

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Appeal (DB) No.958 of 2012

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-37 Year-2001 Thana- Bihariganj District- Madhepura

Suresh Yadav , Son of Late Kamleshwari Yadav, Resident Of Village-
Mohanpur Chaumukh, P.S.- Bihariganj, District Madhepura.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

with

Criminal Appeal (DB) No. 787 of 2012

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-37 Year-2001 Thana- Bihariganj District- Madhepura

Bindu Devi , wife of Suresh Prasad Yadav, Resident Of Village- Mauza
Mohanpur Chaukukh, P.S.- Bihariganj, District - Madhepur.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

with

Criminal Appeal (DB) No. 855 of 2012

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-37 Year-2001 Thana- Bihariganj District- Madhepura

Bhupendra Yadav , son of Late Sumrit Yadav , Resident Of Village- Mauza-
Mohanpur Chaumukh, P.S.- Bihariganj, District- Madhepura

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

(In Criminal Appeal (DB) No. 958 of 2012)

For the Appellant/s : Sri Kanhaiya Prasad Singh, Sr. Advocate

Mrs. Arpana Kumari, A.P.P.

Sri Prateek Mishra, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Sri Ajay Mishra, A.P.P



For the informant : Sri Parmeshwar Mehta, Advocate

(In Criminal Appeal (DB) No. 787 of 2012)

For the Appellant/s : Sri Shekhar Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Sri Ajay Mishra, A.P.P.

For the informant : Sri Parmeshwar Mehta, Advocate

(In Criminal Appeal (DB) No. 855 of 2012)

For the Appellant/s : Sri Shekhar Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Sri Ajay Mishra, A.P.P.

For the informant : Sri Parmeshwar Mehta, Advocate

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR)**

Date : 11-12-2018

1. Aforesaid three appellants in three Appeals were tried together, convicted and sentenced by a common judgment of the trial court and as such aforesaid three Appeals were heard together and are being disposed of by this common judgment.

2. All the three appellants by judgment dated – 07.07.2012 were convicted for commission of offence under Sections 302/307/34 of the Indian Penal Code 1860 [hereinafter referred to as the " I.P.C. "] and Section 27 (1)/35 of the Arms Act, 1959 [hereinafter referred to as the " Arms Act"] and by order dated- 17.07.2012 all the appellants under Section 302/34 of the I.P.C. were sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for life and to pay a fine of Rs. 50,000/- each. In default in payment of



fine they were directed to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for three years. Under Section 27 (1) of the Arms Act all the appellants were sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for three years. No separate sentence was given under Section 307/34 of the I.P.C. All the sentences were directed to run concurrently. The appellants were tried in Sessions Trial No. 41 of 2004 by Dr. Ram Lakhan Yadav, learned Additional Sessions Judge Ist, Madhepura (hereinafter referred to as the "trial judge").

3. Short fact of the case is that on 17.08.2001 at 7.30 A.M. Sub Inspector of Police Sri Suresh Chandra Prasad [not examined] of Bihariganj Police Station recorded fardbyan of Sushil Yadav/ P.W. 6. The said fardbyan was recorded in the clinic of Dr. B.K. Singh, Bihariganj. Informant gave his fardbyan in presence of his co- villager: Priyadarshi Nalin / P.W. 4 and his injured son namely: Rajesh Kumar in the clinic of Dr. Veer Kunwar Singh. He disclosed that on the same day in the morning at 7.00 A.M. his son – Rajesh Kumar with his younger brother – Nitish Kumar (P.W. 1) and neighbourer- Dinesh Kumar (not examined) after attending call of nature was returning from Southern side. At that very time the informant opposite to his house near a well was cleaning his face. He saw that his son Rajesh Kumar while reached near the house of Suresh Yadav



