

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Miscellaneous No.46221 of 2013

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -null Year- null Thana -null District- SAHARSA

=====

1. Chunchun Singh Son of Late Shivanand Singh
2. Bittu Singh @ Bittu Kumar Singh Son of Chunchun Singh
Both resident of Village- Jalshima, P.S.- Sonbarsa Raj, District- Saharsa At Present House No. 248 Jamuna Colony Anuppur District Sahdol Madhya Pradesh.

.... Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Lalmani Singh Son of Late Gokarn Singh Resident of Village- Kapsiya, P.S.- Sourbajar, District- Saharsa

.... Opposite Parties

With

Criminal Miscellaneous No. 4226 of 2014

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -166 Year- 2013 Thana -SONBERSA District- SAHARSA

=====

1. Reena Devi @ Rina Devi W/O Sri Akhilesh Singh @ Chunchun Singh
2. Akhilesh Singh @ Chunchun Singh S/O Late Shivanand Singh
3. Bittu Singh @ Bittu Kumar Singh S/O Akhilesh Singh @ Chunchun Singh

All resident of Village- Jalshima, Ps- Sonbarsa Raj District- Saharsa At Present House No. 248, Jamuna Colony Anupur District Sahdol Madhya Pradesh.

.... Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Lalmani Singh @ Pampal Singh S/O Late Gokarn Singh Resident of Village Kapsiya, P.S- Sourbajar, District- Saharsa.

.... Opposite Parties

With

Criminal Miscellaneous No. 4438 of 2014

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -493 Year- 2013 Thana -SAUR BAZAR District- SAHARSA

=====

1. Reena Devi @ Rina Devi Wife of Sri Akhilesh Singh @ Chunchun



Singh

2. Akhilesh Singh @ Chunchun Singh Son of Late Shivanand Singh
3. Madhav Singh @ Bittu Singh Son of Akhilesh Singh @ Chunchun Singh
All resident of Village - Jalshima, P.S. - Sonbarsa Raj District- Saharsa At Present House No. 248 Jamuna Colony Anuppur District Sahdol Madhya Pradesh.
4. Gopal Singh Son of Late Dayanand Singh Resident of Village - Kapasiya, Police Station - Sour Bazar, District- Saharsa.

.... Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Lalmani Singh @ Pampal Singh Son of Late Gokarn Singh Resident of Village - Kapsiya, P.S.- Sourbajar, District- Saharsa.

.... Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioners	:	Mr. Diwakar Prasad Singh, Advocate
For the opposite party no.2:		Mr. Rajesh Kumar Singh, Advocate
		Mr. Ranjit Choubey, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Ajay Kumar No.1, Advocate
		Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
C.A.V. JUDGMENT

Date: 19-07-2017

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners,
learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State in all these
three applications.

2. As all these three cases involved common
issues between the same parties, as such, on the request
of learned counsel for the parties, all the three cases
have been heard together and are being disposed of by
this common order.



3. Cr. Misc. No. 46221 of 2013 has been filed by one Chunchun Singh and Bittu Singh @ Bittu Kumar Singh, son of Chunchun Singh, for quashing of the order dated 19.07.2013 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Saharsa in Complaint Case No. 839(C)/2012 (Lalmani Singh Vs. Chunchun Singh and others) by which the learned Magistrate has taken cognizance for the offences alleged under Sections 341, 323 and 379 of the Indian Penal Code and issued summon to both the accused who are petitioners before this Court.

4. A perusal of the complaint petition would show that according to the complainant accused persons are related to him as brother-in-law (*Bahnoi*) and sister-in-law's son (*Bhagina*) respectively. The complainant alleged that with intention to earn his livelihood he wanted to purchase a six-wheel vehicle and in this regard when he talked to accused no. 1, he made him to believe that he would help him in getting the vehicle financed through Tata Motor Finance. The complainant believed the words of the accused no. 1 and went to his residence in Madhya Pradesh and requested him to finalize the deal with the financier for the purpose of purchase of vehicle. He allegedly handed over a sum of Rs. 2,50,000/- to accused no. 1 to make the down payment.



