

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Appeal (DB) No.10 of 2014

(Arising out of Judgment dated 2nd November 2013 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge,
Sheikhpura in connection with S.T. No. 477/2012/G.R. No. 89/2010 arising out of Sheikhpura P.S.
Case No. 27/2010)

=====

Bablu Yadav S/O Late Sita Ram Yadav Resident Of Village- Lodipur,
P.O.- Dheosa, P.S.- Sheikhpura (O.P. Kosumbha), District- Sheikhpura
..... Appellant

Versus

The State Of Bihar

..... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Chandra Mohan Jha

For the Respondent/s : Mr. S.C. Mishra, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

And

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD)

Date: 12-04-2018

Heard learned counsel for the appellant and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor representing the State.

2. This criminal appeal has been preferred for setting
aside the judgment dated 2nd November 2013 passed by learned
Additional Sessions Judge, Sheikhpura (hereinafter referred to
as the “learned Trial Court”) in S.T. No. 477/2012/G.R. No.
89/2010 arising out of Sheikhpura P.S. Case No. 27/2010
registered on 13.02.2010 at 7.00 p.m. The sole appellant in the
present case has been convicted under Section 302/34 of the



Indian Penal Code as also under Section 27 of the Arms Act and has been ordered to undergo a sentence of life imprisonment for the offences committed under Section 302/34 of the I.P.C. and further sentence to rigorous imprisonment for 5 years under Section 27 of the Arms Act. He has also been sentenced to pay Rs. 20,000/- as compensation and in default to further undergo simple imprisonment for one year. All the sentences have been ordered to run concurrently.

3. The prosecution case as appearing from the written report submitted by one Suresh Yadav (P.W.10) is that he was residing with his brother-in-law namely Bijendra Yadav (deceased). He was looking after the work of his brother-in-law Mukhiya Bijendra Yadav. He alleged that on 30.02.2010 at 11.45 a.m. while he was sitting near Lohia Bhawan at Village Barui Mushahari along with Bijendra Mukhiya Jee, Gautam Yadav, son of Ramdeo Yadav and Chhathu Yadav, son of Dular Yadav, two motorcycle born criminals one on the red colour Passion and one TVS Motorcycle came. They stopped five steps ahead from the place where the informant and others were sitting. It is alleged that from Hero Honda Passion Motorcycle, Brijnandan Yadav, son of Gaya Yadav resident of village Bhadaus and Bablu



Yadav son of not known resident of Lodipur, (Fufera brother of Brijnandan Yadav) came down, from the second Motorcycle Vijay yadav resident of village – Mahadeo Nagar came, the drivers of both the Motorcycles could not be identified. According to the informant, three persons were there on the Passion Motorcycle while the two were riding on the TVS Motorcycle. Informant alleged that as soon as Brijnandan Yadav came down, he took out country made pistol and said that Mukhiya should not flee away, fire quickly, on this Mukhiya Jee wanted to flee away but Vijay Yadav took out his pistol from his waist and fired upon him. The said shot hit Mukhiya Jee on his back, he fell down. Brijnandan and Bablu came running and in the same position they fired shot on Mukhiya Jee which hit on his head. It is further alleged that the two unknown motorcycle drivers had kept the vehicle in start up condition, all the accused persons fled away by the motorcycle towards Muraina Village in northern direction. Informant further alleged that on hearing the sound of firing people from nearby areas assembled and they saw the accused fleeing away. The informant has further stated that with the help of the villagers he took the injured to the clinic of Dr. K.P. Singh, but Dr. K.P. Singh referred him to



Patna for better treatment. On way to Patna, Mukhiya Jee died. The informant alleged that some more people are involved behind the murder of Mukhiya Jee.

4. On the basis of the written report of Suresh Yadav (informant) Sheikhpura P.S. Case No. 0027/2010 was registered on the same day at about 7.00 p.m. After investigation, police submitted a charge-sheet on 29.05.2011 against the absconder accused Bablu Yadav (the appellant). Later on the police arrested this appellant Bablu Yadav on 24.06.2011. After taking cognizance, the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate committed the case to the court of sessions for trial.

