

\$~3

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

Judgment dated: 10th August, 2016.

+ W.P.(C) 2923/2016 & CM No. 12241/2016
UNION OF INDIA & ORS Petitioners
Through : Mr. Amit Anand, Advocate.

versus

JAGBIR SINGH Respondent
Through : None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SISTANI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE I.S.MEHTA

G.S.SISTANI, J (ORAL)

1. Challenge in this writ petition is to the orders passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal (*hereinafter the 'Tribunal'*) dated 02.04.2013 in OA No. 1214/2011; and the order dated 17.08.2015 in RA No. 22/2014 filed by the petitioners herein was dismissed.

2. The facts of this case very briefly stated are that the respondent, at the relevant time, was working as an 'Extra Department Branch Postmaster' in Auchandi Extra Departmental Branch Post Office, Delhi. On 17.02.1994, respondent was put off duty, as per the erstwhile EDAs (Conduct and Service) Rules, 1964 on the ground that a disciplinary and criminal proceedings were pending against the respondent and that he would not be entitled to any allowance for the period for which he was to remain under put off duty. Meanwhile, the preliminary enquiry was conducted and completed in 1994 itself.

3. Later in 1998, the EDAs (Conduct and Service) Rules were amended to allow Time Related Continuity Allowance to an employee put on off duty,

which led to the filing of an OA No. 2390/2003 before the Tribunal. The same was disposed of on 19.05.2004 with a direction to the petitioners herein to grant *ex gratia* compensation.

4. During the pendency of the said OA, after a delay of about 9 years from the conclusion of the preliminary enquiry on 30.07.2003, a charge-sheet was issued against the respondent under Rule 10 of the Gramin Dak Sevaks (Conduct and Employment) Rules, 2001. The translated english version of the charges framed against the respondent read as under:

“Article – I

It is alleged that Shri Jagbir Singh while working as Extra Departmental (Now G.D.S.) Branch Postmaster Auchandi B.O. from 8-2-1993 to 4-11-1993 received the total amount of Rs.2000/- on the dates stated in Annexure-II from the depositors of R.D. Accounts Nos. 318270 and 318280 and made their entries in the respective Pass Books, but he neither made their entries of the said amounts in the B.O's Journal, B.O's Daily Account nor he has taken the said amounts in the Government Accounts. It is, therefore, alleged that the said Shri Jagbir Singh has violated the provisions of Rule 5 of Francia Hand Book Vol.1, Rule 31(2) (iv) of Post Office Savings Bank Manual Vol.I and Rule 134 of Branch Office Rules (7th Edition). By his above acts, it is alleged that while working as Branch Postmaster Auchandi B.O. failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty and thereby violated the provisions of Rules 17 of the Additional Departmental Service and Conduct Rules, 1964 read with Rule 21 of the Rural Post Service (Conduct and Employment) Rules, 2001.

Article – II

It is alleged that Shri Jagbir Singh while working as Extra Departmental (Now G.D.S.) Branch Postmaster Auchandi B.O. on 1-6-93 and 23-10-93 he received a sum of Rs.1000/- from the depositor of accounts No. 895051 on 1-6-1993 and also received a sum of Rs.500/- from the depositor of account No. 894185 on 23-10-93 and made the entries of the said amounts in their respective Pass Books, the amounts of the said deposits has neither been shown in the Saving Bank Journal of the B.O.

on 1-6-93 and 23-10-93 nor has been shown in the S.B. Daily Account of the Branch Office. The said amounts have also not been taken in the Govt. Accounts. Thus, it is alleged that the said Shri Jagbir Singh while working as Branch Postmaster Auchandi on 1-6-93 and 23-10-93 violated the provisions of Rule 5 of Financial Hand Book Vol.I, Rule 31(2) (iv) of Post Office Savings Bank Manual Vol.I and also failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty thereby, violated the provisions of Rule 17 of the Additional Departmental Service & Conduct Rules, 1964 read with Rule 21 of the Rural Post Service (Conduct & Employment) Rules, 2001.”