[appellant in Cr. Appeal (D.B.) No. 958 of 2012] on the brick soling road, Suresh Yadav, Bhupendra Yadav and son of Suresh Yadav namely - Barun Kumar @ Mantu Yadav caught hold of his son- Rajesh Kumar and thereafter they started to drag him towards his house whereupon his son -Rajesh Kumar started raising hulla. His younger son- Nitish Kumar and Dinesh Kumar by raising alarm started fleeing away. The informant thereafter by raising alarm ran towards the road. Informant heard that Suresh Yadav loudly using filthy language said that this is the person due to whom he lost Panchayat Election and as such he is to be finished. Thereafter he asked Bindu Devi [appellant in Cr. Appeal (D.B.) No. 787 of 2012] to bring loaded masket. Bindu Devi brought loaded masket and handed over the same to her husband (Suresh Yadav) and said as to what they were looking, immediately kill him whereupon Suresh Yadav with a view to kill the son of the informant Rajesh Kumar gave shot of firing which hit his son and due to the said injury he fell down. The informant and others tried to prevent them. Then son of Suresh Yadav namely Barun Kumar @ Mantu Yadav fired from his arm which he was carrying in his hand i.e. three-not on the informant and his son- Nitish however the shot did not hit them and passed from their side. After giving shot of firing Barun forcibly took wrist watch of Rajesh Kumar



and fled away. On alarm being raised by informant and others number of villagers arrived there. After giving shot of firing all the accused persons fled away. In the meanwhile 3-4 unknown associates of Suresh Yadav were also seen fleeing away however the informant could not identify them. The informant carried his son Rajesh Kumar with the help of his family members, Priyadarshi Nalin/ P.W. 4, Sunil Kumar Yadav – P.W. 5, Rajo Yadav (not examined), Bishundeo Yadav- P.W. 2 firstly near to his house on road. He noticed that his son had received injury on the cheek and profused bleeding had come and his son was in unconscious state of mind. The injured thereafter was carried for his treatment to Bihariganj in the clinic of Dr. Veer Kunwar Singh where treatment was going. The informant claimed that the occurrence was seen by Nitish Kumar / P.W. 1, Dinesh Kumar (not examined), Priyadarshi Nalin – P.W. 4, Bishundeo Yadav / P.W. 2, Sunil Kumar Yadav / P.W. 5, Rajo Yadav (not examined) and number of other persons who will explain on being asked. The reason for the occurrence that was given by the informant was Panchayat Election. The informant claimed that Suresh Yadav, Barun Kumar @ Mantu Yadav, Bhupendra Yadav, Bindu Devi and 3-4 unknown accused persons with common intention and conspiracy with a view to kill his son had given shot of firing and



also abused. The said fardbyan was read over to him in presence of his co-villager: Priyadarshi Nalin and then he put his signature. As a witness to the fardbyan Priyadarshi Nalin / P.W. 4 also put his signature. On the basis of the said fardbyan on the same day i.e. 17.08.2001 at 9.00 A.M. a formal F.I.R. vide Bihariganj P.S. Case No. 37 of 2001 was registered for the offence under Sections 341, 342, 307, 504 , 379 /34 of the I.P.C. and Section 27 of the Arms Act against four named accused persons which includes the three appellants and son of appellant – Suresh Yadav namely – Barun Kumar @ Mantu Yadav and 3-4 unknown accused persons. Since the injured died, in F.I.R. Section 302 of the I.P.C. was added on 23.08.2001.

4. After registering formal F.I.R. the Investigating Officer investigated the case and during investigation accusation against- Suresh Yadav and Barun Kumar @ Mantu was firstly found true and as such on 23.11.2001 charge sheet was submitted against them. After submission of charge sheet on 28.11.2001 learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Madhepura took cognizance of offense. Thereafter on 31.08.2002 supplementary charge sheet was submitted against- Bhupendra Yadav [appellant in Cr. Appeal (D.B.) No. 855 of 2012]. Since Police had not sent up Bindu Devi for trial a protest petition was filed and thereafter learned



Chief Judicial Magistrate after completing other formalities by order dated 23.09.2002 issued processes against Bindu Devi. Thereafter, after supply of Police Papers on 31.01.2004 the case was committed to the court of Sessions and as such it was numbered as Sessions Trial No. 41 of 2004. In the case on 13.10.2006 jointly charge was framed against all the four accused which includes the three appellants for offence under Sections 302/34, 307/34 of the I.P.C. and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

5. During the trial plea of juvenility was taken on behalf of one of the accused namely- Barun Kumar @ Mantu and thereafter the learned trial judge of-course convicted all the four accused persons who were put on trial, considering the claim of juvenility the case of Mantu Yadav was referred to Juvenile Justice Board, Madhepura and finally judgment of conviction and sentence was passed in respect of aforesaid three appellants.

