

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

1. CRR-1795-2015
Date of Decision: February 9, 2016

Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu
.....Petitioner
Versus

State of Haryana
.....Respondent

2. CRR-1946-2015

Sakshi
.....Petitioner
Versus

State of Haryana
.....Respondent

3. CRR-4501-2015

Naresh Kumar
.....Petitioner
Versus

State of Haryana and others
.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NARESH KUMAR SANGHI

- 1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ? Yes*
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ? Yes*
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? Yes*

Argued by: Mr.Sanjay Vashisth, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRR-1795-2015 and
for respondent No.2 in CRR-4501-2015.

Mr.Sumit Sangwan, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRR-1946-2015
and for respondent No.3 in CRR-4501-2015.

Mr.Balraj Gujjar, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRR-4501-2015 and for the
informant/complainant in CRR-1795 and 1946-2015.

Mr.Kuldeep Tiwari, Addl.A.G.Haryana.

.....

NARESH KUMAR SANGHI, J.(ORAL)

With the consent of the learned counsel for the parties to this *lis*, all the above-captioned petitions, i.e. CRR-1795-2015 (Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu vs State of Haryana); CRR-1946-2015 (Sakshi vs State of Haryana) and CRR-4501-2015 (Naresh Kumar vs State of Haryana and others), are decided by the present common order, as all the three revision petitions have arisen out of the same impugned order.

Criminal Revision Nos.1795 and 1946 of 2015 have been filed by petitioners-accused Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu and Sakshi, respectively, challenging the order framing charges against them for the offences punishable under Sections 302 and 306, IPC. Criminal Revision No.4501 of 2015 has been filed by petitioner-informant-complainant Naresh Kumar challenging the same impugned order, dated 29.04.2015, passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bhiwani, whereby the charge for the

offences punishable under Sections 66, 66-A and 67 of the Information and Technology Act, 2000 (for brevity, 'the I.T. Act'), were not framed for prosecution of petitioners-accused Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu and Sakshi.

Mr.SanjayVashisth, and Mr.Sunil Sangwan, Advocates, representing petitioners-accused Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu and Sakshi, respectively, submitted as under:

1. that even if the entire material available on record is taken at its face value then also the gravamen of Sections 302 and 306, IPC, are not attracted qua the petitioners;
2. while passing the order framing charges, the learned trial Court failed to discuss material available on record to find out prima facie case against the petitioners-accused;
3. alternative charges under Sections 302 and 306, IPC, cannot be framed in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case in hand;
4. the disclosure statements in the shape of confession before the police, alleged to have been suffered by the petitioners-accused are

inadmissible and, as such, the same have to be excluded while finding out a prima facie case for framing charges against the petitioners-accused;

5. and that the learned trial Court in the last para of the impugned order abruptly ordered for framing of charge under Sections 302 and 306, IPC, which is palpably wrong.

Mr. Balraj Gujjar, Advocate, learned counsel for the petitioner-informant-complainant, Naresh Kumar, submitted that learned Court below has rightly framed the charges under Sections 302 and 306, IPC, but has gone wrong in not framing the charges against the petitioners-accused Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu and Sakshi under the I.T. Act despite availability of the material connecting them with the said offences as well.

Learned counsel for the State after perusal of the photo copy of the record received from the learned trial Court fairly conceded that there was not an *iota* of evidence to connect the petitioners-accused with the offence punishable under Section 302, IPC. However, he opposed the contentions of the learned counsel representing the petitioners-accused for their

discharge for the offence punishable under Section 306, IPC.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and with their able assistance gone through the petitions filed by each petitioner and the photostat copy of the entire record received from the learned trial Court.

To be more specific in discussion, to answer the respective arguments raised by learned counsel for the parties and proper adjudication of the three petitions in hand, the following issues have been identified:-

- (i) Whether there is a prima facie material to connect either or both the petitioners-accused for the offence punishable under Section 302, IPC;
- (ii) Whether there is prima facie material to connect either or both the petitioners-accused for the offence punishable under Section 306, IPC and
- (iii) Whether the learned trial Court has failed to frame the charges under the I.T. Act despite availability of prima facie material against the petitioners-accused.