5. The respondent denied both the allegations and consequently, an enquiry was held against him. Though the Tribunal has held the enquiry to be plagued with numerous illegalities, we deem it appropriate to notice the same at a later stage. During the pendency of the enquiry proceedings, the respondent had applied for copies of additional 15 documents vide his application dated 20.01.2004. The Enquiry Officer, finding them to be relevant, directed the petitioner no. 3/ Sn. Supdt. Of Post Offices, Delhi (North Division), being the disciplinary authority, to provide the same. The petitioner no. 3 failed to provide the said documents and sent a letter dated 23.02.2004 denying the request. The Enquiry Officer submitted its report on 21.08.2007 holding that the charges against the respondent were proved. The same were communicated to the respondent on 23.08.2007 along with a direction to make a representation, if he wished to. Accordingly, the respondent had made a representation.

6. The Disciplinary Authority, vide an Order dated 19.03.2008, rejected the representation of the respondent and imposed a major penalty of removal from service. Aggrieved, the respondent approached the Appellate Authority and, *inter alia*, pleaded the non-production of the documents sought for and the delay occasioned in the enquiry. The Appellate Authority rejected the

submissions of the respondent and on 26.03.2010 passed an order upholding the penalty of the respondent. The relevant portion of the order reads as under:

“In his appeal, the appellant has submitted that authenticated documents were not produced during enquiry. The argument is not justified. The very purpose of holding Departmental inquiry is to afford reasonable opportunity to the delinquent official in order to defend his case. If the argument of the appellant is true, he could have submitted this fact to the Inquiring Authority at the time of inspection of documents and sought redressed.

Pointing out this issue at the appeal stage therefore, does not merit any consideration.

The appellant has further stated that there is delay in conducting the inquiry. I do not agree with the submission of appellant in as much as there is no delay in conducting the enquiry in this case.”

(Emphasis Supplied)

7. Since the appeal of the respondent was dismissed, the respondent approached the Tribunal by means of filing of the OA No. 1214/2011. The Tribunal observing numerous lapses in the enquiry, allowed the OA and directed the petitioners/ respondent therein to regularize the period of put off duty as spent on duty for all purposes excluding payment of arrears of Time Related Continuity Allowance. Further, the Tribunal quashed the penalty order dated 29.03.2008 and the order of the Appellate Authority dated 26.03.2010. It finally ordered the reinstatement of the respondent in service from the date he was put off duty with continuity in service. The Tribunal found numerous infirmities in the conduct of the disciplinary proceedings. We deem it appropriate to list the same below:

- (i) The respondent was put off duty for non-existent reasons. There were no pending criminal or disciplinary proceedings pending against

the respondent on the date he was put off contrary to the provisions of the erstwhile EDAs (Conduct and Service) Rules, 1964.

(ii) The real reason of putting the respondent off duty was alleged embezzlement of Rs. 36,000/- for which no charge was ever framed against him.

(iii) The Disciplinary Authority had clandestinely brought to the notice of the Appellate Authority by a separate note that the respondent had defrauded the department to the tune of Rs. 37,500/-. The same also reflected in the order of the Appellate Authority.

(iv) The respondent was never informed the actual reason for initiating the disciplinary proceedings against him. Proper charges were not framed and the respondent was punished for extraneous reasons.

(v) The Disciplinary Authority prejudged the whole issue and recovered a sum of Rs. 36,000/- from the respondent under pressure and duress. The same showed the bias of the authority.

(vi) There was a delay of about 10 years from putting the respondent off duty and the initiation of enquiry against him. It coupled by the absence of any adequate explanation vitiated the proceedings.

(vii) The non-production of 15 additional documents, even though the same were held to be relevant by the Enquiry Officer. The same denied a proper opportunity to the respondent to establish his innocence.

(viii) The Enquiry Officer proceeded in a lackadaisical manner as it allowed for intervals of more than 20 months between the dates of the enquiry. The same further violated provisions of law as the respondent remained on off duty for a longer period than permitted.

(ix) All documents marked as exhibits were produced by one sole witness, violating the principles of evidentiary law.

8. The petitioners were aggrieved by the failure of the Tribunal to consider their justification of non-supply of additional documents. To this end, the initially approached this Court by filing W.P.(C) 6504/2013. Being a factual matter, the Division Bench was of the view that the Tribunal must rule on this aspect. Therefore, the petition was withdrawn with the liberty to approach the Tribunal by means of filing of an application.

