

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Appeal (DB) No.341 of 1994

{ Against the Judgment of conviction and sentence order dated 12.05.1994 passed by the learned 6th Additional Sessions Judge, Begusarai, in Sessions Case No.96 of 1992 }.

-
1. Arjun Thakur, son of Bholu Thakur.
 2. Shiwani Mahto, son of Late Doman Mahto.
 3. Ram Padarath Paswan, son of Brijbhan Paswan alias Birakh Paswan.
All residents of village-Agapur, Police Station-Mansoorchak, District-Begusarai.

... .. Appellants.

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent.

Appearance :

For the Appellants	:	Mrs. Namrata Mishra, Advocate. Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, Advocate.
For the State	:	Mrs. Archana Jha, Advocate. Mr. Dilip Kumar Sinha, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT KUMAR SRIVASTAVA
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR MISHRA
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT KUMAR SRIVASTAVA)

Date : 05-11-2018

This appeal has been preferred against the Judgment of conviction and sentence order dated 12.05.1994 passed by the learned 6th Additional Sessions Judge, Begusarai, in Sessions Case No.96 of 1992, by which and whereunder he convicted the appellants for the offences punishable under Sections 364, 302/34 and 201 of the Indian Penal Code and, accordingly, sentenced them to undergo rigorous imprisonment for life for the offences punishable under Sections 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code, to undergo rigorous



imprisonment for life for the offence punishable under Section 364 of the Indian Penal Code and to undergo rigorous imprisonment for seven years for the offence punishable under Section 201 of the Indian Penal Code. However, all the sentences were ordered to run concurrently.

2. P.W.7 gave his fardbeyan on 27.03.1991 at about 09.30 P.M. at his house to P.W.8 Phuldeo Singh to this effect that on the same day, his father, namely, Sudhir Chaudhary, had gone to Samsa Chowk at about 02.00 P.M. He further claimed that at about 07.00 P.M., he was going to purchase match box to the shop of Kasim Mian of his village and reached near the house of Tarachand Paswan and saw the appellants, who were assaulting his father. The bicycle of his father was lying there. The aforesaid appellants started taking away his father towards Dusadh Toli, upon which he raised alarm and back to his home and gave information about the aforesaid occurrence to his mother as well as his other family members. He further claimed that his other family members came in search of his father but his father did not return to his home. P.W.7 further claimed that Jay Jay Ram Mahaton (P.W.5) had witnessed the aforesaid occurrence. P.W.7 further claimed that he gave his fardbeyan in presence of his uncle, namely, Upendra Chaudhary (P.W.3), who signed his fardbeyan as a witness.

3. On the basis of the aforesaid fardbeyan of P.W.7, Bhagwanpur (Mansoorchak) P.S. Case No.21 of 1991 for the



offences punishable under Sections 364/34 of the Indian Penal Code was registered and after registration of the F.I.R., P.W.8 took the charge of investigation. However, formal F.I.R. was drawn up against the appellants for the offences punishable under Sections 364/34 of the Indian Penal Code and, subsequently, after recovery of the so-called dead body of Sudhir Chaudhary, Sections 302 and 201/34 of the Indian Penal Code were also added.

4. P.W.8 inspected the place of the occurrence on the same day, however, on 28.03.1991, Upendra Chaudhary gave information to him that a dead body of the deceased of this case was lying, tied with the boring pipes of one Ram Bahadur Singh of village-Rudauli. P.W.8 having got the aforesaid information went there but due to night, he deputed Havildar and Chowkidar there and on 29.03.1991, he prepared the inquest report of the aforesaid dead body and sent the dead body of the deceased to the hospital for post-mortem but before completion of investigation, on the direction of the Superintendent of Police, he handed over the charge of investigation to other police officer, namely, Jai Narain Ram. P.W.8 admitted that the aforesaid dead body was a headless dead body. However, another Investigating Officer, after completion of investigation, submitted the charge-sheet against the appellants.

5. The cognizance of the offence was taken and the case was committed to the court of sessions, in usual way.

6. The appellants stood charged for the offences



punishable under Sections 364, 302/34 and 201 of the Indian Penal Code. The appellants denied the charges and claimed to be tried.