Since all the three issues identified hereinabove are inter-connected with each other, therefore, the composite

discussion would enable the Court to arrive at a just conclusion.

Before narrating the facts of the case, it is essential to discuss the law on the subject.

In the matter of **Union of India vs Prafulla Kumar Samal and another** 1979 SCC (Crl.) 609, Hon'ble the Supreme Court held that the Judge is not a mere post – office to frame the charge at the behest of the prosecution, but has to exercise his judicial mind to the facts of the case in order to determine whether a case for trial has been made out by the prosecution. In assessing this fact, 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 his function after the trial starts. At the stage of Section 227, Cr.P.C., 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. The sufficiency of ground 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.

While dealing with the scope of Section 227, Cr.P.C.,

in the matter of **State of Bihar vs Ramesh Singh**, (1978) 1 SCR

257, Hon'ble the Supreme Court held as under:-

“Strong suspicion against the accused, if the matter remains in the region of suspicion, cannot take the place of proof of his guilt at the conclusion of the trial. But at the initial stage if there is a strong suspicion which leads the Court to think that there is ground for presuming that the accused has committed an offence then it is not open to the Court to say that there is no sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused. The presumption of the guilt of the accused which is to be drawn at the initial stage is not in the sense of the law governing the trial of criminal cases in France where the accused is presumed to be guilty unless the contrary is proved. But it is only for the purpose of deciding prima facie whether the Court should proceed with the trial or not. 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 the offence, then there will be no sufficient ground for proceeding with the trial.”

While considering **Alamohan Das vs State of West Bengal**, (1969) 2 SCR 520, and other judgments, Hon'ble the

Supreme Court in the matter of Union of India vs Prafulla Kumar Samal and another (supra) identified the following principles to be considered at the time of framing of the charges:-

“(1) That the Judge while considering the question of framing the charges under Section 227 of the Code 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;

(2) 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.

(3) The test to determine a prima facie case would naturally depend upon the facts of each case and it is difficult to lay down a rule of universal application. By and large however if two views are equally possible and the Judge is satisfied that the evidence produced before him while giving rise to some suspicion but not grave suspicion against the accused, he will be fully within his right to discharge the accused.

(4) That in exercising his jurisdiction under section 227 of the Code the Judge which under the present Code is a senior and experienced Court cannot act merely as a Post office or a mouth-piece 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 appearing in the case and so on. This however does not mean that the Judge should make a roving enquiry into the pros and cons of the matter and weigh the evidence as if he was conducting a trial.”

In the matter of **State rep.by the Inspector of Police, 'Q' Branch C.I.D., Tirunelveli Range, Tamil Nadu vs Mariya Antony Vijay**, 2015 (4) Recent Apex Judgments (R.A.J.) 23, Hon'ble the Supreme Court held that at the stage of the consideration of Section 227, Cr.P.C., going deep into the facts of the case by the High Court was uncalled for.

In the matter of **S.S.Chheena vs Vijay Kumar Mahajan and another**, 2010(4) Recent Apex Judgments (R.A.J.) 629, while quashing the charge under Section 306, IPC, held as under:-

- “1. Conviction merely on basis of allegation of harassment of deceased is unsustainable in law;*
- 2. Without a positive act on the part of the accused to instigate or aid in committing suicide, conviction cannot be sustained; and*
- 3. The act of accused must have been intended to push the deceased into such a position that he committed suicide.”*

In the matter of **Madan Mohan Singh vs State of Gujarat and Anr.**, 2010(5) Recent Apex Judgments (R.A.J.) 151, Hon'ble the Supreme Court held that for framing charge under Section 306, IPC, it should be seen whether accused intended or engineered the suicide by his acts and words.