9. Thereafter, the petitioners herein filed Review Application, being R.A. No. 22/2014, before the Tribunal. On review, the Tribunal noted that it had considered this ground in Para 9 and 11 of its order dated 02.04.2013 and consequently, dismissed the review petition vide its order dated 17.08.2015. The dismissal of the review has led to the filing of the present writ petition impugning both the orders of the Tribunal in the OA and the RA.

10. Two basic grounds which have been urged by the learned counsel for the petitioners are firstly, that the delay of 14 years in completing the inquiry have been satisfactorily explained and thus, the Tribunal has erred in allowing the OA on the ground of delay. The second point, which has been strongly urged, is that the petitioners have made it absolutely clear that the additional documents sought to be produced were not in existence and this was brought to the notice of the Inquiry Officer by the letter dated 23.02.2004.

11. The learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that the delay in the Enquiry was occasioned due to non-availability of material witnesses. Further that the delay in initiation of enquiry was owing to the involvement

of various authorities for issuance of the charge sheet and otherwise, no prejudice has been caused to the respondent.

12. In respect of the additional documents, it has been urged by the learned counsel that the though most of the documents sought to be relied upon were non-existent. The statements of the officials/ officers carrying the preliminary enquiry/ investigation were not relevant. Further the report of the Police after investigation is usually confidential in nature and intended to satisfy the competent authority to arrive at a concrete decision. Therefore, the inspection report of the ASPOs/SSPOs were weeded out.

13. We have heard the counsel for the petitioners and perused the record. Though there were numerous infirmities in the enquiry highlighted by the Tribunal, we deem it appropriate to deal with the submissions of the counsel for the petitioners raised before us.

14. In respect of the first ground, there is no dispute in respect of the fact that the alleged offence was committed by the respondent in 1993 and the preliminary enquiry was concluded in 1994. While the charge sheet was issued in 2003 after a period of about 9 years. Even thereafter, the enquiry continued for about 4 years and the process finally culminated with the penalty order dated 19.03.2008, i.e. the proceedings took about 15 years to complete in total. We also notice that during substantial period of which the respondent was not getting any allowance as he was put off duty until *ex gratia* compensation was allowed by the Tribunal by its Order dated 19.05.2004.

15. The law in respect of delay in initiation of disciplinary proceedings is well settled. We may note the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***State of M.P. v. Bani Singh and Anr.***, AIR 1990 SC 1308, the relevant portion of which reads as:

“4. The appeal against the order dated 16.12.1987 has been filed on the ground that the Tribunal should not have quashed the proceedings merely on the ground of delay and laches and should have allowed the enquiry to go on to decide the matter on merits. We are unable to agree with this contention of the learned counsel. The irregularities which were the subject matter of the enquiry is said to have taken place between the years 1975-1977. It is not the case of the department that they were not aware of the said irregularities, if any, and came to know it only in 1987. According to them even in April, 1977 there was doubt about the involvement of the officer in the said irregularities and the investigations were going on since then. If that is so, it is unreasonable to think that they would have taken more than 12 years to initiate the disciplinary proceedings as stated by the Tribunal. There is no satisfactory explanation for the inordinate delay in issuing the charge memo and we are also of the view that it will be unfair to permit the departmental enquiry to be proceeded with at this stage. In any case there are no grounds to interfere with the Tribunal's orders and accordingly we dismiss this appeal.”

(Emphasis Supplied)

16. Further, in ***State of Andhra Pradesh v. N. Radhakishan***, AIR 1998 SC 1833, the Supreme Court observed as under:

“19. It is not possible to lay down any predetermined principles applicable to all cases and in all situations where there is delay in concluding the disciplinary proceedings. Whether on that ground the disciplinary proceedings are to be terminated each case has to be examined on the facts and circumstances in that case. The essence of the matter is that the court has to take into consideration all the relevant factors and to balance and weigh them to determine if it is in the interest of clean and honest administration that the disciplinary proceedings should be allowed to terminate after delay particularly when the delay is abnormal and there is no explanation for the delay. The delinquent employee has a right that disciplinary proceedings against him are concluded expeditiously and he is not made to undergo mental agony and also monetary loss when these are unnecessarily prolonged without any fault on his part in delaying the proceedings. In considering whether the delay has