5. The defence of the accused was that no occurrence in the manner, as alleged by the prosecution, took place, the deceased was killed by some unknown as he was a person having criminal antecedents but in order to settle personal grudge which the informant and others were having towards this accused, they falsely implicated him. The appellant also took a plea that on the alleged date and time of occurrence he was not present at so called place of occurrence rather he had gone to village Prabhu Bigha, P.S. – Sheikhpura situated at a distance of only 17-18 k.m., in this regard, D.W.2 namely, Sanjay



Kumar has been introduced as one of the defence witnesses. During his statement under Section 313 Cr.P.C., the appellant has admitted that Brijnandan Yadav (co-accused) is his maternal brother but he has further stated that he does not know Vijay Yadav (co-accused).

6. The prosecution examined as many as 14 witnesses. Out of 14 witnesses, while Suresh Yadav (informant) has deposed as P.W.10, Savita Kumari, wife of the deceased has deposed as P.W.11. Dr. M.P. Singh, who was at the relevant time posted as Medical Officer, Sadar Hospital, Sheikhpura was examined as P.W.12 who has stated that he had done the primary treatment of the deceased Bijendra Yadav and had referred him to PMCH. Upendra Kumar (P.W.13) was the Incharge of the Police Station at Sheikhpura on 13.02.2010 who has stated that he had taken up the investigation of the case, had visited the place of occurrence and the house of the deceased. He had prepared the inquest report which was marked as Exhibit-4. He has also proved the formal F.I.R. recorded in the signature of literate Constable Baiju Singh which has been marked as Exhibit – 2/2. Investigating Officer has proved the seizure list showing that he had collected the blood



stained soil from the place of occurrence and the front portion of the cartridge which was in pressed condition. The seizure list was not attached with the case diary, however the Investigating Officer has stated about these facts based on the entry made in the case diary. Investigating Officer had examined the informant at the police station after lodging the first information report and the prosecution witnesses Gautam Yadav, Chathu Yadav were also examined by the Investigating Officer. He had also gone to the clinic of Dr. Mrigendra Prasad Singh and had recorded his statement. He had also recorded the statement of Ashok Kumar.

7. He has testified on the identification of the place of occurrence and has given the description of the place where the alleged occurrence took place. This witness has proved the seizure list Exhibit- 1 & 2. In paragraph 39 of his cross examination, he has stated that he was producing the seized articles after receiving the same from Malakhana In-Charge. The blood-stained soil and the half portion of cartridge were produced in the court. Srikant Mandal is another witness who has deposed as P.W.14. P.W.14 was the Officer-in-Charge of the Sheikhpura Police Station. He had received the further charge of



investigation from the I.O. Upendra Kumar. He had submitted the charge-sheet against this appellant, who was an absconding accused. He has proved Exhibit-5 & 5/1 respectively. The post mortem report of the deceased has been proved as Exhibit-3. The post mortem report shows that the dead body of the deceased was received at 3.05 a.m. on 14.02.2010 and in course of post mortem the doctor found wound of entry $\frac{1}{2}$ " x $\frac{1}{2}$ " right upper forehead into cavity deep and another wound of entry $\frac{1}{2}$ " x $\frac{1}{2}$ " into parietal cavity deep at right side of lumbar vertebra of back. On dissection one bullet was found on scalp side and second bullet was also found which were handed over to police. P.W.6, Dr. Yogendra Prasad Diwakar has proved the post mortem report. He had mentioned the nature of injuries caused by fire-arm.

8. The defence examined Tarun Yadav (DW.1), Sanjai Kumar (DW.2), Shibu Yadav (DW.3), Rajesh Kumar (DW.4) and Chandan Kumar (DW.5) who have stated that they were present with the deceased at the time of occurrence. According to the defence witnesses Bijendra Yadav was killed but they could not trace out the name of the killers and could not identify the miscreants.



9. The learned trial court examined the prosecution witnesses and the exhibits brought on their behalf as well as the defence evidences. The trial court did not find any dispute as regard the date of occurrence, time of occurrence, place of occurrence and manner of occurrence, thus, the only question which remained open for consideration was as to who committed the murder of Mukhiya Bijendra Yadav.

