

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.553 of 2014**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1624 Year-2009 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE District- Jamui

Haro Ram @ Haribansh Ram, Son of Late Genhari Ram, resident of Village -
Milki, P.S. - Khaira, District - Jamui

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Neeraj Kumar @ Sanidh-Amicus Curiae
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Binod Bihari Singh-A.P.P.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ADITYA KUMAR TRIVEDI
ORAL JUDGMENT**

05-08-2019

None appears on behalf of appellant, on account thereof, Sri Neeraj Kumar @ Sanidh, learned counsel has been requested to assist the Court as an Amicus Curiae.

2. Appellant Haro Ram @ Haribansh Ram vide judgment of conviction dated 20.09.2014 and order of sentence dated 22.09.2014 passed by the 2nd Additional Sessions Judge, Jamui in Sessions Trial No.147 of 2011 arising out of Complaint Case No.1624C of 2009 has been found guilty for an offence punishable under Section 376 of the I.P.C. and sentenced to undergo S.I. for seven years as well as to pay fine appertaining to Rs.2,000/- and in default thereof, to undergo S.I. for three months, additionally.

3. For an occurrence alleged to have taken place in the night of 14.12.2009 at about 9.00 P.M. complaint has been



filed on 23.12.2009 and for that, an explanation has been given by way of introduction that during intervening period, complainant (victim) was very much engaged in convening panchayati which did not materialize, with a narration that she has been raped by Haro Ram, who intruded inside the room after removing the bamboo door. It has also been disclosed that she tried to avert the same by showing resistance and during course thereof, also sustained assault at the end of othe accused, but anyhow she raised alarm, whereupon Samar Manjhi came, seeing whom Haro Ram fled away.

4. It has also been disclosed that when panchayati did not materialize, then she had gone to police station, but as the police refused to register a case due to delay, complaint petition has been filed before the Court as instructed by the Darogaji. Accordingly, an inquiry under Section 202 of the Cr.P.C. commenced, followed with an order of cognizance, after appearance of the accused, trial commenced and concluded in a manner, subject matter of instant appeal.

5. Defence case, as is evident from mode of cross-examination as well as statement recorded under Section 313 of the Cr.P.C. is that of complete denial. It has further been pleaded that appellant/ accused happens to be Ward Commissioner of



different ward while the PW-1, Samar Manjhi, PW-3, the victim are resident of different ward. Even then, they were coercing for recommendation of an application relating to Indira Aawas Yojna as well as having her entry in B.P.L. List which has blatantly been refused at his end, whereupon threatened to face dire consequence. The aforesaid matter has already been communicated to the S.D.O. by way of filing of informatory petition as well as before the Local Sarpanch and in order to substantiate the same, apart from oral evidence, documentary evidence has also been adduced.

6. Altogether four PWs have been examined on behalf of prosecution in order to substantiate its case, who are PW-1, Samar Manjhi, PW-2, Sandeep Ravidas, PW-3, the victim and PW-4, Durga Nand Singh, a formal witness, who has exhibited the complaint petition as Exhibit-1. As is evident, victim has not been medically examined on account of considerable delay.

7. Defence has also exhibited three DWs, who are DW-1, Madan Rai, formal in nature, who has exhibited the informatory petition (Exhibit-A), DW-2, Gurudeo Yadav, who has exhibited the petition having been filed at the end of the appellant/ accused before local sarpanch (in carbon process) and



having been received by the Sarpanch Geeta Devi (signature as Exhibit-B), signature of Sarpanch over carbon copy of the inquiry report (Exhibit-C) and carbon copy of the inquiry (Exhibit-D).

8. While assailing the judgment impugned, it has been submitted at the end of learned Amicus Curiae that judgment impugned happens to be against settled principle to the law, whereupon is fit to be set aside. In order to substantiate the same, it has been submitted that being heinous offence, priority should have been by way of institution of F.I.R. as the same happens to be right path to be followed, facilitating accumulation of proper legal evidence during course of conduction of investigation, but the complainant/ victim (PW-3) motivately, intentionally foreclosed the aforesaid path and for that, an explanation has been given that on account of delay, the police refused to register a case. On the other hand, instructed to file a case before the Court, which happens to be an arrant lie.