vitiated the disciplinary proceedings the court has to consider the nature of charge, its complexity and on what account the delay has occurred. If the delay is unexplained prejudice to the delinquent employee is writ large on the face of it. It could also be seen as to how much the disciplinary authority is serious in pursuing the charges against its employee. It is the basic principle of administrative justice that an officer entrusted with a particular job has to perform his duties honestly, efficiently and in accordance with the rules. If he deviates from this path he is to suffer a penalty prescribed. Normally, disciplinary proceedings should be allowed to take their course as per relevant rules but then delay defeats justice. Delay causes prejudice to the charged officer unless it can be shown that he is to blame for the delay or when there is proper explanation for the delay in conducting the disciplinary proceedings. Ultimately, the court is to balance these two diverse considerations.”

(Emphasis Supplied)

17. The Supreme Court summarized the law in respect of delay in disciplinary proceedings in its judgment in **Ministry of Defence v. Prabhash Chandra Mirdha, (2012) 11 SCC 565** as under:

“12. Thus, the law on the issue can be summarised to the effect that the charge-sheet cannot generally be a subject-matter of challenge as it does not adversely affect the rights of the delinquent unless it is established that the same has been issued by an authority not competent to initiate the disciplinary proceedings. Neither the disciplinary proceedings nor the charge-sheet be quashed at an initial stage as it would be a premature stage to deal with the issues. Proceedings are not liable to be quashed on the grounds that proceedings had been initiated at a belated stage or could not be concluded in a reasonable period unless the delay creates prejudice to the delinquent employee. Gravity of alleged misconduct is a relevant factor to be taken into consideration while quashing the proceedings.”

(Emphasis Supplied)

18. Applying the above principles in the present case, we observe that there was an inordinate delay in conducting the disciplinary proceedings.

The petitioners were aware of the irregularities committed by the respondent in 1993 itself and the preliminary enquiry had culminated in 1994. Thereafter, there is a delay of about 9 years in issuance of the charge sheet. There is further delay in finishing the enquiry proceedings and passing the penalty order, which took about 5 years. The whole proceedings have taken about 15 years to complete. The only explanation for the delay of 9 years in initiation of enquiry is that there were numerous authorities involved. The same is nothing but a specious explanation and by no means can be accepted. Even the explanation for the prolongation of the enquiry cannot be accepted. Therefore, there is no reasonable explanation given by the petitioners for the delay occasioned; more so, in respect of the delay of 9 years in issuance of the charge sheet. Therefore, the first ground of the counsel for the petitioner cannot be accepted.

19. Coming to the second ground urged before us, we deem it appropriate to reproduce the letter dated 23.02.2004 of the petitioner no. 3/ Disciplinary Authority. The same reads as:

“As per daily order sheet dtd. 20.1.04 of disciplinary proceedings under Rule-10 of GDS (Conduct and Employment) Rules 2001 an application for supply some additional documents containing Sl. 1 to 15 was forwarded to the disc. Authority is mentioned against each documents mentioned below:-

1. *Statement/Report of Sh. Subhash Chand Gupta ASP:-
The document has no relevancy to the charge sheet hence can not be supplied.*
2. *The Statement/Report of Sh. A.L. Gupta ASP:-
The document has no relevancy to the charge sheet hence can not be supplied.*
3. *Statement/Report of Sh. Vakil Singh Mail Overseer:-
No such document as statement/Report is available hence can not be supplied.*
4. *Statement/Report of Sh. M.R. Nega:-*