7. In course of trial, the prosecution examined, altogether, 9 witnesses and also got exhibited certain documents.

8. The statements of the appellants were recorded under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, in which they reiterated their innocence and claimed their false implication. No evidence was adduced on behalf of the appellants in support of their defence but certain documents were got exhibited on their behalf in course of trial. From perusal of trend of cross-examination of the prosecution witnesses as well as the statements made by the appellants under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, it would appear that the defence of the appellants was totally denial of the claim of the prosecution witnesses.

9. The learned trial court after analyzing the evidences, available on the record, convicted and sentenced the appellants in the manner, as we have already stated above.

10. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellants challenged the impugned Judgment of conviction and sentence order, arguing that the learned court below has not appreciated the evidences, available on the record, properly, as a result whereof, the learned court below failed to come on the right conclusion. Continuing his submission, learned counsel for the appellants submits that the learned court below completely



overlooked this fact that the prosecution did not come with clean hands as the prosecution witnesses tried to suppress the real facts. He submitted that in course of their examination, the material prosecution witnesses including P.W.8 admitted that on the same day, one Sahdeo Chaudhary, who was full brother of the appellant no.3 Ram Padarath Paswan, was killed and P.W.8 was present in village in connection with the aforesaid murder. He further submitted that P.W.7 and his other family members were made accused in killing of Sahdeo Chaudhary and, as a matter of fact, P.W.7 in collusion with P.W.8 lodged the present case against the appellants with an object to save their skin from the case, instituted in connection with the murder of Sahdeo Chaudhary. He further submitted that P.W.8 was not making proper investigation and he was in collusion with P.W.7 and that was the reason, the concerned Superintendent of Police relieved him from further investigation, just after one day of the registration of the present case. He further submitted that, admittedly, one headless dead body was recovered from the place of the occurrence and P.W.7 as well as other witnesses claimed to have identified the aforesaid dead body only on the basis of the clothes found on the dead body but the aforesaid clothes were never produced before the trial court, nor appears to have been seized by the police and, therefore, it is obvious from the aforesaid fact that the identification of the dead body was doubtful. He submitted that, as a matter of fact, P.W.8, on the basis of recovery of an unknown dead



body, falsely implicated the appellants in the present case. He further submitted that there were several infirmities in the prosecution case as P.W.8 did not find bicycle of the victim of the present case, lying near the place of the occurrence, nor found any mark of dragging near the place of the occurrence and the aforesaid facts create doubt about the claim of the prosecution witnesses but the learned trial court ignored the aforesaid facts. He further submitted that P.W.9, who did post-mortem on the recovered corpse, found that the head was completely chopped up from the neck and one injury was found on the abdomen of the recovered corpse. He further submitted that the statement of P.W.9 as well as the post-mortem report go to show that no injury of assault was found on the recovered corpse and both injuries found on the corpse were caused by sharp cutting weapon. He submitted that not a single prosecution witness claimed to have seen the appellants carrying any sharp cutting weapon at the time of the alleged occurrence. He further submitted that, admittedly, none had seen the actual killing of the deceased and the learned trial court convicted the appellants only on the ground that some witnesses claimed to have seen the appellants assaulting and taking away the deceased prior to the recovery of the dead body and, therefore, the aforesaid fact, clearly goes to show that the factum of killing is based upon the circumstantial evidence and, moreover, even if the above stated circumstances, for the sake of argument, are accepted to be true, then also, the aforesaid circumstances were not sufficient to



convict the appellants for the murder of the deceased. He submitted that Ext.A goes to show that one Most. Ramjhari Devi, who happens to be the mother of Sahdeo Chaudhary, gave her fardbeyan before P.W.8 on 27.03.1991 at about 07.00 P.M. at village-Mansoorchak and in the aforesaid fardbeyan, she claimed that Prem Kumar Chaudhary and several others committed the murder of her son. He submitted that Ext.A clearly goes to show that prior to the institution of the present case, the mother of Sahdeo Chaudhary had already lodged a case regarding the murder of her son against the family members of P.W.7 and, therefore, the possibility of false implication of the appellants cannot be ruled out as appellant no.1 had witnessed the murder of Sahdeo Chaudhary and it was appellant no.1, who had given information to Most. Ramjhari Devi regarding the murder of her son Sahdeo Chaudhary.

11. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor supported the impugned Judgment of conviction and sentence order, arguing that P.W.7 and other eye witnesses claimed to have seen the appellants assaulting and taking away the deceased on the alleged date of the occurrence and, subsequently, on the next day, headless dead body of the deceased of the present case was recovered. He further submitted that P.W.7 and other witnesses, who claimed to have identified the recovered dead body, specifically, stated that the recovered dead body was of the deceased of the present case. He further submitted that P.W.9 found that the head of



recovered dead body was completely chopped off and injury was found on the abdomen of the deceased and, therefore, it is explicit clear that it were the appellants, who took away the deceased and, subsequently, committed his murder. He further submitted that, no doubt, no one had seen the actual killing of the deceased but the aforesaid circumstances were sufficient to show the complicity of the appellants in the present crime and, therefore, the learned trial court rightly convicted and sentenced the appellants, passing the impugned Judgment and there is no need to interfere into the impugned Judgment of conviction and sentence order.

12. Having heard the rival contentions of both the parties, we went through the records along with the Lower Court Records.

13. As we have already stated that the prosecution examined, altogether, 9 witnesses, out of them P.W.1 Raj Kumar Chaudhary is uncle, whereas P.W.2 Budhan Chaudhary is brother of the deceased. Similarly, P.W.3 is also uncle of the deceased. P.W.4 Rambadan Paswan is a hostile witness and P.W.6 Ashok Kumar Chaudhary is a formal witness. P.W.5 Jay Jay Ram Mahaton claims himself to be an eye witness and, similarly, P.W.7 Sumant Kumar Chaudhary also claims himself to be the eye witness of the alleged occurrence. P.W.8 claims to have recorded the fardbeyan of P.W.7 and P.W.9 is Doctor, who conducted the post-mortem on the recovered corpus. P.W.1 Raj Kumar Chaudhary, P.W.2 Budhan



Chaudhary, P.W.5 Jay Jay Ram Mahaton and P.W.7, the informant Sumant Kumar Chaudhary, claim to have seen the appellants assaulting and taking away the deceased.

14. P.W.1 Raj Kumar Chaudhary claims that at the time of the alleged occurrence, he was going to Chowk Agapur from his village and reached near the house of the appellant no.2, namely, Shiwdani Mahto and saw that the appellants were assaulting the deceased and taking him away towards Dusadh Toli. This witness in his cross examination admitted that there were several houses near the place of the occurrence. This witness also admitted that the place of the occurrence was a busy place and the distance between Agapur Chowk and the house of Tarachand was about 20-25 Laghas. This witness also admitted that one Prem Kumar Choudhary was his cousin brother. This witness also admitted that just after the alleged occurrence, he as well as others had gone in search of the deceased but could not succeed to trace him out. This witness also admitted that the police met him in the same night. This witness admitted that the above stated Prem Kumar Chaudhary was accused in the murder of Sahdeo Chaudhary.

15. P.W.2 Budhan Choudhary claims that at the time of the alleged occurrence, he was taking tea at Agapur Chowk and having heard the noise, he went at the place of the occurrence and saw that the appellants were assaulting Sahdeo Paswan, which was witnessed by the deceased Sudhir and the deceased Sudhir raised



alarm and, after that, the appellants threw the dead body of Sahdeo Paswan and started assaulting Sudhir and took him away from there. This witness admitted in his cross examination that Raj Kishore Chaudhary, Bachcha Chaudhary, Dineshwar Chaudhary and Bhuvneshwar Chaudhary were also sitting with him, while he was taking tea. This witness further admitted that several persons were present at the Chowk at the time of the alleged occurrence. This witness also admitted that Prem Kumar Choudhary, Suresh Kumar Chaudhary and others are his family members. He also admitted that Prem Kumar Chaudhary and others were convicted in the murder case of Doman Mahto. This witness also admitted that while he was going to his Dera, after the alleged occurrence, the wife of Jhagru Mahto met him on his way and she narrated the entire story to him. The aforesaid admission of this witness goes to show that he happens to be hearsay witness.