10. P.W.1 Chathu Yadav, P.W.4 Gautam Kumar, P.W.5 Ashok Kumar, P.W.7 Binod Yadav, P.W.10 Suresh Yadav (informant) and P.W.11 Savita Kumari have been believed to be the star witnesses of the prosecution. These witnesses have claimed that they are the eye witnesses to the occurrence. They have stated that after fell down of Bijendra Yadav, Brijnandan Yadav and Bablu Yadav also fired shots which hit on his head and then they fled away. The witnesses have admitted that several criminal cases were pending against the deceased along with other prior to the occurrence. P.W.1, P.W.4, P.W.5 are the co-villagers and they were the persons sitting with the deceased near Lohia Bhawan and they have seen the occurrence.

11. The trial court found that the witnesses have given the graphic version of the occurrence which finds



corroboration from the medical report proved by the medical officer (P.W.6). Dr. Mrigendra (P.W.12) has admitted that he had given the first aid and had referred the injured Bijendra Yadav to PMCH but he had succumbed to his injuries on way. P.W.5 Ashok Kumar also identified the accused Bablu Yadav (appellant). P.W.7 Binod Yadav has also claimed that he was sitting with the deceased at the time of occurrence. He has stated that this appellant had also fired.

12. Savita Kumari (P.W.11) who is the wife of the deceased is not an eye witness but as a hearsay witness she has stated that 3 ½ years ago at about 12 noon while she was inside her house, her Nandosi informed her that the accused persons has killed her husband. She has further stated that her husband used to tell her that three persons are adamant to kill him. She has stated that there was enmity due to Hill.

13. The trial court while examining the evidence of the I.O. (P.W.13) has noticed that there appears some latches on the part of the I.O. in not taking pain to send the seized bullet or the blood-stained soil of the cloth of the deceased to Forensic Science Laboratory (in short the "FSL"). However, the learned trial court found that in the present case the



prosecution has been able to bring evidences through its witnesses that at the time of alleged murder, the accused Bablu Yadav (appellant) was present along with the other co-accused persons, and he had also fired shots which hit on the head of the deceased. The learned trial court observed that if the accused wanted the court to believe that at that time he was at village Prabhu Bigha, he was legally required to produce the reliable evidence in support of his defence, but the accused has not been able to discharge his burden in terms of Section 103 of the Evidence Act. The trial court was therefore unable to believe that the appellant was in village Prabhu Bigha on the alleged date and time of occurrence in order to attend the so-called ceremony of 'Faldaan' scheduled to be held on 13.02.2010 in a village which was situated only at a distance of 5-7 k.m. from his village. The plea of alibi was thus rejected.

14. In order to assail the findings of the learned trial court, learned counsel representing the appellant has attempted to raise a number of grounds beginning from the timing of registration of F.I.R. It is submitted that the information was received at police station about the occurrence at about 12.00 noon but it has not been brought on record. The



submission is that report which was on police station was signed by one Manoj Yadav (not examined) and signed by informant (P.W.10) on 13.10.2010 at 7.00 p.m. but the Investigating Officer reached the place of occurrence at 12.00 noon itself and remained at the place of occurrence up to 7.00 p.m., it is his submission that till that time name of any of the criminal was not disclosed by anyone. It is further submitted that the inquest report (Exhibit-4) was prepared in the village of the deceased in the Aangan of his house even prior to submission of written report i.e. at 5.00 p.m. on 13.02.2010. It is also submitted that Exhibit-5 i.e. seizure list was prepared by I.O. on 13.02.2010 at 13.30 hours where he seized the blood and earth from the place of occurrence. It is stated that both the seizure list witnesses namely Ramchandra Manjhi and Bhonu Manjhi have not been examined by prosecution and in the seizure list apart from the blood and earth there is seizure of front portion of cartridge. Another seizure list was prepared on 13.02.2010 at 6.30 p.m. in the clinic of Dr. M.P. Singh in which witnesses are Surjeet Kumar and Awadhesh Kumar but both were not examined. It is in this seizure list the shirt of the deceased with fire-arm injury was seized.