9. In the aforesaid background, it has also been submitted that there happens to be inordinate delay and the explanation on that very score, happens to be flimsy one. So, submitted that in a criminal case, delay if not properly explained, is bound to cause severe jolt to the prosecution and



so, on that very score alone, nullify the finding so arrived at by the learned lower Court.

10. Apart from this, it has also been submitted that manner whereunder occurrence is alleged to have taken place, is not inspiring confidence, whereupon is fit to be disbelieved. In likewise manner, the witnesses, who have come forward also improbablized the version. The cumulative effect suggest luxation, whereupon the finding so recorded by the learned lower Court did not justify its prevalence, hence is fit to be set aside.

11. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor while supporting the finding recorded by the learned lower Court has submitted that so far genesis of case is concerned, that is found duly substantiated, which should also be viewed under present scenario as, no woman could put her chastity at stake by admitting rape committed over her, in ordinary course of nature, as, it happens to be a stigma over her which, she has to carry till last. Furthermore, the ground so suggested are so superficial which would not be considered for proper appreciation. Furthermore, the evidence of victim to be of paramount consideration has to be considered, and if inspires confidence. When the evidence of the victim (PW-3) is gone



through, it is evident that she has faced the ruthless cross-examination and during course thereof, substantiated the occurrence.

12. As stated above, PW-4 happens to be a formal one and so, needs no discussion. PW-1 is the co-villager, 80 years old man, during course of examination-in-chief has stated that while he had gone to ease himself, he heard sound of alarm that of victim. After hearing sound of alarm, he came to his house where he had seen all the family members sleeping after taking the supper. Then he had gone to the victim where he had seen the Haro Ram committed rape over the victim. He directed the Haro Ram not to do so, whereupon he ran there from. He identified him properly. Also identified in dock.

13. During cross-examination, he has admitted that Haro Ram is a Ward Commissioner, but the victim belongs to different panchayat and then, denied the suggestion that they were coercing to recommend Indira Aawas Yojna and on being refused, threatened over which, Haro Ram filed informatory petition before the S.D.O. as well as Sarpanch. At Para-9, he has stated that after easing himself, he returned back, consuming about 20-25 minutes. Then he has come to his house and then, to the house of the victim after burning lantern which took 45



minutes. Before coming to the place of victim, he raised alarm attracting so many neighbours Kallu, Munti Devi, Anita Devi and others. In Para-10, he has further stated that all of them heard the alarm and then, came to the house of the victim. In Para-11, he has stated that before all the villagers, victim had disclosed about the occurrence.

14. PW-2 is the son of the victim. A young chap whose age on the date of examination has been estimated as 12 years. During his examination-in-chief, he has stated that occurrence is about one year and eight months ago. It was 9.00 P.M. He was sleeping at his house. After breaking the bamboo door, Haro Ram intruded inside the house and committed sin with his mother. On hue and cry by her mother, Haro Ram escaped there from. Identified the accused. During cross-examination, he has stated at Para-5 that he used to remain at Kolkata in a capacity of being a domestic servant. In Para-6, he has stated that house of Kallu Dom, Munni Devi, Sammat Manjhi, Anita Devi lie in the vicinity of his house. In Para-6, he has stated that whether Haro Ram is Ward Commissioner or not, he does not know. At Para-8, he has stated that 10-15 persons arrived at the place where hulla was being done at village Pathak Chak. In Para-9, he has stated that he happens to be an



illiterate. His mother has accompanied him. Then has denied the suggestion that he has deposed whatever been tutored by his mother.

15. PW-3 is the victim. She has stated that the occurrence is about two years, three and half months ago, it was 9.00 P.M. At that very time, after taking supper, she was sleeping. Haro Ram made house trespass after damaging the bamboo gate and came near her and said that her husband has died on account thereof, take the money and permit him to sexual intercourse, which she blatantly refused. As a result of which, the accused lifted her from cot, lie down on the ground and then, committed rape. She became unconscious. She had raised alarm, whereupon her two sons namely Sanjeev and Praveen woke up and had seen the occurrence. They have also raised alarm. Samar Manjhi came with lantern and all of them identified the accused in the light of lantern. On the following morning, she had complained before the villagers, whereupon there was panchayati, but as Haro Ram declined to obey, then thereafter, case has been filed. It has further been disclosed that her sasural lies at Pathak Chak, but on account of death of her husband, she began to reside at her Maika. She further stated that as alternative recourse of panchayati was taken up, hence