6. During the trial to prove its case on behalf of the prosecution altogether nine witnesses were examined. Out of them, P.W. 1 / Nitish Kumar [brother of the deceased], P.W. 2 / Bishundeo Yadav (co-villager), P.W. 3 / Birendra Kumar (co-villager), P.W. 4 / Priyadarshi Nalin (distant agnate of the informant), P.W. 5 – Sunil Kumar Yadav (agnate of the informant) and P.W. 6 - Sushil Yadav [informant & father of the deceased]



were examined as eye witnesses to the occurrence. P.W. 7 / Ganesh Mukhiya [co-villager] is a hearsay witness. P.W. 8 / Dr. Gulam Mustafa, who on 19.08.2001 was posted as Civil Assistant Surgeon, Sadar Hospital, Madhepura and at 10.00 A.M. had conducted post -mortem examination on the dead body of the deceased and P.W. 9 – Surendra Nath Singh who was posted on 17.08.2001 as Sub Inspector of Police in Bihariganj Police Station was entrusted with investigation of the case who investigated the case and submitted charge sheet with the approval of senior officials.

7. After completion of prosecution evidence on 10.12.2011 all the circumstances and evidences brought during the trial on record were explained to the accused persons and their statement under Section 313 of the Cr.P.C. was recorded in which they claimed innocence and also claimed about their false implication.

8. In defence also one witness was examined namely – Ram Prakash Yadav / D.W. 1. However this witness was examined on behalf of defence only regarding the claim of juvenility of Barun Kumar @ Mantu and thereafter the learned trial judge has passed the impugned judgment of conviction and sentence.



9. Sri Kanhaiya Prasad Singh, learned senior counsel assisted by Sri Prateek Mishra and Smt. Arpana Kumari, learned counsel for the appellant in Cr. Appeal (D.B.) No. 958 of 2012 has argued that it appears that due to political rivalry the appellants were falsely implicated. He submits that in the evidence the fact has come that the informant was one of the strong members of a political party which was in power at the time while occurrence had taken place. He submits that it has come that informant, appellant -Suresh and some others had fought Panchayat Election and since informant and appellant / Suresh both lost Election due to division of votes there is every possibility that informant himself had falsely implicated the appellants in a case of murder of his son who was done to death in an otherwise manner than the case of prosecution. It has further been highlighted that it is true that the injured who received injury in the morning at 7.00 on 17.8.2001 was alive till 19.8.2001 but the Investigating Officer did not bother to examine the injured or record his statement. He submits that had the Investigating Officer approached the injured and recorded his statement picture would have been different. He submits that no plausible explanation has been given for non-examination of the injured. Non- examination of Dinesh Kumar as prosecution witness has also been highlighted by Sri Singh that the



said witness was purposely withheld by the prosecution. No explanation has been given for his non -examination whereas it is case of prosecution that injured (deceased) alongwith Dinesh Kumar and one another while was returning after attending call of nature the injured was intercepted by the appellants and Dinesh Kumar and P.W. 1 – Nitish Kumar started fleeing away raising alarm. In such a situation as per Sri Singh it was mandatorily required on the part of prosecution to examine Dinesh Kumar or in case of his non- examination it was necessary to give plausible explanation for his non -examination however nothing has been done by the prosecution. It has further been argued that prosecution has not given any explanation for non-examination of two doctors who examined the injuries of the son of the informant. He submits that it is prosecution case that after Rajesh [injured son of the informant] was brought from the place of occurrence to the door of informant he was firstly carried to the clinic of Dr. B.K. Singh where while he was under treatment, fardbyan of informant was recorded and thereafter the injured was admitted in the clinic of Dr. J.V. Singh where subsequently injured succumbed to his injuries. According to Sri Singh it was necessary for the prosecution to examine those witnesses. Had those doctors been examined it would had come as to whether the injured after



getting injury was in a position to make any statement or not. It has also been highlighted that evidence of P.W. 8 / Dr. Gulam Mustafa makes it clear that in a case of giving shot of firing from close range on neck there was every possibility of instantaneous death however injured continued to be alive for two days. According to Sri Singh all the aforesaid circumstances create serious doubt on the prosecution case and as such it is a fit case to interfere with the judgment of conviction and sentence by way of extending benefit of doubt to the appellants .