15. It is thus submission of learned counsel representing the appellant that much prior to lodging of the present written report at police station at 7.00 p.m. the Investigating Officer had already started the investigation and had gone to the place of occurrence and prepared the seizure list at 1.30 p.m.

16. Further submission of learned counsel representing the appellant is that Savita Kumari P.W.11 has stated in her deposition that prior to lodging the case there was consultation in which Suresh Yadav (P.W.10), Chathu (P.W.1) and Binod Yadav (P.W.7) were present and she has further stated in the same paragraph that newspaper, TV Channel people had also arrived at that time but she did not remember whether she had disclosed the name of any of the accused or not. It is submitted that the I.O. (P.W.13) has stated in deposition that people had stated him that they saw the accused persons fleeing away but he had not conducted Test Identification Parade (in short 'TIP'). He has further stated that no witness have claimed to identify the person. It is also pointed out that according to I.O., in paragraph 33 name of one Ganga Yadav of village Kasaur had also transpired in the said murder.



He has stated that on 13.02.2010 he learnt the name of accused and from 12.00 noon to 7.00 p.m. he was at the place of occurrence and during this period no one disclosed the name of accused, no one disclosed about the occurrence.

17. Learned counsel further submits that according to I.O. several persons had arrived on his arrival but informant, witnesses and deceased were not at the place of occurrence because the place of occurrence is at another place whereas the house of the deceased where the dead body was found is a different place. He has stated that prior to 7.00 p.m. telephonic information was given to him on the basis of which station diary entry no. 288/2010 was instituted at 12.00 noon but the said station diary entry is not before him. He has stated that in the telephonic message which was received at 12.00 noon name of none of the accused was disclosed. The appellant has also sought to point out that there are inconsistencies in the statement of P.W.4 and P.W.5 as also P.W.10 in the matter of disclosure of the names of the accused to the I.O. According to the appellant the I.O. reached the place of occurrence at 12.00 noon and remained there up to 7.00 p.m. but during this period the name of the accused were not disclosed to him by any of



the persons present there. P.W.4 has claimed that police reached at the place of occurrence after 20 minutes of the occurrence and he, Chathu (P.W.1) and Suresh (P.W.10) got their statement recorded. According to the prosecution, the I.O. had already started investigation and had prepared the seizure list and inquest report, whereas the written report giving rise to first information report was filed at police station only at 7.00 p.m., and therefore, the written report will not be admissible in law and will be hit under section 162 Cr.P.C. Reliance in this regard has been placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of State of Andhra Pradesh Vs. Punati Ramalu and others reported in AIR 1993 SC 2644 and Deo Pujan Thakur and others Vs. State of Bihar reported in 2005 (1) PLJR 446.

18. The appellant has seriously doubted the prosecution evidences by pointing out the discrepancies in the statement of the informant (P.W.10), Chathu Yadav (P.W.1), Gautam Yadav (P.W.4), Ashok Kumar (P.W.5) and Binod Yadav (P.W.7). It is submitted that the station diary entry no. 288/2010 has not been brought on record by the prosecution and the statement of the witnesses at the earliest stage have not been brought on the record. It is pointed out that P.W.10 has, in the



F.I.R., mentioned only two persons were sitting along with him apart from the deceased at the place of occurrence. The submission is that none of the aforesaid witnesses were present at the place of occurrence or saw the alleged occurrence and this fact is further supported from the fact that all these witnesses claimed to be related with the deceased. It is the submission of learned counsel representing the appellant that non-disclosure about the occurrence at the earliest stage is fatal to the prosecution as has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of State of Gujarat Vs. Patel Mohan Mulgi reported in 1994 Cr.L.J. 280 and Satguru Singh Vs. State of Punjab reported in AIR 1995 SC 2449.

19. Further submission of learned counsel representing the appellant is that the earliest version which was received at police station on 13.02.2010 at 12.00 noon on the basis of which station diary entry no. 288/10 was instituted has been suppressed by the prosecution. It has been pointed out that P.W.4 has stated that after 20 minutes of the occurrence police arrived at the place of occurrence and at that time police recorded his statement as well as statement of Chathu (P.W.1) and Suresh (P.W.10). This statement has been withheld by the



prosecution, similarly P.W.10 (informant) has stated that when Daroga Jee arrived he got the application written by Manoj Yadav and gave the same to the police. He has stated that at the village where place of occurrence is situated he gave his statement to the police on the basis of which this case was instituted. All these statement has been withheld by the prosecution.