In the matter of **Deepak Jain and ors vs State of Uttarakhand and another**, 2013(2) NCC 348, Hon'ble Uttarakhand High Court held that for an offence punishable under Section 306, IPC, there has to be clear *mens rea* on the part of the accused. The offence requires an active or direct act, which led the deceased to commit suicide and that act must have been intended to push the deceased into such a position that he would commit suicide.

In the matters of **Prasoon Gupta and others vs State of U.P. and another**, 2011 (7) R.C.R.(Criminal) 790 (Allahabad High Court), **Jatinder Kumar and others vs State (Delhi Administration)**, 1990(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 117 (Delhi High Court), and **Om Parkash and others vs State of Haryana**, 2006 (4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 331, in substance it was held that ordinarily an alternative charge cannot be framed in respect of distinctive offences particularly when the offences are diametrically opposite to each other.

Section 25 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, (for brevity, 'the 1872 Act') mandates that no confession made to a Police Officer shall be proved as against a person accused of any offence.

Section 26 of the 1872 Act prescribes that no confession made by any person whilst he is in custody of a Police Officer unless it be made in the immediate presence of a Magistrate, shall be proved as against such person.

Section 27 of the 1872 Act prescribes that when any fact is deposed to as discovered inconsequences of information received from a person accused of any offence in custody of a Police Officer, so much of such information, whether it amounts to a confession or not, as relates distinctly to the fact thereby discovered, may be proved.

In the matter of **Aher Raja Khima vs State of Saurashtra**, AIR 1956 SC 217, Hon'ble the Supreme Court held that a fact already discovered from other source cannot be discovered afresh even if relevant information is extracted from the accused.

Before applying the above discussed law, it is essential to recapitulate the facts of the case:-

The First Information Report was lodged by the petitioner-informant-complainant, Naresh Kumar, father of Ankit (since deceased) on 13.10.2013 alleging that:-

“On 11.10.2013 at about 6.00 p.m., his son, Ankit, had gone out of the shop by saying that friends of Ankit were calling him (Ankit) and he would come back after seeing them (*ki papa main ja ke aa raha hoon*). Thereafter at about 7.00 p.m., a telephone call was received from Police Station, City, Dadri, that his son (Ankit) after swallowing poisonous substance was lying in C.C.I. factory and thereafter the police had carried him (Ankit) to Government Hospital. Complainant also reached there. He had doubt that unknown persons or at their behest someone else had administered the poison, therefore, it was requested that on the basis of mobile which was already in possession of police and on other basis, strict action be initiated against the accused. After receiving the call from police, complainant had arrived at Civil Hospital, Dadri. Thereafter, the Doctor of the Government Hospital advised to take Ankit to P.G.I.M.E.R., Rohtak, but due

to his precarious condition they (informant) took him to Dr.G.B.Gupta at Bhiwani. Seeing no improvement in his condition till morning of 12.10.2013, Ankit was shifted to Sri Balaji Hospital, Peeragari, Delhi, from where on the morning of 13.10.2013 informant received the information from their known person regarding death of Ankit. Therefore, police was once again requested to initiate strict action against the culprits.”

On the basis of the above, FIR No.393, dated 13.10.2013, for the offence punishable under Section 306, IPC, was registered at Police Station, City, Dadri.

Initially the matter was investigated by SI Neki Ram, who inspected the place of occurrence; recorded the statements under Section 161, Cr.P.C., of Kuldeep and Harkishan, who were posted as Guards in the C.C.I. factory at City, Dadri; took into police possession Scooty No.HR-19H 2917, a mobile phone and two empty pouches (*pudia*) containing sulphose from the place of occurrence. Inquest report under Section 174, Cr.P.C., was prepared by ASI Ramesh Chander of Police Station, Paschim Vihar, Delhi. Further investigation was carried out by Sub Inspector/ Station House Officer, Sukhbir Singh and thereafter