she could not be taken proper legal recourse so much so, she failed to get herself medically examined. She has further stated that she has brought the cloth having semen stain, which she was wearing at the time of commission of the occurrence. Identified the accused. During cross-examination at Para-10, she has stated that the P.O. is village-Milky (her house). She has further stated that in the vicinity of her house, house of her caste men is also there. Then she denied the suggestion that she has spoken wrongly. At Para-11, she has stated that at the time of breaking of door, there was some sound. She could not perceive as she thought that it might be a dog or cat. Just after coming near her lot, Haro Ram indulged in grappling with her. In Para-12, she has stated that in course of grappling, she sustained hurt over her head, back, stomach. At some places, there was abrasion. Blood oozen out, but the same could not spread over her cloth nor over the ground. During course of grappling, her cloth torn. She has shown the torn cloth to the witnesses and in likewise manner, injury. In Para-13, she has stated that at the time of commission of rape, she has not sustained hurt over her waist. At that very time, her both hands were on the ground. At that very time, she was beneath Haro Ram. In Para-14, she has stated that at the time of rape, she became unconscious. She



regained sense after taking water from her son. After regaining sense, she raised alarm. In Para-15, she has stated that she understand the meaning of sexual intercourse. In Para-16, she has stated that on hulla, Samar Manjhi and her granddaughter Geeta have come. In Para-17, she has stated that accused was Ward Commissioner at the time of occurrence. Then has denied the suggestion that she is under illicit relationship with Samar Manjhi and as accused refused to recommend her application on account thereof, they both got this false case filed.

16. From the evidence of DW-1, DW-2, DW-3, it is evident that they have exhibited the informatory petition (carbon copy) as well as the application given to Sarpanch (carbon copy) and the report of the Sarpanch (carbon copy). From Exhibit-A, it is evident that it is a copy and so, how it has come having seal of S.D.O. Jamui having initial would have been explained. Whether any informatory petition was filed would have been substantiated only after having the original copy. On account of absence thereof, it looks in appropriate to rely upon the copy as its authentication happens to be under disputed one and the same consideration also happens to be with regard to Exhibit-B, C, D as Sarpanch is not at all competent enough to entertain an informatory petition and in likewise manner, inquire



into the matter, prepare the report in carbon process. Had there been, then in that circumstance, Sarpanch would have been summoned to depose as DW in order to justify whether under Gram Panchayat Act, Sarpanch is authorized to entertain such kind of petition and to prepare report in duplicate. None of DWs has stated how this carbon copy came under possession of the appellant.

17. Now, reverting back to the facts of the case, it is evident that there happens to be delay and for that, in complaint petition as well as during course of examination-in-chief, the victim has explained the same, to be on account of convening of Panchayati over which, no cross-examination has been made. Furthermore, on the factum of rape under Para-13, 14 and 15, the victim has been cross-examined and she faced the rigor substantiating the allegation, which she confronted during course of commission of the rape. There happens to be no suggestion nor there happens to be plea taken at the end of the appellant that the she was a consenting party and being major was capable to give consent rather there happens to be blatant refusal.

18. It is needless to remind that by catena of decision, it has conclusively been held that if the evidence of the



victim inspires confidence, then in that circumstance, there needs no corroboration. In ***State of Himachal Pradesh vs. Sanjay Kumar alias Sunny reported in 2017 CRI.L.J. 1443***, it has been held:-

“31.

By now it is well settled that the testimony of a victim in cases of sexual offences is vital and unless there are compelling reasons which necessitate looking for corroboration of a statement, the courts should find no difficulty to act on the testimony of the victim of a sexual assault alone to convict the accused. No doubt, her testimony has to inspire confidence. Seeking corroboration to a statement before relying upon the same as a rule, in such cases, would literally amount to adding insult to injury. The deposition of the prosecutrix has, thus, to be taken as a whole. Needless to reiterate that the victim of rape is not an accomplice and her evidence can be acted upon without corroboration. She stands at a higher pedestal than an injured witness does. If the court finds it difficult to accept her version, it may seek corroboration from some evidence which lends assurance to her version. To insist on corroboration, except in the rarest of rare cases, is to equate one who is a victim of the lust of another with an accomplice to a crime and thereby