20. Reliance in this regard has been placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs. State of Rajasthan reported in 2000 Cr.L.J. 2982 and Kanhaiya Mishir vs. State of Bihar reported in AIR 2001 (SC) 1113. Referring to the statement of some of the prosecution witnesses, learned counsel submits that the independent witnesses who have been produced by the prosecution and whose houses is situated near the place of occurrence or who were working at the place of occurrence are P.W.2, P.W.8 and P.W.9. P.W.2 has stated that at the time of occurrence he was by the side of Lohia Bhawan where Shibu (not examined), Kailash (not examined) were sitting and at that time one motorcycle on which three persons arrived and fired two rounds at Bijendra Yadav. These witnesses have stated that the accused



Bablu Yadav who is in the dock was not amongst the accused and he was not present at the P.O. P.W.8 Ram Briksha Ram had seen the miscreants fleeing away but failed to identify them.

21. Relying upon the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Javed Masood vs. State of Rajasthan reported in AIR 2010 (SC) 979 and Sanjay Paswan vs. State of Bihar reported in 2012(1) PLJR (SC) 252, learned counsel for the appellant would submit that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that if the prosecution witnesses stated about the innocence of the accused and their evidence was not challenged by the prosecution, it would be binding on the prosecution.

22. On the point of motive, learned counsel for the appellant has submitted that P.W.5 has stated that in the month of December 2009 Bablu Yadav had a quarrel with the deceased but this witness has further stated that he cannot say about the date and month. P.W.10 has stated that there was dispute of business with Brijnandan, Bablu and Vijay Yadav one month prior to the alleged occurrence. P.W. 5 has stated that the dispute was over the Hill (Pahar) with Bablu Yadav and Brijnandan Yadav and P.W.7 has also stated the same, but according to learned counsel representing the appellant the



prosecution has miserably failed to substantiate the said motive and in the statement under Section 313 Cr.P.C. also no question was put to the accused on the question of the said motive. It is submitted that in the case of Ayodhya Sah vs. State of Bihar reported in 1988 (Crime) 749, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that once a motive was introduced by the prosecution, it is his duty to satisfy the conscience of the court in this regard. Reliance has also been placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Sharad Birdichand Sarda vs. State of Maharashtra reported in AIR 1984 SC 1622; wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has laid down that the circumstances that appellant has motive to commit murder has not been put to the accused under Section 313 Cr.P.C. and therefore that circumstance cannot be used against the appellant.

23. Learned counsel for the appellant has submitted that in the present case it is evident from the evidence available on the record that P.W.1, 4, 5, 7 and 10 have actually not seen the occurrence.

24. On the other hand, learned counsel representing the State has submitted that that the prosecution has been able to discharge it's liability and the learned trial court has correctly



arrived on a conclusion that the evidences available on the record is giving graphic picture of the entire occurrence and no material contradictions could be found in the deposition of the prosecution witnesses.

25. It is submitted that the I.O. has explained the reason for delay in registration of the F.I.R. as he was busy in preparing the inquest report and sending the dead body for post mortem. It is also pointed out that the evidences would show that the injured Bijendra Yadav was first brought to the clinic of Dr. Mrigendra Pd. Singh from where he was referred to PMCH, Patna and the informant and other prosecution witnesses were taking him Patna but on the way Bijendra Yadav succumbed to his injuries. Thus, when the police reached at the place of occurrence, the dead body was not there and the inquest report was later on prepared in the Aangan of the deceased.

26. It is also submitted that even though the investigation is lacking on some scientific aspects as the blood stained cloths and the cartridge were not sent to FSL but it is to be remembered that this is not a case of circumstantial evidence rather it is a case where several eye witnesses are available and they have fully explained the manner of



occurrence. It is also submitted that the prosecution has not suppressed the earliest version of the prosecution case and the submission of learned counsel for the appellant on this issue is not pointing out to any material contradictions in the evidence of the prosecution witnesses. It is further submitted that the Hon'ble Apex Court has repeatedly held that only because the prosecution witness is related to the deceased, his testimony cannot be discarded out rightly. On the point of motive also the prosecution submits that the motive behind killing is apparent as there is no denial of fact and cross examination on the point that the appellant was not having any dispute over the Mountain (Hill) with the deceased.