once again the investigation was entrusted to SI Neki Ram. Under the orders of Senior Police Officers, the investigation was entrusted to the Inspector, Crime Branch, Charkhi Dadri. During the investigation Mohit Kumar, son of Naresh Kumar (brother of Ankit, since deceased) presented an application on the basis of which Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu (petitioner-accused) was joined in the investigation and arrested on 26.11.2014. Pursuant to his (Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu) disclosure statement, Sections 120-B and 506, IPC, as well as Sections 66, 66-A and 67 of the I.T. Act were added. Petitioner-accused Sakshi was joined in the investigation on 14.12.2014 and a mobile phone was recovered from her. The report under Section 173, Cr.P.C., for prosecution of Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu and Sakshi was presented before learned Area Judicial Magistrate. (Facts narrated above were gathered from the First Information Report and the report filed under Section 173, Cr.P.C.). The case was committed to the Court of Session and the same was entrusted to the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bhiwani, for trial.

Vide order dated 29.04.2015, charge for the offences punishable under Sections 302 and 306, IPC, was framed which has been impugned in all the three petitions captioned above.

While dealing with the criminal revision petitions, this

Court is conscious of its limitation in elaborate discussion of the facts but keeping in view the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case and the manner in which the charges have been framed, this Court is bound to take into consideration the material available on record to find out the prima facie material to connect the accused with the offences under Sections 302 and 306, IPC.

Perusal of the documents received from learned trial Court would further reveal that during investigation, hard copies of the conversation between Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu and Ankit (since deceased) were collected. The said documents have also been perused. Perusal of the statement of Hari Kishan, recorded under Section 161, Cr.P.C., would reveal that on 11.10.2013 he along with Kuldeep was posted as Guard at C.C.I. Factory, Dadri. In the evening, a young boy was sitting on a scooty. After sometime, he alighted from the said scooty, laid down on the earth and started moving his hands and legs. Hari Kishan and Kuldeep failed in their attempt to know the credentials of that young boy. He started emitting foam and smell of sulphose from his mouth. The police was telephonically informed. After leaving the scooty at spot, the young boy was carried to Civil Hospital after making arrangement of a vehicle. From the police he (Hari Kishan) came to know that the said young boy had died. On the

pointing out of Kuldeep, rough site plan was prepared. Two empty pouches containing sulphose, a mobile phone and a scooty were recovered and taken into police possession.

On 26.11.2014, during investigation, the petitioner-accused, Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu, suffered the disclosure statement before the police that about 13-14 months ago, in the month of October 2013, Ankit (since deceased) son of Naresh Kumar, resident of Ashram Road, Charki Dadri, was sending obscene messages to his friend Sakshi, daughter of Ramesh Kumar, resident of Ashram Road, Charkhi Dadri. Sakshi disclosed the said fact to him (Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu) and further told him to forbid Ankit not to send such messages to her. At the asking of Sakshi, he prepared fake Face Book I.D. in the name of 'Sahil Aggarwal'. The passwords were 'Sonucol' and 'Sandeepji'. From the said Face Book I.D., the messages were sent on the Face Book address ankitgoyal99@gmail.com to the effect that he should not send messages to Sakshi. However, Ankit did not refrain himself, then obscene messages were sent to Ankit and it was also informed that the nude photo of his (Ankit) sister, Komal, would be uploaded on the 'YouTube'. He was also threatened to be seen in future and challenged to come to C.C.I. Factory, Dadri, so that he could get rid of his (Sandeep

@ Monu @ Sonu) way. Sakshi and he had planned to create Face Book I.D. for sending multiple obscene messages. After few days Sakshi told him on telephone that Ankit had committed suicide, then he removed the Face Book I.D. created in the name of 'Sahil Aggarwal'. It is apposite to mention that the said disclosure statement was signed by the police officials as well as by Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu, petitioner.

