) 9 SCC 460, the Apex Court enlisted certain principles with reference to exercise of power under Section 397 and Section 482 of Cr.P.C. by the Courts while deciding as to whether the charges framed against an accused be quashed or not. The principles listed are as under:

“27. Having discussed the scope of jurisdiction under these two provisions, i.e., Section 397 and Section 482 of the Code and the fine line of jurisdictional distinction, now it will be appropriate for us to enlist the principles with reference to which the courts should exercise such jurisdiction. However, it is not only difficult but is inherently impossible to state with precision such principles. At best and upon objective analysis of various judgments of this Court, we are able to cull out some of the principles to be considered for proper exercise of jurisdiction, particularly, with regard to quashing of charge either in exercise of jurisdiction under Section 397 or Section 482 of the Code or together, as the case may be:

27.1. Though there are no limits of the powers of the Court under Section 482 of the Code but the more the power, the more due care and caution is to be exercised in invoking these powers. The power of quashing criminal proceedings, particularly, the charge framed in terms of Section 228 of the Code should be exercised very sparingly and with circumspection and that too in the rarest of rare cases.

27.2. The Court should apply the test as to whether the uncontroverted allegations as made from the record of the case and

the documents submitted therewith prima facie establish the offence or not. If the allegations are so patently absurd and inherently improbable that no prudent person can ever reach such a conclusion and where the basic ingredients of a criminal offence are not satisfied then the Court may interfere.

27.3. The High Court should not unduly interfere. No meticulous examination of the evidence is needed for considering whether the case would end in conviction or not at the stage of framing of charge or quashing of charge.

27.4. Where the exercise of such power is absolutely essential to prevent patent miscarriage of justice and for correcting some grave error that might be committed by the subordinate courts even in such cases, the High Court should be loathe to interfere, at the threshold, to throttle the prosecution in exercise of its inherent powers.

27.5. Where there is an express legal bar enacted in any of the provisions of the Code or any specific law in force to the very initiation or institution and continuance of such criminal proceedings, such a bar is intended to provide specific protection to an accused.

27.6. The Court has a duty to balance the freedom of a person and the right of the complainant or prosecution to investigate and prosecute the offender.

27.7. The process of the Court cannot be permitted to be used for an oblique or ultimate/ulterior purpose.

27.8. Where the allegations made and as they appeared from the record and documents annexed therewith to predominantly give rise and constitute a 'civil wrong' with no 'element of criminality' and does not satisfy the basic ingredients of a criminal offence, the Court may be justified in quashing the charge. Even in such cases, the Court would not embark upon the critical analysis of the evidence.

27.9. Another very significant caution that the courts have to observe is that it cannot examine the facts, evidence and materials on record to determine whether there is sufficient material on the basis of which the case would end in a conviction, the Court is concerned primarily with the allegations taken as a whole whether

they will constitute an offence and, if so, is it an abuse of the process of court leading to injustice.

27.10. It is neither necessary nor is the court called upon to hold a full-fledged enquiry or to appreciate evidence collected by the investigating agencies to find out whether it is a case of acquittal or conviction.

27.11. Where allegations give rise to a civil claim and also amount to an offence, merely because a civil claim is maintainable, does not mean that a criminal complaint cannot be maintained.

27.12. In exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 228 and/or under Section 482, the Court cannot take into consideration external materials given by an accused for reaching the conclusion that no offence was disclosed or that there was possibility of his acquittal. The Court has to consider the record and documents annexed with by the prosecution.

27.13. Quashing of a charge is an exception to the rule of continuous prosecution. Where the offence is even broadly satisfied, the Court should be more inclined to permit continuation of prosecution rather than its quashing at that initial stage. The Court is not expected to marshal the records with a view to decide admissibility and reliability of the documents or records but is an opinion formed *prima facie*.

27.14. Where the charge-sheet, report under Section 173(2) of the Code, suffers from fundamental legal defects, the Court may be well within its jurisdiction to frame a charge.

27.15. Coupled with any or all of the above, where the Court finds that it would amount to abuse of process of the Code or that interest of justice favours, otherwise it may quash the charge. The power is to be exercised *ex debito justitiae*, i.e. to do real and substantial justice for administration of which alone, the courts exist.