10 . Sri Shekhar Kumar Singh, learned counsel who has appeared on behalf of the other two appellants adopting the submission of Sri Singh, learned senior counsel submits that though the injured was firstly examined in the clinic of Dr. B.K. Singh neither Dr. B.K. Singh was examined nor any injury report was brought on record by the prosecution. Similarly no report from the clinic of Dr. J.V. Singh has been brought on record. He further submits that during the trial specific plea of *alibi* was taken on behalf of the appellant - Bindu Devi however learned trial judge has simply ignored those evidences.

11. Sri Ajay Mishra, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposing the aforesaid Appeals has argued that during the present trial at least six witnesses who were eye witness to the



occurrence had consistently deposed in favour of the prosecution. He submits that the witnesses had stated only those facts during the trial which they had stated in their statement recorded under Section 161 of the Cr.P.C. of- course some deviation had taken place but such deviations are not enough to examine evidence of all those eye witnesses with suspicion. He submits that during investigation the Investigating Officer had also found the place of occurrence as disclosed by the informant and prosecution witnesses. He submits that it is a case that while the son of the informant along with two others was returning back from attending natural call, on a brick soling road he was caught by the appellants and from there they dragged him to the door of appellant – Suresh where gun shot injury was given. Near the premises stone chips were also piled up. The Investigating Officer had noticed huge blood at the place of occurrence which is the first place of occurrence and Investigating Officer has also stated that he had seen blood on stone chips also. Sri Mishra admits that it is true that some irregularities had been committed by the Investigating Officer that he did not chose to record the statement of the injured but fact remains that the injuries which were found during post mortem examination itself indicates that in such injury there was no possibility of making any statement by such injured.



By way of referring to the post mortem examination report i.e. Ext. 2 Sri Mishra has argued that injury was on neck. In such situation it was normally not possible to make statement by such injured. He submits that though the Investigating Officer had not preferred to record the statement of the injured but the condition of the injury of the injured is sufficient to indicate that his non- examination by the Investigating Officer was not fatal in respect of the prosecution case. On aforesaid grounds it has been argued that prosecution was able to prove its case beyond all reasonable doubts and this was the reason that the learned trial judge by detailed judgment has convicted the appellants and the judgment impugned requires no interference.

12. Sri Parmeshwar Mehta, learned counsel who has appeared on behalf of the informant adopts the submission advanced by Sri Mishra.

13. Besides hearing learned counsel for the parties, we have minutely examined entire evidence on record and after going through the same *prima facie* we are satisfied that there is no apparent error in the judgment of conviction and sentence warranting interference, however before coming to conclusion it would be necessary to first discuss the evidence of the informant i.e. P.W. 6 - Sushil Yadav who is non else but the father of the



deceased and is eyewitness to the occurrence. In his evidence P.W. 6 stated that occurrence had taken place on 17.08.2001 at 7.00 in the morning. At that very time he was cleaning his face near the well and he saw that his son -Nitish / P.W. 1, Dinesh (not examined) and Rajesh (deceased) were returning from Southern side after attending call of nature. While they reached near electric pole three accused namely - Suresh Yadav, Bhupendra, Barun @ Mantu all caught hold of Rajesh and started to drag him towards their door. Nitish and Dinesh by raising *hulla* started fleeing away and they were saying that Rajesh was caught. Thereafter, this witness ran towards the house of Suresh Yadav (appellant) and saw that Suresh, Bhupendra, Barun pulled Rajesh by dragging inside his gate. Suresh was loudly speaking that he (Rajesh deceased) was the reason due to which he lost Panchayat Election and he will kill him. Suresh asked his wife to bring loaded Masket which was kept in house . Thereafter, Bindu Devi [appellant in Cr. Appeal (DB) No. 787 of 2012] bringing Masket handed over to Suresh. Thereafter, Suresh gave one shot of firing on Rajesh which hit his cheek and Rajesh fell down and became unconscious. When this witness started raising *hulla* as to what they were doing, Barun Kumar gave shot of firing from his Three-Not (fire arm) on informant and Nitish however the said firing did