16. No doubt, P.W.1 claimed in his deposition that he had seen the appellants assaulting and taking away the deceased but, admittedly, P.W.1 is the uncle of the deceased. P.W.7 also claimed himself to have seen the appellants, assaulting and taking away the deceased but P.W.7, has, nowhere, mentioned the presence of P.W.1 at the time of the alleged occurrence.

17. It is settled principle of law that the statement of a witness cannot be discarded only on the ground that the witness is an interested witness but the statement of the said witness has to be



judged with caution and circumspection.

18. Admittedly, P.W.1 is an interested witness as his nephew was killed and, therefore, the statement of P.W.1 has to be considered very carefully and if the statement of P.W.1 does not inspire confidence to the Court, his statement can be rejected straightway.

19. As we have already stated that the presence of P.W.1 has not been mentioned in the fardbeyan of P.W.7 and, therefore, the presence of P.W.1 over the place of the occurrence appears to be doubtful. Had P.W.1 been present over the place of the occurrence, at the time of the alleged occurrence, the name of P.W.1 would have certainly been mentioned in the fardbeyan of P.W.7 because P.W.1 is non else but the grandfather of P.W.7 and it cannot be said that P.W.7 failed to take notice of the presence of P.W.1 at the place of the occurrence when the occurrence took place. Therefore, in our view, no reliance can safely be placed upon the statement of P.W.1.

20. P.W.3 Upendra Chaudhary is also a hearsay witness because he has himself admitted in his examination-in-chief that at the time of the alleged occurrence, he was at his Dera and P.W.7 came there and informed him that the deceased was being taken by Ram Padarath and Shiwdani. This witness, has, nowhere, stated the name of the appellant no.1 Arjun Thakur and this witness stated that P.W.7 had disclosed the name of only Shiwdani and Ram Padarath before him. This witness also claimed that having got the aforesaid



information from P.W.7, he went there and saw the appellants Shiwdani Mahto and Ram Padarath Paswan, dragging the deceased and, subsequently, on the next day, the dead body of the deceased Sudhir was found in a river. This witness claimed that he saw the dead body but the head of the dead body was missing. This witness admitted in his cross-examination that even after hearing the noise, he remained at his Dera for near about 3-4 hours and between the aforesaid 3 to 4 hours, he did not meet with any co-villager. This witness also admitted that the police came at his Dera and asked him to go to the place, where the dead body was lying. This witness also admitted that after one night and one day of the alleged occurrence, Darogaji had asked him to see the dead body. This witness also admitted that he did not ask from Darogaji as to from where the dead body was recovered and of whom the aforesaid dead body was. This witness also admitted that Darogaji asked him to go to Rudauli Ghat, where the dead body was lying and he along with Darogaji and Chowkidar went to Rudauli Ghat and dead body was recovered from there. This witness admitted that the head of the aforesaid dead body was missing. This witness admitted that the deceased was the family member of Prem Kumar and others.

21. After analyzing the evidence of P.W.3, it is obvious that this witness is not an eye witness of the alleged occurrence and he came to know about the alleged occurrence from P.W.7 and, furthermore, the evidence of this witness goes to show that headless



dead body was recovered from Rudauli Ghat but no document in respect of recovery of the aforesaid headless dead body was prepared in presence of this witness.

22. The most important prosecution witnesses are P.W.5 Jay Jay Ram Mahaton and P.W.7 Sumant Kumar Chaudhary, who claim themselves to be eye witnesses of the alleged occurrence.

23. P.W.5 Jay Jay Ram Mahaton claims that he was going from his home towards shop and reached near the house of Shiwdani (appellant no.2), where he saw the appellants, who were assaulting the deceased Sudhir Chaudhary and they started dragging the deceased towards Dusadh Toli. This witness claimed that P.W.1 and P.W.2 as well as several others were also present there. As we have already stated that P.W.7, has, nowhere, stated about the presence of P.W.1 and P.W.2 and others at the place of the occurrence when the occurrence took place. However, the name of his witness has been mentioned in the fardbeyan of P.W.7 but this witness is said to have seen only the factum of assault on the deceased and this witness himself admitted that later on he learnt that Sudhir was no more. On being cross examined by the defence, this witness admitted at paragraph-4 of his cross-examination that he had seen the appellant Ram Padarath, for the first time, on the alleged date of the occurrence but he has, nowhere, stated as to how he came to know about the name of the appellant Ram Padarath. This witness also admitted that there were several shops and houses near the place of