insult womanhood. It would be adding insult to injury to tell a woman that her claim of rape will not be believed unless it is corroborated in material particulars, as in the case of an accomplice to a crime. Why should the evidence of the girl or the woman who complains of rape or sexual molestation be viewed with the aid of spectacles fitted with lenses tinged with doubt, disbelief or suspicion? The plea about lack of corroboration has no substance {See [Bhupinder Sharma v. State of Himachal Pradesh](#) (2003) 8 SCC 551}. Notwithstanding this legal position, in the instant case, we even find enough corroborative material as well, which is discussed hereinabove.”

19. In likewise manner, delay so far rape case is concerned, is bound to occur and on that score alone, it could not be brushed aside. In ***State of Punjab vs. Gurmit Singh and others reported in (1996) 2 SCC 384***, it has been held:-

“8. The grounds on which the trial court disbelieved the version of the prosecutrix are not at all sound. The findings recorded by the trial court rebel against realism and lose their sanctity and credibility. The court lost sight of the fact that the prosecutrix is a village girl. She was a student of Xth Class. It was wholly irrelevant and immaterial whether she was ignorant of the difference between



a Fiat, an Ambassador or a Master car. Again, the statement of the prosecutrix at the trial that she did not remember the colour of the car, though she had given the colour of the car in the FIR was of no material effect on the reliability of her testimony. No fault could also be found with the prosecution version on the ground that the prosecutrix had not raised an alarm while being abducted. The prosecutrix in her statement categorically asserted that as soon as she was pushed inside the car⁵ she was threatened by the accused to keep quiet and not to raise any alarm otherwise she would be killed. Under these circumstances to discredit the prosecutrix for not raising an alarm while the car was passing through the Bus Adda is travesty of justice. The court over-looked the situation in which a poor helpless minor girl had found herself in the company of three desperate young men who were threatening her and preventing her from raising any alarm. Again, if the investigating officer did not conduct the investigation properly or was negligent in not being able to trace out the driver or the car, how can that become a ground to discredit the testimony of the prosecutrix? The prosecutrix had no control over the investigating agency and the negligence of an investigating officer could not



affect the credibility of the statement of the prosecutrix. Trial Court fell in error for discrediting the testimony of the prosecutrix on that account. In our opinion, there was no delay in the lodging of the FIR either and if at all there was some delay, the same has not only been properly explained by the prosecution but in the facts and circumstances of the case was also natural. The courts cannot over-look the fact that in sexual offences delay in the lodging of the FIR can be due to variety of reasons particularly the reluctance of the prosecutrix or her family members to go to the police and complain about the incident which concerns the reputation of the prosecutrix and the honour of her family. It is only after giving it a cool thought that a complaint of sexual offence is generally lodged. The prosecution has explained that as soon as Trilok Singh PW6, father of the prosecutrix came to know from his wife, PW7 about the incident he went to the village sarpanch and complained to him. The sarpanch of the village also got in touch with the sarpanch of village Pakhowal, where in the tube well kotha of Ranjit Singh rape was committed, and an effort was made by the panchayats of the two villages to sit together and settle the matter. It was only when the Panchayats failed to provide any



relief or render any justice to the prosecutrix, that she and her family decided to report the matter to the police and before doing that naturally the father and mother of the prosecutrix discussed whether or not to lodge a report with the police in view of the repercussions it might have on the reputation and future prospects of the marriage etc. of their daughter. Trilok Singh PW6 truthfully admitted that he entered into consultation with his wife as to whether to lodge a report or not and the trial court appears to have misunderstood the reasons and justification for the consultation between Trilok Singh and his wife when it found that the said circumstance had rendered the version of the prosecutrix doubtful. Her statement about the manner in which she was abducted and again left near the school in the early hours of next morning has a ring of truth. It appears that the trial court searched for contradictions and variations in the statement of the prosecutrix microscopically, so as to disbelieve her version. The observations of the trial court that the story of the prosecutrix that she was left near the examination center next morning at about 6 a.m. was "not believable" as "the accused would be the last persons to extend sympathy to the prosecutrix" are not at all intelligible. The accused