I. At this stage, it is alleged that the Tata Motors demanded a certificate of being local resident which was not available with the complainant. He alleges that when he demanded back his Rs. 2,50,000/- from the accused, the accused no. 1, persuaded him to let the agreement be executed in the name of accused no. 1 and that there will not be any issue as both of them are related as *Sala-Bahnoi*. The complainant had no option but to believe the words of accused no. 1, the papers were made in the name of cousin sister of the complainant namely, Reena Devi @ Rina Devi and the vehicle was delivered on 12.08.2010, which the complainant brought to his village and started paying the installment out of the earnings from the said vehicle.

II. It is alleged that on 14.06.2011, also a paper was prepared, whereunder it was agreed that the complainant will keep depositing the installment in the bank account no. 10990843969 of the cousin sister, Rina Devi, in the State Bank of India,



Jamuna Kalri Branch (Madhya Pradesh), and the accused promised that whatever money will be received from the insurance company against the risk amount the same will be handed over to the complainant after taking no objection from the company and the vehicle will be transferred.

5. Further case of the complainant is that the accused persons gave a promise that the complainant will have no loss because of the said document, the complainant kept on paying the installment amount through bank and whenever the accused persons demanded in cash the same was paid in cash, however, when the complainant enquired from the financier about the status of the installment deposits, came to know that the installment amount was not deposited with the financier. The complainant alleges that the money has been utilized by the accused for own purposes. On inquiry made from the accused persons, it is alleged that they became angry, abused the complainant and threatened him of kidnapping, murder and taking away of the vehicle. In this regard, the complainant is said to have submitted a "Sanha" in the court of Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Saharsa bearing no. 1068/2012.



According to the complainant, after knowing about the Sanha entry recorded by the complainant, the accused persons became so angry that they started conspiring to take away the vehicle. On the alleged date of occurrence i.e. 29.05.2012, when the complainant was going with his vehicle through Dumri Puja at about 5-6 PM, the accused persons overtook the vehicle by two motorcycles and by putting the three-nut on the complainant and the driver, they were also beaten and pulled down of the vehicle. The accused persons and two unknown took away the vehicle from the possession of the complainant. It is alleged that in the vehicle, all documents, cloths and a sum of Rs. 5000/- in cash were kept which the accused persons had taken away. The complainant further alleged that he went to the police station and submitted a written application, but he was told to come back after 3-4 days. The complainant allegedly went to the police station again on 01.06.2012, when he was directed to lodge a case in the court, hence the complainant alleged that he was filing the complaint as there was no other option. The complaint was filed on 02.06.2012 in the court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Saharsa giving rise to Complaint Case No. 839(C)/2012.

6. The complainant was examined on oath. In his



statement he repeated the allegations made in the complaint petition. In answer to the court queries the complainant disclosed that the vehicle was in the name of Rina Devi, about 13-14 installments were deposited. Each of the installments was of Rs. 29,320/- and the financial assistance was for Rs. 10 lacs. He further disclosed that he had deposited the entire installments in cash. In support of the complaint, he brought one Krishna Kumar Choudhary as complainant witness no. 1. He disclosed himself as driver engaged by the complainant. This witness has stated that while he along with his owner of the vehicle were going to Bhagalpur for loading Sand and reached near Khojraha the two motorcycles intercepted the vehicle and snatched the key. The owner disclosed the name of the accused, however this witness has further stated in the answer to the court's query that the owner of the vehicle did not disclose that the accused persons are related to him. He has further stated that he had not gone to the police station with the owner. The another complainant witness namely, Sri Shashi Yadav, has stated that while he was passing through the Harizan school, one truck and after the said truck two motorcycles on which two persons were sitting came from behind, the motorcycles overtook