not hit either of them. At that place besides the informant , Sunil/ P.W. 5, Dinesh (not examined), Rajo (not examined), Bishundeo / P.W. 2 , Priyadarshi - P.W. 4, Birendra - P.W. 3 had also arrived then all the accused persons fled away. He further deposed that Barun had forcibly taken wrist watch of Rajesh. Thereafter by way of lifting Rajesh this witness carried him firstly to his door and then the injured was carried to the clinic of Dr. Veer Kunwar Singh in Bihariganj. From there he was referred to Udakishunganj. Then the injured was carried to Madhepura where after two days the injured succumbed to his injuries. He further stated that he gave his fardbyan to Darogaji of Bihariganj Police Station in the clinic of Dr. Veer Kunwar Singh and thereafter he put his signature on the fardbyan which was marked as Ext. 1. He also deposed that the fardbyan was signed by Priyadarshi Nalin / P.W. 4 and his signature was marked as Ext. 1/1. This witness was cross-examined at length however on going through entire evidence we do not find anything which may create any doubt on the evidence of informant - P.W. 6 rather in cross- examination every facts were reiterated by this witness. It is true that in his cross-examination he in paragraph 6 stated that he was President of one Political Party. He further stated that prior to the occurrence Panchayat Election had taken place and he was also one of the



candidates. Besides him Birendra; Kamleshwari, Suresh (appellant) were also candidates for the Mukhiya post. Kamleshwari won the said Election.

14. P.W. 1 - Nitish Kumar who was also returning back with the deceased is none else but his brother and in his presence as well as in presence of one Dinesh Kumar his brother was caught by the appellants on the brick soling road and thereafter he was dragged by the appellants to their house. In his evidence P.W. 1 / Nitish Kumar deposed that occurrence had taken place on 17.08.2001 at 7.00 in the morning. He with his brother - Rajesh Yadav and Dinesh Yadav had gone to attend call of nature and after easing out they were returning. While they reached near the house of Suresh Yadav (appellant) where there was an electric pole Suresh Yadav, Bhupendra Yadav, Barun Yadav @ Mantu Yadav came there and caught hold of Rajesh Yadav and thereafter they carried him towards his house. At the said place there were some stone chips. He raised alarm thereafter his father and other villagers came runningly and reached near the door of Suresh Yadav. Suresh Yadav asked his wife- Bindu Devi to bring loaded Masket. Bindu Devi (appellant) brought loaded Masket and handed over to Suresh Yadav. Thereafter Bindu Devi exhorted that he was the reason for defeat in the Panchayat Election and as



such she exhorted to shoot him. This witness further stated that his father was opposing however appellant- Suresh Yadav gave shot of firing from his Masket which hit near neck and cheek whereupon his brother -Rajesh Yadav fell down on Earth near the stone chips. He raised alarm then on them also Barun Yadav @ Mantu Yadav gave shot of firing however the said fire did not hit them. This witness too was cross -examined at length. It is evident that this witness also reiterated and stated regarding presence of all the witnesses at the time of occurrence. In paragraph 10 of his cross examination he stated that while Rajesh Yadav fell down about 7-8 witnesses arrived. Amongst them Priyadarshi Nalin / P.W. 4, Bishundeo Yadav - P.W. 2, Ganesh Mukhiya - P.W. 7 , Sunil Yadav / P.W. 5, Birendra Yadav / P.W. 3, Dilip Yadav (not examined) all arrived.

15. Similarly, P.W. 2 / Bishundo Yadav, P.W. 3 / Birendra Kumar and P.W. 5 / Sunil Kumar Yadav have deposed giving specific description of the occurrence showing involvement of all the appellants. Their evidence is also almost similar to the evidence of P.W. 1 and P.W. 6. They were also cross -examined at length but nothing could be extracted to create any doubt on their evidence and as such there is no need to reiterate their evidence. P.W. 7 / Ganesh Mukhiya is a co-villager and hearsay witness.