Similarly, on 14.12.2014, petitioner-accused Sakshi disclosed to the police that 13-14 months ago in the months of September/ October, 2013, Ankit son of Naresh Kumar, resident of Ashram Road, Dadri, was sending obscene messages to her. She narrated the said fact to her friend Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu, son of Shri Anand Prakash, caste Mahajan, resident of Hira Chowk, Charkhi Dadri, and asked him to inform Ankit not to send such messages to her (Sakshi). Sonu sent the message to Ankit but he did not mend his way. Thereupon she told Sandeep to create fake Face Book I.D. to harass Ankit and further to threaten him that the obscene photos of his sister would be uploaded on the 'YouTube'. Thereupon Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu created a fake Face Book I.D. in the name of 'Sahil Aggarwal' and sent multiple messages to Ankit and also threatened him to upload on 'YouTube', the nude photos of his (Ankit) sister, Komal. The code

of fake Face Book I.D. was 'Sonucool' and 'Sandeepji' as it was disclosed to her by Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu. Several messages, full of challenge, were sent to Ankit and he was further challenged to come to factory. Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu had created a fake Face Book I.D. at her asking. She came to know that Ankit had committed suicide, then the said information was passed on to Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu and told him to shut down the Face Book I.D.. Ankit used to send messages from his Face Book I.D., i.e. 'ankitgoyal99@gmail.com' to her I.D., i.e. 'sakshigupta271@rediffmail.com'. The phone on which she received the Face Book messages has been handed over to police. The said disclosure statement was signed by Sakshi in addition to the police officials.

The report received from Forensic Science Laboratory, Haryana, Madhuban, Karnal, would reveal that aluminum phosphate was detected in the viscera of Ankit Goyal (since deceased).

Perusal of the medico legal report and other treatment papers collected by the police during course of investigation would show that there was no injury on the person of Ankit (since deceased). Hard copies of multiple messages sent by Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu through his fake Face Book I.D. to Ankit have also

been perused.

In sub and substance whatever has been discussed above is the only material on the basis of which the charges have been framed.

Learned trial Court while passing the order for framing the charges under Sections 302 and 306, IPC, observed as under:-

“Arguments heard on charge.

The learned counsel for the accused Sandeep has argued that no offence is made out against him as perusal of the complaint shows that the father of the deceased has stated that his son Ankit had gone to his friends and someone has given him some poisonous substance due to which he died and it is a case of murder and not of suicide. The prosecution case is based on fact that Ankit went somewhere and there he was given some poison due to which he died. He also argued that the occurrence is of 11.10.2013 and the complaint is dated 13.10.2013. There is a delay of two days in filing the FIR and the delay is not explained. He also argued that the complainant has stated that investigation be conducted through the call details of the phone of Ankit and the police had recorded the statement of brother of the deceased and only then they have arrested the accused in this case.

*The learned counsel for the accused while placing reliance on case **Chitresh Kumar Chopra versus State (Govt. of NCT of Delhi) 2009 (4) RCR (Criminal) page 196 and L.Krishna Reddy versus State by Station House Officer and others (2015) 1 SCC (Crl) page 376** prayed that when the involvement of the accused seems to be false and is not justified he should be discharged and the prosecution must prove the circumstances which compelled the deceased to take the extreme step of bringing an end to his life. He prayed that accused be discharged.*

The learned counsel for accused Sakshi has argued that she has been falsely implicated as it was Ankit who was harassing her and she never made any threat to Ankit nor she was given any poisonous substance to him and prayed for discharge of the accused.

After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and after going through the case file carefully it is observed that a case was registered on a complaint made by ShriNaresh, father of Ankit (since deceased). It was stated in the complaint that Ankit left the shop on 11.10.2013 at about 6.00 p.m. telling his father (complainant) that his friends were calling him and he is going to them. At about 7.00 p.m. he received a telephone from Police Station CharkhiDadri that his son has consumed some poisonous substance and was lying in CCI factory.

The police took him to the General Hospital. The complainant also reached there. He stated that he has apprehension that some of his friends has given him some poisonous substance and investigation be conducted on the basis of mobile calls from the mobile of his son Ankit.