- No such statement/report is available hence can not be supplied .*
5. *Statement/Report of Sh. Om Chand Mangal:-
No such statement/Report is available in this office hence can not be supplied.*
 6. *Statement/Report of Sh. Shiv Shankar Gaur:-
No such statement/report of Sh. Shiv Shankar Gaur is available in this office hence can not be supplied.*
 7. *Written orders regarding investigation of the case nominating/appointing the investigation:-
No such orders are available in this office hence can not be supplied.*
 8. *Investigation report of authorized investigation - The word “authorized” issued by the charged official is not understood. There is no relevancy of investigation report to the charge sheet hence can not be supplied.*
 9. *Unauthorized investigation report:- There is no such unauthorized investigation report hence can not be supplied.*
 10. *Attendance register of B.O. Auchaundi for the month of Feb 93 to Nov 93. No such attendance register is maintained in the B.O. hence can not be supplied.*
 11. *Inspection report carried by ASPOs/SSPOs Feb 93 to Dec 93. The IR for the year has since been weeded out in due course of time. As such same could not be supplied*
 12. *Visit report of mail overseer Bawana for the month of Feb 93 to Dec 93:- SSPOs Delhi North Dn is not the custodian of the visit report of mail overseer hence not be supplied.*
 13. *Past work verification report: -
There is no relevancy of this document in the charge sheet issued to the charged official. Hence can not be supplied.*
 14. *Hand writing expert report: -
No such report is available in this officer. As such same can not be supplied.*
 15. *Leave record of BPM Auchandi:-
As per D.G. Post letter No. 26-1/77/97-PC & ED Cell the leave record was to be maintained w.e.f. 17.12.98. The period of charge sheet relates to the year 1993. At that time no leave record of BPM was being maintained. As such same could not be supplied.”*

(Emphasis Supplied)

20. A perusal of the above letter, sought to be relied upon by the petitioners, clearly reveals that the statements of the ASPs, Investigation Report and the Past Work Verification Report were denied to the respondent as the same were deemed to be irrelevant to the proceedings by the petitioner no. 3/ Disciplinary Authority and not due to non-existence, as contended by the counsel for the petitioners. The Disciplinary Authority has observed the documents to be irrelevant, despite the clear observation of the Enquiry Officer in his Order dated 20.01.2004 that the documents “*are found relevant to the case.*” Further the application filed by the respondent also shows that the statements were required for effective cross-examination, while the Investigation Report and Past Work Verification Report were required for juxtaposition with charges and to show that the case against the respondent is fabricated respectively.

21. In this regard, the law is also no longer *res integra*. It is settled law that the charged officer must be provided with a copy of the relevant statements and documents as only then he would be in a position to properly meet the charges leveled against him. If the statements and documents are not supplied, it would lead to inhibition of his ability to effectively cross-examine the witnesses produced before him. In this regard, the following observations of the Supreme Court in ***Kashinath Dikshita v. Union of India (UOI) and Ors., (1986) 3 SCC 229*** are relevant:

“10. ...It is thus clear that the appellant's request for supply of copies of relevant documents and statements of witnesses has been refused in no unclear terms. We do not consider it necessary to burden the records by quoting the extracts from the letters addressed by the appellant and the reply sent to him. The extracts quoted hereinabove leave no room for doubt that the disciplinary authority refused to furnish to the appellant

copies of documents and copies of statements. When a government servant is facing a disciplinary proceeding, he is entitled to be afforded a reasonable opportunity to meet the charges against him in an effective manner. And no one facing a departmental enquiry can effectively meet the charges unless the copies of the relevant statements and documents to be used against him are made available to him. In the absence of such copies, how can the concerned employee prepare his defence, cross-examine the witnesses, and point out the inconsistencies with a view to show that the allegations are incredible? It is difficult to comprehend why the disciplinary authority assumed an intransigent posture and refused to furnish the copies notwithstanding the specific request made by the appellant in this behalf. Perhaps the disciplinary authority made it a prestige issue. If only the disciplinary authority had asked itself the question: "What is the harm in making available the material?" and weighed the pros and cons, the disciplinary authority could not reasonably have adopted such a rigid and adamant attitude. On the one hand there was the risk of the time and effort invested in the departmental enquiry being wasted if the courts came to the conclusion that failure to supply these materials would be tantamount to denial of reasonable opportunity to the appellant to defend himself. On the other hand by making available the copies of the documents and statements the disciplinary authority was not running any risk. There was nothing confidential or privileged in it. It is not even the case of the respondent that there was involved any consideration of security of State or privilege. No doubt the disciplinary authority gave an opportunity to the appellant to inspect the documents and take notes as mentioned earlier. But even in this connection the reasonable request of the appellant to have the relevant portions of the documents extracted with the help of his stenographer was refused. He was told to himself make such notes as he could. This is evident from the following passage extracted from communication dated July 25, 1962 from the disciplinary authority to the appellant:

"The Government has been pleased to allow you to inspect all the documents mentioned in Annexure II to the charge-sheet given to you. While inspecting the documents, you are also allowed to take notes or even prepare copies, if you so like, but you will not be permitted to take a stenographer or any

other person to assist you. In case you want copies of any specific documents, from out of those inspected by you, the request will be considered on merits in each case by the government. In case you want to inspect any document, other than those mentioned in Annexure II, you may make a request accordingly, briefly indicating its relevancy to the charge against you, so that orders of the government could be obtained for the same As pointed out above, if you wish to have copies of any specific documents, from those inspected by you, you should make a request in writing accordingly, mentioning their relevancy to the charge, so that orders of Government could be obtained.