27.16. These are the principles which individually and preferably cumulatively (one or more) be taken into consideration as precepts to exercise of extraordinary and wide plenitude and jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Code by the High Court. Where the factual foundation for an offence has been laid down, the courts should be reluctant and should not hasten to quash the proceedings even on the premise that one or two ingredients have not been

stated or do not appear to be satisfied if there is substantial compliance to the requirements of the offence.”

13. In the case of **Asim Shariff v. National Investigation Agency : (2019) 7 SCC 148**, it was reiterated by the Apex Court that the trial court is not supposed to divulge the evidence on the record to determine whether the accused would get acquitted or convicted if a particular charge is framed against an accused. The relevant portion of the observation of the court in the case is as under:

“**18.** Taking note of the exposition of law on the subject laid down by this Court, it is settled that the Judge while considering the question of framing charge under Section 227 CrPC in sessions cases (which is akin to Section 239 CrPC pertaining to warrant cases) has the undoubted power to sift and weigh the evidence for the limited purpose of finding out whether or not a prima facie case against the accused has been made out; where the material placed before the court discloses grave suspicion against the accused which has not been properly explained, the court will be fully justified in framing the charge; by and large if two views are possible and one of them giving rise to suspicion only, as distinguished from grave suspicion against the accused, the trial Judge will be justified in discharging him. It is thus clear that while examining the discharge application filed under Section 227 CrPC, it is expected from the trial Judge to exercise its judicial mind to determine as to whether a case for trial has been made out or not. It is true that in such proceedings, the court is not supposed to hold a mini trial by marshalling the evidence on record.”

14. Further, in the case of **Vikram Johar v. State of Uttar Pradesh : 2019 SCC OnLine SC 609** the Apex Court has reiterated that during the stage of charge, the court must not conduct a mini-trial and the decision should be based on the prima facie appreciation of the materials placed on record. The relevant portion of the said judgment is as under:

“**19.** It is, thus, clear that while considering the discharge application, the Court is to exercise its judicial mind to determine whether a case for trial has been made out or not. It is true that in such proceedings, the Court is not to hold the mini trial by marshalling the evidence.”

15. The Apex Court in **Bhawna Bai Vs. Ghanshyam : (2020) 2 SCC 217**, has observed as under:—

“13. ...At the time of framing the charges, only prima facie case is to be seen; whether case is beyond reasonable doubt, is not to be seen at this stage. At the stage of framing the charge, the court has to see if there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused. While evaluating the materials, strict standard of proof is not required; only prima facie case against the accused is to be seen.”

16. In **M.E. Shivalingamurthy Vs. CBI : (2020) 2 SCC 768**, the Hon'ble Apex Court, while discussing the principles to be followed while dealing with an application seeking discharge, observed as under:

“i. If two views are possible and one of them gives rise to suspicion only as distinguished from grave suspicion, the Trial Judge would be empowered to discharge the accused.

ii. The Trial Judge is not a mere Post Office to frame the charge at the instance of the prosecution.

iii. The Judge has merely to sift the evidence in order to find out whether or not there is sufficient ground for proceeding. Evidence would consist of the statements recorded by the Police or the documents produced before the Court.

iv. If the evidence, which the Prosecutor proposes to adduce to prove the guilt of the accused, even if fully accepted before it is challenged in cross-examination or rebutted by the defence evidence, if any, “cannot show that the accused committed offence, then, there will be no sufficient ground for proceeding with the trial.

v. It is open to the accused to explain away the materials giving rise to the grave suspicion.

vi. The court has to consider the broad probabilities, the total effect of the evidence and the documents produced before the court, any basic infirmities appearing in the case and so on. This, however, would not entitle the court to make a roving inquiry into the pros and cons.

vii. At the time of framing of the charges, the probative value of the material on record cannot be gone into, and the material brought on record by the prosecution, has to be accepted as true.

viii. There must exist some materials for entertaining the strong suspicion which can form the basis for drawing up a charge and refusing to discharge the accused...”

17. The Apex Court in **State of Rajasthan Vs. Ashok Kumar Kashyap : 2021 SCC OnLine SC 314**, held that the at the stage of framing of the charge and/or considering the discharge application, a mini trial is not permissible. The Court observed that the position of law that emerges is that at the stage of discharge/framing of charge, the Judge is merely required to take note of the material on record in order to find out whether or not there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.