the occurrence and Mukhiya, Dafadar and Chowkidar were also present over the place of the occurrence when the occurrence took place. This witness admitted that he had not made any statement prior to making the statement before the court. However, this witness admitted that on the alleged date of the occurrence at about 09.00 P.M., the police had come to his house to make inquiry. The attention of this witness was drawn towards his previous statement recorded under Section 161 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and this witness denied the suggestion of the defence that he had not made any statement before the police to this effect that at the time of the alleged occurrence, he was going to his shop from his village. This witness also admitted that prior to his statement, he had talked with P.W.7. However, this witness admitted that he had given a petition, mentioning therein that he knew nothing about the occurrence. This witness denied the suggestion of the defence that he had not seen the alleged occurrence.

The perusal of evidence of this witness goes to show that the statement of this witness is itself contradictory because somewhere this witness claimed that he had given a petition, mentioning therein that he had not seen the alleged occurrence and somewhere this witness stated that he had seen the alleged occurrence. Moreover, this witness admitted that, for the first time, he made statement in court and prior to his above stated statement, he had not made any statement before the police. Admittedly, this



witness was examined on 22.02.1994, whereas the alleged occurrence took place on 27.03.1991. Therefore, the above stated belated statement of this witness does not appear to be reliable and trustworthy and it is unsafe to rely upon the statement of this witness.

24. P.W.7 Sumant Kumar Chaudhary is the informant. This witness claims that his father had gone to Samsa Chowk at about 02.00 P.M. on 27.03.1991 and while this witness was going to purchase the match box and reached near the house of Tarachand, he saw the appellants assaulting his father. This witness also claimed that the bicycle of his father was lying there. This witness further claimed that the aforesaid appellants took away his father towards Dusadh Toli and, thereafter, he raised alarm and came to his home by the bicycle of his father. He narrated about the present occurrence to his family members. Thereafter, he searched his father but could not succeed to trace him out. This witness admitted that on 29.03.1991 at about 05.00 A.M., he came to know that the dead body of his father was lying near the boring of Ram Bahadur Singh and, thereafter, he went to village-Rudauli, where headless dead body of his father was recovered. This witness claimed to have identified the dead body of his father. On being cross-examined by the defence, this witness admitted that he narrated the above stated occurrence to Soman Chaudhary, Bata Chaudhary and Upendra Chaudhary (P.W.3) and, thereafter, he as well as others went in search of his father. This witness admitted that he did not give any information to Mukhiya,



Dafadar and Chowkidar. He further admitted that he searched his father in the entire village but no villager met him. This witness also admitted that he did not enquire from any persons, who were at the Chowk. This witness also admitted that while he went in search of his father, he was not carrying torch or lantern with him but he searched his father for near about one and half hours. This witness also admitted that he returned to his home after searching his father at about 09.00 P.M. and remained at his home for near about 10 minutes and, after that, the police came at his home and he narrated the entire story to the police. This witness further stated that the police took him to the place from where his father was taken away and he as well as police remained there for about 10 minutes and, after that, police left the place and he, too, returned to his home. This witness further admitted that when he along with police went to the place of the occurrence, he did not see the dead body of Sahdeo Paswan. This witness denied that a criminal case was instituted against his family members for the murder of Sahdeo Paswan. This witness also admitted that the bicycle was shown to the police by him and the police had prepared the document of the aforesaid bicycle. This witness also admitted that he learnt from one Hemant Chaudhary that the dead body of his father was lying near Balan river. This witness also admitted that the said Hemant Chaudhary came to his house and gave information regarding the dead body of his father. He further claimed that he went there and saw the dead



body of his father but the head of the dead body was missing. This witness also admitted that Upendra Chaudhary, Ashok Chaudhary and several other persons were present there from before. This witness admitted at paragraph-14 of his cross examination that the police did not ask him to identify the dead body of his father, nor he had told before the police that he learnt about the dead body from Hemant Chaudhary. However, this witness claimed that the police prepared the document in his presence but he had not signed the aforesaid document. This witness further admitted that the police took away the aforesaid dead body but he did not accompany the police, nor got the aforesaid dead body, later on.