Government, however, maintains that you are not entitled to ask for copies of documents as a condition precedent to your inspection of the same. I am further to add that in case you do not inspect the documents on the date fixed, you will do so at your own risk.”

11. And such a stance was adopted in relation to an inquiry whereat as many as 38 witnesses were examined, and 112 documents running into hundreds of pages were produced to substantiate the charges. In the facts and circumstances of the case we find it impossible to hold that the appellant was afforded reasonable opportunity to meet the charges levelled against him. Whether or not refusal to supply copies of documents or statements has resulted in prejudice to the employee facing the departmental inquiry depends on the facts of each case. We are not prepared to accede to the submission urged on behalf of the respondents that there was no prejudice caused to the appellant, in the facts and circumstances of this case. The appellant in his affidavit [P. 309 of SLP paper-book] has set out in a tabular form running into twelve pages as to how he has been prejudiced in regard to his defence on account of the non-supply of the copies of the documents. We do not consider it necessary to burden the record by reproducing the said statement. The respondents have not been able to satisfy us that no prejudice was occasioned to the appellant.”

(Emphasis Supplied)

22. We may also observe the observations of the Supreme Court in ***Chandrama Tewari v. Union of India*, 1988 SCC (L&S) 226**, wherein the law was summarized as follows:

“9. It is now well settled that if copies of relevant and material documents including the statement of witnesses recorded in the preliminary enquiry or during investigation are not supplied to the delinquent officer facing the enquiry and if such documents are relied in holding the charges framed against the officer, the enquiry would be vitiated for the violation of principles of natural justice. Similarly, if the statement of witnesses recorded during the investigation of a criminal case or in the preliminary enquiry is not supplied to the delinquent officer that would amount to denial of opportunity of effective cross-examination. It is difficult to comprehend exhaustively the facts and circumstances which may lead to violation of principles of natural justice or denial of reasonable opportunity of defence. This question must be determined on the facts and circumstances of each case. While considering this question it has to be borne in mind that a delinquent officer is entitled to have copies of material and relevant documents only which may include the copy of statement of witnesses recorded during the investigation or preliminary enquiry or the copy of any other document which may have been relied in support of the charges. If a document has no bearing on the charges or if it is not relied by the enquiry officer to support the charges, or if such document or material was not necessary for the cross-examination of witnesses during the enquiry, the officer cannot insist upon the supply of copies of such documents, as the absence of copy of such document will not prejudice the delinquent officer. The decision of the question whether a document is material or not will depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case.

23. In the present case, the documents and statements sought to be relied upon were denied to the respondent on the specious ground that the same were not relevant. The letter dated 23.02.2004 belies the stand of the counsel for the petitioners that the documents/ statements were denied as the same did not exist. The Investigation Report and the statements of the ASPOs/

SSPOs had been denied on the ground that the same are not relevant. Though the department should not be permitted to change the reason at such a stage; we still proceed to examine the explanation furnished to us. Before us, it has been contended that such statements are usually confidential in nature. We are not satisfied as to how the statements and documents in the present case can be said to be confidential in nature. Therefore, even the same cannot be accepted. It is also pertinent to note that the Enquiring Officer had categorically held the documents to be relevant. In view of the same, we are of the view that clear prejudice has been caused to the respondent, in as much as, he has been denied of a reasonable opportunity to meet the charges leveled against him in contravention of the principles of natural justice. Accordingly, the second ground urged before us also cannot be accepted.

24. In view of the foregoing, we find no infirmity in the orders passed by the Tribunal. Hence, there is no ground to interfere in the proceedings under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

25. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed at this preliminary stage.

G.S.SISTANI
(JUDGE)

I.S. MEHTA
(JUDGE)

AUGUST 10, 2016 //