18. In the case of **State of Rajasthan Vs. Ashok Kumar Kashyap : 2021 SCC OnLine SC 314**, the Apex Court held that the evaluation of evidence on merits is not permissible at the stage of considering the application for discharge. At the stage of framing of the charge and/or considering the discharge application, a mini trial is not permissible. It has been held as under:

“23. In the case of P. Vijayan (supra), this Court had an occasion to consider Section 227 of the Cr.P.C. What is required to be considered at the time of framing of the charge and/or considering the discharge application has been considered elaborately in the said decision. It is observed and held that at the stage of Section 227, the Judge has merely to sift the evidence in order to find out whether or not there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused. It is observed that in other words, the sufficiency of grounds would take within its fold the nature of the evidence recorded by the police or the documents produced before the Court which ex facie disclose that there are suspicious circumstances against the accused so as to frame a charge against him. It is further observed that if the Judge comes to a conclusion that there is sufficient ground to proceed, he will frame a charge under Section 228 Cr.P.C., if not, he will discharge the accused. It is further observed that while exercising its judicial mind to the facts of the case in order to determine whether a case for trial has been made out by the prosecution, it is not necessary for the court to enter into the pros and cons of the matter or into a weighing and balancing of evidence and probabilities which is really the function of the court, after the trial starts.”

19. Further the Apex Court in the case of **State of Orissa Vs. Pratima Mohanty : 2021 SCC OnLine SC 1222** has comprehensively dealt with the powers exercisable and extent of the jurisdiction of the High Court while deciding a petition under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. It has been held as under:

“16. It is trite that the power of quashing should be exercised sparingly and with circumspection and in rare cases. As per settled proposition of law while examining an FIR/complaint quashing of which is sought, the court cannot embark upon any enquiry as to the reliability or genuineness of allegations made in the FIR/complaint. Quashing of a complaint/FIR should be an exception rather than any ordinary rule. Normally the criminal proceedings should not be quashed in exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. when after a thorough investigation the charge-sheet has been filed. At the stage of discharge and/or considering the application under Section 482 Cr.P.C. the courts are not required to go into the merits of the allegations and/or evidence in detail as if conducting the mini-trial. As held by this Court the powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is very wide, but conferment of wide power requires the court to be more cautious. It casts an onerous and more diligent duty on the Court.”

20. In the case of **State Through Deputy Superintendent of Police Vs. R. Soundirarasu : 2022 SCC OnLine SC 1150** the Apex Court has held as under:

“75. The ambit and scope of exercise of power under Sections 239 and 240 of the CrPC, are therefore fairly well settled. The obligation to discharge the accused under Section 239 arises when the Magistrate considers the charge against the accused to be “groundless”. The Section mandates that the Magistrate shall discharge the accused recording reasons, if after (i) considering the police report and the documents sent with it under Section 173, (ii) examining the accused, if necessary, and (iii) giving the prosecution and the accused an opportunity of being heard, he considers the charge against the accused to be groundless, i.e., either there is no legal evidence or that the facts are such that no offence is made out at all. No detailed evaluation of the materials or meticulous consideration of the possible defences need be undertaken at this stage nor any exercise of weighing materials in golden scales is to

be undertaken at this stage - the only consideration at the stage of Section 239/240 is as to whether the allegation/charge is groundless.

76. This would not be the stage for weighing the pros and cons of all the implications of the materials, nor for sifting the materials placed by the prosecution the exercise at this stage is to be confined to considering the police report and the documents to decide whether the allegations against the accused can be said to be “groundless”.

77. The word “ground” according to the Black's Law Dictionary connotes foundation or basis, and in the context of prosecution in a criminal case, it would be held to mean the basis for charging the accused or foundation for the admissibility of evidence. Seen in the context, the word “groundless” would connote no basis or foundation in evidence. The test which may, therefore, be applied for determining whether the charge should be considered groundless is that where the materials are such that even if unrebutted, would make out no case whatsoever.”