were not showing "any sympathy" to the prosecutrix while driving her at 6.00 a.m. next morning to the place from where she had been addicted but on the other hand were removing her from the kotha of Ranjit Singh and leaving her near the examination center so as to avoid being detected. The criticism by the trial court of the evidence of the prosecutrix as to why she did not complain to the lady teachers or to other girl students when she appeared for the examination at the center and waited till she went home and narrated the occurrence to her mother is unjustified. The conduct of the prosecutrix in this regard appears to us to be most natural. The trial court over-looked that a girl, in a tradition bound non-permissive society in India, would be extremely reluctant even to admit that any incident which is likely to reflect upon her chastity had occurred, being conscious of the danger of being ostracized by the society or being looked down by the society. Her not informing the teachers or her friends at the examination center under the circumstances cannot detract from her reliability. In the normal course of human conduct, this unmarried minor girl, would not like to give publicity to the traumatic experience she had undergone and would feel terribly embarrassed in relation to the incident to narrate it



to her teachers and others over-powered by a feeling of shame and her natural inclination would be to avoid talking about it to any one, lest the family name and honour is brought into controversy. Therefore her informing to her mother only on return to the parental house and no one else at the examination center prior thereto is an accord with the natural human conduct of a female. The courts must, while evaluating evidence, remain alive to the fact that in a case of rape, no self-respecting woman would come forward in a court just to make a humiliating statement against her honour such as is involved in the commission of rape on her. In cases involving sexual molestation, supposed considerations which have no material effect on the veracity of the prosecution case or even discrepancies in the statement of the prosecutrix should not, unless the discrepancies are such which are of fatal nature, be allowed to throw out an otherwise reliable prosecution case. The inherent bashfulness of the females and the tendency to conceal outrage of sexual aggression are factors which the Courts should not over-look. The testimony of the victim in such cases is vital and unless there are compelling reasons which necessitate looking for corroboration of her



statement, the courts should find no difficulty to act on the testimony of a victim of sexual assault alone to convict an accused where her testimony inspires confidence and is found to be reliable. Seeking corroboration of her statement before relying upon the same, as a rule, in such cases amounts to adding insult to injury. Why should the evidence of a girl of a woman who complains of rape or sexual molestation, be viewed with doubt, disbelief or suspicion? The Court while appreciating the evidence of a prosecutrix may look for some assurance of her statement to satisfy its judicial conscience, since she is a witness who is interested in the outcome of the charge levelled by her, but there is no requirement of law to insist upon corroboration of her statement to base conviction of an accused. The evidence of a victim of sexual assault stands almost at par with the evidence of an injured witness and to an extent is even more reliable. Just as a witness who has sustained some injury in the occurrence, which is not found to be self inflicted, is considered to be a good witness in the sense that he is least likely to shield the real culprit, the evidence of a victim of a sexual offence is entitled to great weight, absence of corroboration notwithstanding. Corroborative evidence is not an



imperative component of judicial credence in every case of rape. Corroboration as a condition for judicial reliance on the testimony of the prosecutrix is not a requirement of law but a guidance of prudence under given circumstances. It must not be over-looked that a woman or a girl subjected to sexual assault is not an accomplice to the crime but is a victim of another persons's lust and it is improper and undesirable to test her evidence with a certain amount of suspicion, treating her as if she were an accomplice. Inferences have to be drawn from a given set of facts and circumstances with realistic diversity and not dead uniformity lest that type of rigidity in the shape of rule of law is introduced through a new form of testimonial tyranny making justice a casualty. Courts cannot cling to a fossil formula and insist upon corroboration even if, taken as a whole, the case spoken of by the victim of sex crime strikes the judicial mind as probable. In State of Maharashtra Vs. Chandraprakash Kewalchand Jain (1990 (1) SCC 550) Ahmadi, J. (as the Lord Chief Justice then was) speaking for the Bench summarised the position in the following words:

"A prosecutrix of a sex offence cannot be put on par with an accomplice. She is in fact a



victim of the crime. [The Evidence Act](#) nowhere says that her evidence cannot be accepted unless it is corroborated in material particulars. She is undoubtedly a competent witness under [Section 118](#) and her evidence must receive the same weight as is attached to an injured in cases of physical violence. The same degree of care and caution must attach in the evaluation of her evidence as in the case of an injured complainant or witness and no more. What is necessary is that the court must be alive to and conscious of the fact that it is dealing with the evidence of a person who is interested in the outcome of the charge levelled by her. If the court keeps this in mind and feels satisfied that it can act on the evidence of the prosecutrix, there is no rule of law or practice incorporated in the [Evidence Act](#) similar to illustration (b) to [Section 114](#) which requires it to look for corroboration. If for some reason the court is hesitant to place implicit reliance on the testimony of the prosecutrix it may look for evidence which may lend assurance to her testimony short of corroboration required in the case of an accomplice. The nature of evidence required



to lend assurance to the testimony of the prosecutrix must necessarily depend on the facts and circumstances of each case. But if a prosecutrix is an adult and of full understanding the court is entitled to base a conviction of her evidence unless the same is shown to be infirm and not trustworthy. If the totality of the circumstances appearing on the record of the case disclose that the prosecutrix does not have a strong motive to falsely involve the person charged, the court should ordinarily have no hesitation in accepting her evidence."

20. In ***Karnel Singh vs. State of M.P. reported in (1995) 5 SCC 518***, it has been observed:-

"7. We have carefully examined the evidence of the prosecutrix, the medical evidence of her examination and the evidence of the investigating officer and we are inclined to think there is no risk involved in accepting the version of the prosecutrix. Her evidence shows that she had joined the two accused persons hardly three days before the incident as a labourer under a contractor. She was, therefore, in not too familiar an environment. She was the only female worker just out of her teens.



Besides, the two accused persons and the prosecutrix there was one more person by the name Charan who was sent away to fetch tea. Taking advantage of the prosecutrix being alone in their company the appellant picked her up and took her inside the machine room, laid her on a pile of sand, removed her saree and petticoat, and had sexual intercourse with her against her wish. After he had satisfied his lust, he called his companion but before the latter could have her, she ran away and narrated the incident to Multanabai and then went in search of her husband, a rickshaw puller. After narrating the incident to him, both of them went to the police station and lodged the complaint, Exhibit P.1, at about 4.10 p.m. It was said that there was considerable delay and sufficient time for tutoring and therefore her evidence could not be belivered. There is no merit in this contention. The submission overlooks the fact that in India women are slow and hesitant to complain of such assaults and if the prosecutrix happens to be a married person she will not do anything without informing her husband. Merely because the complaint was lodged less than promptly does not raise the inference that the complaint was false. The reluctance to go to the police is because of society's attitude towards such



women; it casts doubt and shame upon her rather than comfort and sympathise with her. Therefore, delay in lodging complaints in such cases does not necessarily indicate that her version is false. The possibility of tutoring is ruled out because the evidence does not show that her husband knew the appellant and his companion before the incident. She too had started work hardly three days before and therefore she had no reason to falsely involve the appellant. No such reason is even suggested. She was a poor labourer hired by a contractor just a few days back and had no enmity with the appellant and his companion. Nor is there any such history so far as her husband is concerned. There is, therefore, no reason to doubt her word. As for corroboration the find of semen stains on her 'saya' and in her vagina lends sufficient assurance to her accusation. [In State of Maharashtra v. Chandraprakash Kewal Chand Jain](#) (1990) 1 SCC 550, this Court speaking through one of us (Ahmadi,J) had an occasion to point out that a woman who is a victim of a sexual assault is not an accomplice to the crime but is a victim of another person's lust and therefore her evidence need not be tested with the same amount of suspicion as that of an accomplice. She is not in the category of a child witness or an accomplice and



therefore the rule of prudence that her evidence must be corroborated in material particulars has no application, at the most the court may look for some evidence which lends assurance.”

21. Taking into account the evidence of the victim, it is found and held that the evidence does inspire confidence, whereupon the finding so recorded by the learned lower Court did not require interference. Accordingly, this appeal is found devoid of merit, whereupon dismissed. Appellant is under custody, which he will remain till saturation of the period of the sentence. The first and last page of the judgment should be given to the learned Amicus Curiae for the needful.

(Aditya Kumar Trivedi, J)

Vikash/-

AFR/NAFR	A.F.R.
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	07.08.2019
Transmission Date	07.08.2019