16. P.W. 8 / Dr. Gulam Mustafa on 19.08.2001 was posted as Civil Assistance Surgeon , Sadar Hospital, Madhepura and on the same day at 10.00 A.M. he conducted post mortem-examination on the dead body of the deceased and he proved the post-mortem examination report which was marked as Ext. 2. During post-mortem examination this witness had noticed the following facts :-

"(i) Stitched wound right side of neck extending from angle of mandible to sternum.

(ii) Stitched wound below chin.

On opening the muscles neck in right side damaged on large vessels of neck damaged. There was a bullet track in the neck going up to left side. Bullet found in the neck left side at acromioclavicular joint. Bullet preserved. Weapon used- fire arm.

On dissection scalp and skull - N.A.D.

Vertebra - N.A.D.

Melgranderad - N.A.D.

In my opinion death was caused by shock and haemorrhage as a result of bullet injury. Time since death - within 12 hours."

This witness was cross- examined and in his cross-examination he stated as follows: **“ It is difficult to say whether the stitched wounds were operated or not. I have not mentioned the length, width and depth of injuries no. (i) and (ii) ”.** Meaning thereby that of -course learned counsels for the appellants have tried to persuade the court that there was no charring mark on injury of the deceased whereas it was case of prosecution that firing was made from a distance of 1-2 hands but fact remains that witnesses who are eye witness to the occurrence



and their evidence is consistent and otherwise credible and as such merely on the ground of non finding of charring mark it would be quite difficult to disbelieve the prosecution evidence.

17. The Investigating Officer -P.W. 9/ Surendra Nath Singh on 17.08.2001 was posted as Sub Inspector of Police in Bihariganj Police Station and on the same day the Officer -in-charge who had recorded fardbyan had handed over investigation of the case to P.W. 9 and during investigation he prepared seizure list in respect of seizure of blood soaked soil from the place of occurrence i.e. near the door of the appellant. He also prepared inquest report which was marked as Ext. 2/1, fardbyan Ext. 1/2, endorsement on fardbyan as Ext. 1/3 . In his cross -examination in paragraph 9 he stated that near the place of occurrence on soil as well as stone chips he had noticed blood mark. He was contradicted with the statement of P.W. 4 / Priyadarshi. In paragraph 12 of cross- examination this witness has admitted that during investigation his statement was not recorded under Section 161 of the Cr.P.C. but fact remains that right from the very beginning it is case of the prosecution that this witness was present at the place of occurrence however if for the time being evidence of this witness i.e. P.W. 4 even though is ignored the prosecution has otherwise proved its case beyond all reasonable doubt .



18. On going through the entire evidence we are satisfied that the prosecution has been able to establish its case beyond all reasonable doubts. Right from the very beginning the informant is consistent regarding the manner of occurrence and how the occurrence had taken place. This witness was supported by other eye witnesses which we have discussed here-in-above. It is true that some error was committed by the Investigating Officer but fact remains that if the evidence is otherwise credible only on the ground of some irregularities committed by the Investigating Officer no benefit can be granted to an accused.

19. We do not find any error in the judgment of conviction and sentence. Accordingly judgment of conviction dated- 07.07.2012 and sentence dated- 17.07.2012 passed by Sri Dr. Ram Lakhan Yadav, learned Addl. Sessions Judge Ist , Madhepura in Sessions Trial No. 41 of 2004 (arising out of Bihariganj P.S. Case No. 37 of 2001, corresponding to G.R. Case No. 660 of 2001) is hereby approved and all the three Appeals are dismissed.

20. Since judgment of conviction and sentence has been approved and appellants – Bhupendra Yadav [in Cr. Appeal (D.B.) No. 855 of 2012] and Bindu Devi [in Cr. Appeal (D.B.) No. 787 of 2012] had earlier been granted bail, they are hereby



directed to surrender before the court below forthwith, failing which, the learned trial court shall take steps for securing their appearance.

(Rakesh Kumar, J)

(Arvind Srivastava, J)

praful/-

AFR/NAFR	AFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	20-12 -2018
Transmission Date	20-12-2018