the truck and stopped the said truck. This witness has stated that they committed assault with the driver and owner of the vehicle and snatched money from them. This witness has further stated that he had not seen the number of the motorcycles and because the accused persons were wearing Helmet, he could not identify. The complainant told this witness that Chunchun Singh and Bittu Singh had committed the said offence. The complainant witness no. 3, Premjit Singh, has also deposed on the line of Shashi yadav. According to this witness he was told by the driver that his name is Krishna Kumar Choudhary and that a sum of Rs. 5000/- was taken away by both Chunchun Singh and Bittu Singh. In answer to the court's query, this witness has stated that he cannot say either the number of the truck or the motorcycles. He could not see even the colour of the motorcycles. He has further stated that he knew Shashi Yadav but does not know the other persons who had been there.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits in the present case that the learned Magistrate has taken cognizance in a routine and mechanical manner. He has relied on the apparent contradictions recorded by the learned Magistrate in the statement of the complainant



and these three witnesses in course of inquiry which are showing the falsehood in the story as made out in the complaint and submitted that in fact save and except bald statement of the complainant there is no legal evidence on record to show a prima facie case under Sections 323, 341 & 379 I.P.C. Learned counsel further submits that, in fact, in the present case, the petitioners are the victim. Petitioner no. 1 has suffered huge loss as he had deposited the entire income in the account of the financier in order to save himself from penalty, the complainant never deposited the real income in the account of the wife of the petitioner no. 1. The complainant was neither borrower nor guarantor of loan. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner no. 2 is a student and the manner in which he has been made accused in the present case no reasonable person would believe the occurrence as true. The witness who deposed as driver of the vehicle has clearly stated that he had not gone to Police Station on alleged date of occurrence, other witnesses have not been able to disclose the Registration number of truck and/or motorcycle, they do not know even colour of the motorcycles. The complaint case was lodged on 02.06.2012 in respect of an occurrence allegedly took place on 29.05.2012. The



complainant says he had gone to Police Station but neither the driver nor the enquiry witnesses have supported this statement of the complainant. The driver and the witnesses did not claim to have accompanied the complainant, thus the whole allegation of assault, threat and theft are baseless, false and mala fide allegations.

8. Learned counsel has relied upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Madhavrao Jiwaji Rao Scindia & Anr. Vs Sambhajirao Chandrojirao Angre & Ors.** since reported in **(1988) 1 SCC 692**; and submitted that when a prosecution at the initial stage is asked to be quashed, the test to be applied by the court is as to whether the uncontroverted allegations as made prima facie establish the offence. It is also for the court to take into consideration any special features which appear in particular case to consider whether it is expedient to and in the interest of justice to permit a prosecution to continue. Learned counsel further submits that the process of court cannot be utilized for any oblique purpose and where in the opinion of the court chances of an ultimate conviction is bleak, no useful purpose is likely to be served by allowing a criminal prosecution to continue, the court may while taking into consideration the special facts of a case, also



quash the proceeding even though it may be a preliminary stage. He has further relied upon another judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Punjab National bank and Others Vs. Surendra Prasad Sinha** since reported in **JT 1992 (3) 46**; to advance his submission that the judicial process should not be an instrument of oppression or needless harassment. Vindication of majesty of justice and maintenance of law & order in the society are the prime objects of criminal justice but it would not be the means of wreck vengeance.

9. On the other hand, learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 has opposed the prayer for quashing of the order taking cognizance in the present case. Learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 submits that in the facts of the present case, the learned Magistrate has found a prima facie case, and therefore, this court should not interfere with the order taking cognizance and issuance of process at this stage.

10. Before I consider the case of the parties against the order taking cognizance and issuance of summons in the present case, it would be just and proper to take note of the facts of the other two cases and then shall proceed to decide all the issues by this



common order/judgment.

Cr. Misc. No. 4226/2014

11. The petitioner in this case is Reena Devi @ Rina Devi, her husband namely, Akhilesh Singh @ Chunchun Singh and son Bittu Singh. The opposite party no.2 is Lalmani Singh @ Pampal Singh, who is also the opposite party no. 2 in the above-mentioned complaint case.