27. So far as the judgments relied upon on behalf of the appellant are concerned, it is the submission of learned Additional Public Prosecutor that the propositions of law as laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court are not in quarrel in the present case, however the judgments are applied in the facts and circumstances of a particular case and so far as the facts of this case are concerned, the submission of the learned counsel representing the appellant based on the judicial pronouncements cited on his behalf would not be acceptable on



the face of the glaring evidences indicating the guilt of the accused (appellant) beyond all reasonable doubts.

28. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State has pointed out that in paragraph 13 of his cross examination, the I.O. has stated that he had lodged Sanha Entry vide Sanha Entry No. 288/2010 and the same is entered in the case diary. Once it is explained by the I.O., the defence has not challenged it further in course of cross examination. The I.O. has also explained that when he reached the place of occurrence, many people were assembled there, but the informant, witness or the dead body was not available on the place of occurrence. He has stated that he had prepared the inquest report after registering the first information report.

29. Having heard learned counsel for the appellant as well as learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State and on perusal of the evidence available on the record, we find that the defence has not been able to draw any material contradictions in the evidence of the prosecution witnesses. P.W.4 Gautam Yadav has narrated the manner of occurrence and has also proved his signature on the written report submitted by Suresh Yadav (informant) which has been marked as Exhibit-2. He has



stated that police reached at the place of occurrence 20 minutes after the alleged occurrence, at that time the dead body was not there. He has however stated that police had recorded his statement, he had identified the signature on the written report on which his signature was present. In paragraph 15 of his cross examination he has stated that he had signed on the first information report and no other document. P.W.5 has also supported the version of P.W.4. He has narrated the story in similar manner as has been stated by P.W.4. He has denied the suggestion that he had not disclosed to police that at the time of alleged occurrence he was sitting near the Lohia Bhawan in his village. He has further denied the suggestion of the defence that he had reported to police that at the time of occurrence he was sitting at the crusher of Binod and had heard the sound of firing from there. P.W.6 Dr. Yogendra Kumar Diwakar has proved the post mortem report of the deceased. He was posted as Medical Officer at Sadar Hospital, Munger. He had found two bullets from the dead body which were handed over to police. Two injuries were found by him on the dead body of deceased. P.W.7 Binod Yadav had also supported the prosecution and had also proved on the point of motive. This witness has stated that



the accused persons were asking Mukhiya not to participate in the auction process of Hill (Pahar) and a quarrel had taken place one month ago. This witness has stated in paragraph 4 that he is not related to the deceased Bijendra Yadav. He had denied the suggestion of the defence that he happened to be the Fufera brother of the deceased. He is also not a lessee of the Hill (Pahar). He had not participated in the auction of the Hill (Pahar). He has stated that his statement was recorded by police on 13.02.2010. This witness has identified this appellant and has alleged that he had fired on the head of the deceased. P.W.8 is Ram Briksha Ray who has not seen the assailant but has stated that three boys had come on a motorcycle and he had seen them fleeing away. P.W.9 has also not identified the assailant but is consistent on the point that three persons had come on the motorcycle. P.W.10 is the informant and brother-in-law of the deceased. He has supported his case. The informant has stated that he had disclosed the name of the accused to the Officer-in-Charge but had not disclosed the father's name. He has stated that his statement was recorded at the place of occurrence. On scrutiny of all these prosecution evidences, we are unable to find any material contradictions in the evidences



of the prosecution and therefore the view taken by the learned trial court, in our considered opinion, is not fit to be interfered with.

30. Learned Trial Court has rightly appreciated the entire materials available on the record. Finding no material contradictions in the evidences, we are unable to interfere with the judgment of the learned Trial Court.

31. The appeal, therefore, fails, and is dismissed, accordingly.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ.)

Rajeev/-

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J.)

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	03.05.2018
Transmission Date	03.05.2018