The statement of this witness goes to show that the conduct of this witness was unnatural. Firstly, this witness claims to have seen the appellants assaulting and taking away the deceased and, subsequently, this witness claimed that his other family members were also present there and saw the occurrence of assaulting and taking away the deceased by the appellants but it is surprising enough that this witness as well as other witnesses did not take any pain to prevent the appellants from assaulting and taking away the deceased from the place of the occurrence, particularly, in the circumstance, when neither P.W.7, nor any other so-called prosecution witnesses claimed to have seen any arms in the hands of the appellants at the time of the alleged occurrence. Therefore, the aforesaid conduct of P.W.7 appears to be unnatural. Furthermore,



P.W.7 has admitted in his testimony that after recovery of headless dead body, the aforesaid headless dead body was taken away by the police but he did not accompany the police, while the headless dead body was being taken by the police. This witness further admitted that he did not receive the headless dead body, later on. Admittedly, the post-mortem on the aforesaid headless dead body was done but it is surprising enough that P.W.7 being the son of the deceased did not receive the dead body, nor performed the last rituals of the aforesaid dead body. Had the recovered dead body been of the father of P.W.7, he would have certainly received the dead body and performed the last rituals of the dead body but P.W.7 has himself admitted that he did not receive the dead body. The aforesaid conduct of P.W.7 is an unnatural conduct and creates doubt about the claim of this witness that the recovered dead body was of his deceased father.

On the basis of the aforesaid discussions, we are of the view that the claim of P.W.7 does not inspire confidence to this Court and, therefore, we are of the view that no reliance can safely be placed upon the deposition of P.W.7.

25. P.W.8 is the Investigating Officer. This witness admitted that on 27.03.1991 at about 05.00 P.M., he recorded the fardbeyan of Ramjhari Devi at Agapur Chowk and got registered a case in connection with the murder of Sahdeo Paswan. This witness also claimed that he took the charge of investigation of the aforesaid case. This witness further admitted that he did not find any bicycle



on the place of the occurrence, nor any mark of dragging over the place of the occurrence. This witness also claimed that the dead body was recovered in the same night but due to paucity of light, he could not prepare the inquest report. This witness also admitted that there was no mark of identification on the aforesaid dead body. This witness failed to remember as to whether he had seen the dead body of Sahdeo Paswan. However, this witness further admitted that he had seen the injury on the person of the appellant no.1 and the aforesaid injury had been caused by the accused of Mansoorchak P.S. Case No.20 of 1991. This witness also admitted that the dead body of the deceased Sahdeo Paswan was found in a bush, situated at the distance of 30-35 Gauge from the house of the appellant no.1. This witness also admitted that P.W.7 had not shown any bicycle to him.

The statement of this witness goes to show that he was at Agapur Chowk at about 05.00 P.M. on the alleged date of the occurrence and prior to the institution of Bhagwanpur (Mansoorchak) P.S. Case No.21 of 1991, one Sahdeo Paswan was killed and Mansoorchak P.S. Case No.20 of 1991 had already been registered against the family members of P.W.7. Ext.A goes to show that the appellant Arjun Thakur had disclosed to the informant of Mansoorchak P.S. Case No.20 of 1991 about the occurrence, levelling allegation against the family members of P.W.7 and, therefore, the possibility of false implication of the appellant Arjun Thakur and others by P.W.7 cannot be ruled out. Moreover, we also



find that the identity of recovered dead body also could not be established because the conduct of P.W.7 after recovery of the aforesaid dead body creates doubt about this fact that the recovered dead body was of the father of P.W.7 and, therefore, in the aforesaid circumstance, we are of the view that the prosecution could not succeed to prove its case beyond all shadows of reasonable doubts and the appellants are entitled to get the benefit of doubt.

26. On the basis of the aforesaid discussions, this appeal is allowed and the impugned Judgment of conviction and sentence order are, hereby, set aside. The appellants are acquitted of the charges. The appellants are on bail. They are discharged from the liabilities of their respective bails bonds.

(Hemant Kumar Srivastava, J)

(Rajendra Kumar Mishra, J)

**Pradeep
Srivastava/-**

AFR/NAFR	AFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	26.11.2018.
Transmission Date	26.11.2018.