12. The petitioners have prayed for quashing of the F.I.R. as contained in Sonbarsa Raj P.S. Case No. 166/2013 registered for the offences under Sections 420, 406, 379, 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code. This case was lodged again by Lalmani Singh. The case was registered on the order of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Saharsa passed under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. in Complaint Case No. 1735C/2012. A reading of the complaint petition which is the basis of the F.I.R. would show that the allegations made in the complaint petition were identical to the statements made in the Complaint Case No. 839(C)/2012. However, one paragraph has been added towards the end of complaint petition saying that on 22.09.2012 at about 4-5 PM while the accused was returning from the court after doing *pairvy* in the case and was going to *Shahpur*, near *Shahpur Satsang*



Bhawan, the accused persons stopped the complainant and Bittu Singh took out three-nut and threatened the informant and got his signature on a stamp paper and took away a sum of Rs. 5000/- from his pocket. I need not go into the details of this case for the reasons recorded in the order dated 12.07.2012. The parties have informed this Court that so far as Cr. Misc. No. 4226/2014 is concerned, the same has become infructuous as police has submitted final form since the investigating officer could not get sufficient materials to submit a charge-sheet against the accused-petitioners. The Cr. Misc. No. 4226/2014 is, therefore, disposed off as withdrawn.

Cr. Misc. No. 4438/2014

13. This case has been filed by (1) Reena Devi @ Rina Devi (2) Akhilesh Singh @ Chunchun Singh (3) Madhav Singh @ Bittu Singh and (4) Gopal Singh Son of Late Dayanand Singh. In the present case, these petitioners are praying for quashing of the F.I.R. as contained in Sour Bazar (Patharghat outpost) P.S. Case No. 493/2013 registered for the offences under Sections 420, 406, 341, 323, 504 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code lodged by Sri Lalmani Singh on 13.11.2013.

14. A perusal of the First Information Report



would show that this case has also been lodged on the basis of a Complaint Case No. 1321/2013 filed in the court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Saharsa on 16.08.2013. A perusal of the statements made in the complaint petition would show that the accused Gopal Singh is a neighbour of the informant and is in the relationship of uncle, while Reena Devi @ Rina Devi is the daughter of the said Gopal Singh and wife of Akhilesh Singh @ Chunchun Singh and mother of Bittu Singh. The informant had once again alleged the facts about the purchase of vehicle in question, its finance obtained through Akhilesh Singh @ Chunchun Singh. However, in this case the informant has alleged an extra fact that the accused no. 4 had also gone to the residence of accused nos. 1 to 3 in the State of Madhya Pradesh. The informant alleged connivance on the part of all the accused persons. He has accepted the agreement dated 14.06.2011 and stated that the entire outstanding amount was paid on the said date and the accused persons received further amount shown in the complaint in the presence of the villagers at the residence of informant at Kapasiya. Thereafter, again the informant has alleged the same facts regarding default in payment of outstanding amount and snatching away of the



vehicle. In this complaint, one more paragraph has been added showing that a Panchayati took place between the parties on 21.07.2013 at the residence of accused no. 4, where the local Panchas were the witnesses. It is alleged that the accused persons accepted their mistake but refused to return the money to the informant and thereby they misappropriated the money of the informant in conspiracy. Save and except this addition, no other additional fact has been alleged, if compared with complaint case no. 839(C)/2012.

15. Learned counsel for the petitioners, in the present case, would submit that a bare perusal of the statements made in the complaint petition, which has given rise to the present police case, would show that the present case is by way of a repetition of the allegations made in the Complaint Case No. 839(C)/2012, which is subject matter of consideration in Cr. Misc. No. 46221/2013. Learned counsel further submits that in fact it is the third case in the series of cases filed by the opposite party no. 2 for the same alleged occurrence and hence when both the complaint case and the F.I.R. related to the same incident in respect of same occurrence or are in regard to the incidence which are two or more parts of the same



transaction, the second and third F.I.R. are liable to be quashed. He has relied upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **T.T. Antony Vs. State of Kerala and Ors.** since reported in **(2001) 6 SCC 181**, **Upkar Singh Vs. Ved Prakash** since reported in **(2004) 13 SCC 292** and **Babubhai Vs. State of Gujarat and others** since reported in **(2010) 12 SCC 254**. All the judgments are authorities on the propositions that on applying the test of 'sameness' if the court comes to a conclusion that both F.I.Rs. related to the same incidence, in respect of same occurrence or are in regard to the incidence which are two or more parts of the same transactions, the second F.I.R. is liable to be quashed, where version in the second F.I.R. is different and they are in respect of different incident, the second F.I.R. is permissible.

16. Learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 as also learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State opposed the prayer for quashing of the F.I.R., as according to them, although the case is of the year 2013 but is still under investigation and it would not be just and proper to quash the F.I.R., as both the complaints and the F.I.R. related to two different incidences.

17. I have considered the rival submissions and



perused the records. In Complaint Case No. 839/2012, the whole allegations cluster around the facts and circumstances under which the vehicle in question was purchased and the financial assistance was obtained admittedly in the name of Reena Devi @ Rina Devi who is none else than the wife of accused no. 1 and mother of accused no. 2. The allegation of the complainant is that in fact he had paid a sum of Rs. 2,50,000/- as down payment and was also sending the installment amount but the same were not paid to the financier and the money was utilized by the accused persons for their own purpose. He has further alleged about the occurrence which took place on 29.05.2012, in which the allegations is that the vehicle in question was taken away at the point of three-nut and there were some act of assault also. The allegation of assault and threat are totally vague. No evidence of assault or threat could be brought in evidence in course of enquiry. It is not believable that police will not register a case if the complainant had gone to Police Station on 29.05.2012 that too with any sign of assault. It appears from perusal of the statement of the complainant witnesses that they have not been able to disclose even the number and colour of the two motorcycles which allegedly came from behind and the



person sitting thereon indulged in the said occurrence. Out of these witnesses, the two are said to be the passerby who are living in different village and were admittedly brought by the complainant for deposition in the court. The witness Krishna Kumar Choudhary who says that he was the driver has not been able to produce even the driving license. He in his statement submits that the opposite party no. 2 told him about the accused persons and the relationships between the accused and the opposite party no. 2. He has clearly stated that he does not identify the accused persons and had not gone to Police Station. The complaint case was lodged on 02.06.2012 in respect of the occurrence allegedly took place on 29.05.2012. These depositions have been noted to consider whether on the face of this the learned Magistrate has applied his judicious mind or just acted in a routine & mechanical manner in the matter of taking cognizance and issuance of summon ?

18. On the other hand, the complainant witness no. 2 has stated that he was told by the complainant-opposite party no. 2 that these petitioners had committed the alleged occurrence but he also could not see the motorcycles number or the colour of the same. It is not in dispute that the vehicle (Truck) in question is



registered in the name of Reena Devi, wife of the petitioner no. 1 and this complainant has admittedly not signed any document of loan in any capacity and therefore the risk of the finance is solely upon the registered owner Reena Devi @ Rina Devi. The parties are closely related to each other and apparently the dispute has arisen over the transactions which are in the nature of commercial transactions allegedly agreed upon between the parties. The version of both the parties clearly establishes that the dispute is over the transaction in which the complainant alleges that he had made payment of the installments against the finance of the truck but the same was not deposited, whereas the accused persons take a stand that the complainant had taken the truck on hire with a promise to pay the installments on earning out of that, but the complainant did not abide by his promise despite there being an agreement executed by him on 14.11.2011. In the Sour Bazar P.S. Case, the complainant and opposite party no. 2 of the Complaint Case No. 839(C)/2012 is the informant and he has admitted to have executed the agreement dated 14.11.2011. In the said F.I.R., the allegations made by the informant are one and the same and this court has no doubt that the F.I.R. if tested on



the principle of sameness would take the court to a conclusion that both the complaint as well as the F.I.R. are related to same incident in respect of same occurrence and are parts of the same transactions. Apart from the judgments noted in earlier part of this order learned counsel has drawn the attention of this court towards the views taken by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Inder Mohan Goswami and Anr. Vs. State of Uttaranchal and Ors.** since reported in (2007) 12 SCC 1. The Hon'ble Apex Court has taken note of the cases in which in respect of a pure and civil dispute the parties give it a colour of criminal proceeding. An extract from paragraph '23' & '24' of the said judgment is quoted hereunder for ready reference : -