It is observed that Ankit died due to consumption of poisonous substance and as per the Forensic Science Laboratory report, aluminum phosphide was detected in the stomach of Ankit, parts of small and large intestines, portion of liver, spleen and kidneys, blood approximately 100 ml and as per the post mortem report, there was no injury to any muscle and the cartilages and there was no external injury when he was brought to the hospital. As per the MLR, his pulse was unmeasurable and general condition was also very poor. He was taken from the General Hospital Charkhi Dadri to Shri Balajit Action Medical Institute and was declared dead on 12.10.2013.

The accused Sandeep had made a disclosure statement that he was approached by co-accused Sakshi who told him that Ankit was sending her indecent messages and he should ask him to stop doing so. On the asking of co-accused Sakshi, he created a fake Face Book ID and sent messages to Sahil to stop sending messages to Sakshi but when he did not stop doing so then he started sending indecent messages to Ankti and also threatened that

he would upload nude photographs of his sister on the You-Tube and also asked him to come to CCI Factor so that hews may see him. The conversation which took place between Ankit and Sandeep have been placed on record. It is also the document? (argument) of the counsel for accused Sandeep that he cannot be connected with the Face Book ID as it was not his ID but this fact is to be proved by the prosecution and the accused Sandeep has himself made a disclosure statement that he created a fake Face Book ID and also closed the same on the death of Ankit which clearly shows that Sandeep was threatening or humiliating Ankit by sending him indecent messages with regard to his sister and as per the disclosure statement of Sakshi it was she who had suggested Sandeep to create a fake Face Book ID and send messages to Ankit. The call/message details placed on file by the prosecution show that Ankit was to meet Sandeep on 11.10.2013 at CCI Factory and it is this place where Ankit was found unconscious after sometime he left the shop after telling his father that he was going to see his friends. The prosecution investigation had to start from the mobile call details of the deceased and the accused were not arrested immediately. It was after thorough investigation the disclosure statement of Sandeep was recorded on 26.11.2014 and that of Sakshi was recorded on 14.12.2014.

In view of the evidence on the file and in view of the above-said observations, prima facie case punishable under Section 306, 302 of Indian Penal Code is made out against both the accused and they have been charge-sheeted accordingly to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed trial. The case is adjourned to 18.05.2015 for evidence of prosecution. All PWs be summoned for the date fixed.”

After perusing the whole material including the impugned order, discussed hereinabove, this Court finds that there is not an *iota* of word to connect either of the accused-petitioners with the offence punishable under Section 302, IPC. Therefore, this Court finds that in the last para of the impugned order the learned trial Court, in a very cursory manner ordered for framing of the charge under Section 302, IPC, therefore, the first issue identified by this Court is answered in favour of petitioners-accused Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu and Sakshi.

Perusal of the material available on record would further reveal that prima facie case for proceeding against the petitioners-accused, i.e. Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu and Sakshi for the offence punishable under Section 306, IPC, is made out. Learned trial Court may proceed with trial for the offence punishable under Section 306, IPC, against both the accused.

The second issue identified by this Court is decided against Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu and Sakshi.

Since not an iota of word has been discussed by learned trial Court with regard to the offences under the I.T.Act, therefore, it is directed that before proceeding further the Court below shall consider on the basis of the material available on record as to whether either or both the petitioners are liable to be proceeded against for the offence(s) punishable under the I.T.Act. In view of the discussion hereinabove, third issue indentified by this Court is answered accordingly.

As a sequel to the above discussion, all the three revision petitions, captioned above, are partly allowed. Petitioners Sandeep @ Monu @ Sonu and Sakshi are hereby discharged for the offence punishable under Section 302, IPC. Learned trial Court shall proceed with further trial for the offence punishable under Section 306, IPC, after consideration as to whether the charge under the I.T.Act, if any, made out against either or both of the accused?

February 9, 2016
meenu

(NARESH KUMAR SANGHI)
JUDGE