21. In the case of **Manendra Prasad Tiwari Vs. Amit Kumar Tiwari : 2022 SCC OnLine SC 1057**, the Apex Court has explained the well-settled law on exercise of powers under Section 397 and 482 Cr.P.C. as under:

“21. The law is well settled that although it is open to a High Court entertaining a petition under Section 482 of the CrPC or a revision application under Section 397 of the CrPC to quash the charges framed by the trial court, yet the same cannot be done by weighing the correctness or sufficiency of the evidence. In a case praying for quashing of the charge, the principle to be adopted by the High Court should be that if the entire evidence produced by the prosecution is to be believed, would it constitute an offence or not. The truthfulness, the sufficiency and acceptability of the material produced at the time of framing of a charge can be done only at the stage of trial. To put it more succinctly, at the stage of charge the Court is to examine the materials only with a view to be satisfied that prima facie case of commission of offence alleged has been made out against the accused person. It is also well settled that when the petition is filed by the accused under Section 482 CrPC or a revision Petition under Section 397 read with Section 401 of the CrPC seeking for the quashing of charge framed against him,

the Court should not interfere with the order unless there are strong reasons to hold that in the interest of justice and to avoid abuse of the process of the Court a charge framed against the accused needs to be quashed. Such an order can be passed only in exceptional cases and on rare occasions. It is to be kept in mind that once the trial court has framed a charge against an accused the trial must proceed without unnecessary interference by a superior court and the entire evidence from the prosecution side should be placed on record. Any attempt by an accused for quashing of a charge before the entire prosecution evidence has come on record should not be entertained sans exceptional cases.

22. The scope of interference and exercise of jurisdiction under Section 397 of CrPC has been time and again explained by this Court. Further, the scope of interference under Section 397 CrPC at a stage, when charge had been framed, is also well settled. At the stage of framing of a charge, the court is concerned not with the proof of the allegation rather it has to focus on the material and form an opinion whether there is strong suspicion that the accused has committed an offence, which if put to trial, could prove his guilt. The framing of charge is not a stage, at which stage the final test of guilt is to be applied. Thus, to hold that at the stage of framing the charge, the court should form an opinion that the accused is certainly guilty of committing an offence, is to hold something which is neither permissible nor is in consonance with the scheme of Code of Criminal Procedure.

23. Section 397 CrPC vests the court with the power to call for and examine the records of an inferior court for the purposes of satisfying itself as to the legality and regularity of any proceedings or order made in a case. The object of this provision is to set right a patent defect or an error of jurisdiction or law or the perversity which has crept in the proceeding.”

22. In the case of **Kanchan Kumar Vs. State of Bihar : (2022) 9 SCC 577** the Apex Court while considering the judgement in the case of *Dipakbhai Jagdishchandra Patel Vs. State of Gujarat* summarised the principles on discharge under Section 227 Cr.P.C. and held as follows:

“**15.** Summarising the principles on discharge under Section 227 CrPC, in *Dipakbhai Jagdishchandra Patel v. State of Gujarat* [*Dipakbhai Jagdishchandra Patel v. State of Gujarat*, (2019) 16

SCC 547 : (2020) 2 SCC (Cri) 361] , this Court recapitulated :
(SCC p. 561, para 23)

“23. At the stage of framing the charge in accordance with the principles which have been laid down by this Court, what the court is expected to do is, it does not act as a mere post office. The court must indeed sift the material before it. The material to be sifted would be the material which is produced and relied upon by the prosecution. The sifting is not to be meticulous in the sense that the court dons the mantle of the trial Judge hearing arguments after the entire evidence has been adduced after a full-fledged trial and the question is not whether the prosecution has made out the case for the conviction of the accused. All that is required is, the court must be satisfied that with the materials available, a case is made out for the accused to stand trial. A strong suspicion suffices. However, a strong suspicion must be founded on some material. The material must be such as can be translated into evidence at the stage of trial. The strong suspicion cannot be the pure subjective satisfaction based on the moral notions of the Judge that here is a case where it is possible that the accused has committed the offence. Strong suspicion must be the suspicion which is premised on some material which commends itself to the court as sufficient to entertain the prima facie view that the accused has committed the offence.”

(emphasis supplied)”

23. Thus, the position of law that emerges is that at the stage of discharge/framing of charge, the Court is merely required to sift the evidence in order to find out whether or not there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused i.e. whether a prima facie case is made out against the accused.

24. Looking to the facts of the case, the prima facie allegation against the applicant and the law as stated above, no case for interference is made out. The present application under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is thus dismissed.

(Samit Gopal,J.)

Order Date :- 23.7.2024

Naresh