"23. This court in a number of cases has laid down the scope and ambit of courts powers under section 482 Cr.P.C. Every High Court has inherent power to act ex debito justitiae to do real and substantial justice, for the administration of which alone it exists, or to prevent abuse of the process of the court. Inherent power under section 482 Cr.P.C. can be exercised:

- (i) to give effect to an order under the Code;*
- (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of court, and*
- (iii) to otherwise secure the ends of justice.*

24. Inherent powers under section 482 Cr.P.C. though wide have to be exercised sparingly, carefully and with great caution and only when such exercise is justified by the tests specifically



laid down in this section itself. Authority of the court exists for the advancement of justice. If any abuse of the process leading to injustice is brought to the notice of the court, then the Court would be justified in preventing injustice by invoking inherent powers in absence of specific provisions in the Statute."

19. In the present case, this court is of the opinion that the whole substratum and foundation of the Complaint Case No. 839(C)/2012 is in the nature of a civil dispute where the parties are looking for accounting of their money and are casting aspersion against each other. The vehicle is registered in the name of Reena Devi @ Rina Devi and the financial assistance has been provided to her on her sole risk. It is not the case of the complainant/informant that he has stood as a guarantor or is otherwise at the risk of being exposed to the said financial risk.

20. In this view of the matter, the allegations of theft and other allegations as mentioned in the complaint petition are apparently made with an intention to give the whole dispute which is otherwise of civil nature a colour of criminal proceeding. A registered owner of vehicle cannot be said to have committed theft of her own vehicle. The allegation of assault and threat are ornamental and mala fide allegations without there being



any prima facie evidence to make out a case for issuance of summon. The statement of the complainant that he went to Police Station on 29.05.2012 is not supported by driver and witness, therefore lodging of the complaint case on 02.06.2012 is mala fide with a view to give the whole dispute a criminal angle.

21. In one of the F.I.Rs. which is subject matter of Cr. Misc. No. 4226/2014, this court has been informed that police has already submitted a final form as the investigating authority could not find sufficient materials to proceed against the accused, however, the same is pending in the court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, as according to the learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 a protest petition has been filed, this court is not concerned with the same as the protest petition is yet to be considered in accordance with law by the learned Magistrate.

22. However, so far as Sour Bazar P.S. Case No. 493/2013 is concerned, this Court is of the considered opinion that the same is nothing but a repetition of the allegations made in the complaint case which is subject matter of Cr. Misc. No. 46221/2013 with only addition that Gopal Singh who is uncle of the informant and father of Reena Devi, the registered owner, has been brought in



picture as a conspirator showing his presence at Madhya Pradesh when the informant had gone to meet Chunchun Singh. The case is apparently a mala fide prosecution and has been registered as an afterthought with an intention to implicate Reena Devi and Gopal Singh, both who were not made accused in the complaint case. It is a mala fide prosecution and is covered under one of the illustrations of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **State of Haryana Vs. Bhajan Lal and others** since reported in **(1992) 1 supp. SCC 335**. The informant has indulged in giving the otherwise civil dispute a criminal colour.

23. In the facts and circumstances, this court is of the opinion that continuation of the proceeding in Complaint Case No. 839(C) of 2012 in the court of Sri Mukesh Kumar-II, Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Saharsa is an abuse of the process of the court as also the prosecution of the petitioners in Cr. Misc. No. 4438/2014 in Sour Bazar P.S. Case No. 493/2013 is a mala fide prosecution of the petitioner on the identical allegations as were mentioned in the complaint petition and not being any separate cause of action. The very lodgment of the First Information Report was mala fide, the dispute between the parties are purely civil in nature and is at



best a case of accounting thus, it would be in the interest of justice to quash the same.

24. In the result, both Cr. Misc. No. 46221/2013 and Cr. Misc. No. 4438/2014 are allowed and the impugned order as well as the First Information Report which are impugned therein are hereby quashed.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J.)

Rajeev/-

AFR/NAFR	AFR
CAV DATE	12.07.2017
Uploading Date	19.07.2017
Transmission Date	19.07.2017

