

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 09.08.2019

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE V.BHAVANI SUBBAROYAN

W.P.No.28792 of 2010

B.Haniffa
Ex-Constable No.912296454
Mathur Village, Mathur Post,
Dharmapuri District

...Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Commandant
CISF Unit,
SCCL, Singareni,
Bellampalli, Andhrapradesh

2. Deputy Inspector General,
Central Industrial Security Force,
South Zone Head Quarters,
Rajaji Bhavan, Rajaji Nagar,
Chennai - 600 090

... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 16.11.2010 in his order No.V-11014/71/ANU/SZ/2010/7250 confirming the order passed by the 1st respondent in his order No.V/15014/B.H./Maj / Disc/10/5396 dated 02.09.2010 and quash the same and to direct the respondents to take the petitioner into the strength of CISF with all monetary benefits.

For Petitioner : Mrs.Rita Chandrasekaran for
Mrs.R.Meenakshi

For Respondents: Mr.B.Ramanathan

WEB COPY
O R D E R

The petitioner has prayed for a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to quash the order of the 2nd respondent dated 16.11.2010 in Order No.V-11014/71/ANU/SZ/2010/7250 confirming the order passed by the 1st respondent in its Order No.V-15014/B.H/Maj/Disc/10/5396 dated 02.09.2010 and further direct the respondents to take the petitioner into the strength of CISF with all monetary benefits.

2. The brief facts leading to the filing of the present case by the petitioner as stated in his affidavit filed in support of the Writ Petition are that; the petitioner joined the Central Industrial Security Force, hereinafter referred to as 'CISF' as constable in the year 1991. During the year 2008, while he was working at the Bangalore Airport, he claims that he met with an accident and sustained grievous injuries to which he was medically treated by CISF and he was advised to avail medical home rest.

3. The petitioner further claims that immediately after the accident, his first wife namely, Mubeen Taj deserted him and took away his children from his house and he did not know their whereabouts after that. The petitioner had given the report to the police authorities on 04.07.2008 and on 02.04.2009. At later point of time, the petitioner came to know that his wife went away with one Allaudin, a driver, who is a cousin in his relationship and further that they caused the pre-planned accident to the petitioner in January, 2008.

4. The petitioner also contends that as his wife's whereabouts were not known for a longer period and on the advice of the Masjith Committee, the petitioner gave a paper publication on 15.02.2008, 05.07.2008 and 06.07.2008. As the petitioner was not keeping good health and no one was there to take care of him, the petitioner's father and his relatives consulted their religion leaders for performing another marriage to the petitioner. Since the 1st wife had deserted him at her own Will and in furtherance of the same, the petitioner was allowed to marry another lady, as per their religious customs and he married one Reshma as per muslim law and as per the advice of elders and religious leaders. Thereafter, the petitioner has sent a written information to the Department as early as in the month of November 2009, as 1st marriage was dissolved by Masjith Committee of his community. While that being so, the Commandant, CISF Unit, SCCL-Singaneri, Headquarters, Bellampalli had issued two charges against the petitioner and dismissed him from service by final order dated 02.09.2010.

5. According to the petitioner, as against the order dated 02.09.2010, he preferred an appeal before the 1st respondent, who inturn confirmed the order passed by the 2nd respondent by his order dated 16.11.2010, as against which order, the present Writ Petition has been filed.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner contended before this Court that the petitioner has not committed any misconduct or 2nd marriage of polygamy under

Mohameedin Law where the limited Polygamy is permitted and the case of the petitioner is that since the 1st wife had deserted the petitioner and after obtaining no objection certificate from the Jamad, the 2nd marriage was organised. Even otherwise the dismissal from service is disproportionate punishment for no mistake of the petitioner such a harsh punishment is unjustifiable and has to be quashed.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that the 2nd wife, Reshma is also legally wedded wife of the petitioner and there is no violation of law by the petitioner. Hence the departmental enquiry initiated against the petitioner on the ground of polygamy or against the personal Law, as the central government employees are permitted to act according to the rule of personal law and hence the petitioner counsel pleaded that there is no grievances committed by the petitioner by marrying another woman while the marriage with the 1st wife is subsisting and the personal Law permits such marriage and no disciplinary action proceedings can be initiated against the personal law.

8. The Department, CISF has filed a detailed counter rebutting the said statements made by the petitioner. The respondents stated that the petitioner submitted an application dated 21.08.2009 for grant of family Leave Travel Concession, [in short referred to 'LTC'] for the block year 2008-2009, in which he has referred his wife's name as B.Mubeen Taj, as the dependent of the petitioner. While LTC application was pending for sanction, the Department had received a complaint dated 14.10.2009 under the signature of Smt.Mubeen Taj wife of Haniffa, petitioner herein alleging that her husband had developed illegal relationship with another lady, while working at previous Unit and presently living with that second wife at Godavarikhani Out-Post, CISF Unit SCCL, Singareni. In the said letter, it was further alleged that the petitioner after developing illegal intimacy with another lady had neglected her and her two children and he used to often beat them. She precisely requested the Commandant, CISF Unit to take action against the petitioner for harassing her and her children and requested not to remove her name from the service register of the petitioner and further requested to order the petitioner to pay maintenance to them.

9. On such complaint received by the respondents, a preliminary enquiry was conducted and the petitioner had accepted the 2nd marriage with one Reshma and informed that through her, a 7 months old son has been born and they are residing in Government family accommodation in Quarters No.ST-02/415, Bus stand colony, Ramagundam. However, he suppressed the fact of the 2nd marriage with Reshma, when that being so, on

24.12.2009, petitioner submitted an application stating that his wife has deserted and living with another person and he is not aware of her whereabouts. Hence he married Reshma on 27.07.2008 as his wife, thus he requested to make fresh entry of the family photo and details of the family member removing the photograph of 1st wife, viz., Mubeen Taj.

10. The respondents after conducting preliminary enquiry had framed two charges against the petitioner, which are as follows:

'Gross indiscipline and misconduct and violation of Rules on the part of CISF No.912296454 Constable B.Hanifa of RG Area of CISF Unit SCCL(S), in that, having a spouse living by name Smt.MobeenTaj, got second marriage with another lady named Mrs.H.Reshma without obtaining divorce with his first an act within the meaning of Rule 21(2) of Central Civil services (Conduct) Rules, 1964 Section 18(A) of CISF Act, 1968

Gross indiscipline and misconduct on the part of CISF No.912296454 Constable B.Hanifa of RG Area CISF Unit SCCL(S), in that, he had applied LTC for the block year, 2008-09 for self and for his wife namely Smt.Mobnin Taj on dated 21.08.2009 whereas he is living with second wife Mrs.H.Reshma. The part on the official to suppress the fact from the department is a major offence."

11. The counsel for the respondents further contended that after due enquiry and by following principles of natural justice, the charges were well supported with oral and documentary evidence and held both the charges as proved in a duly conducted Departmental enquiry in the presence of petitioner and a penalty was awarded by the Disciplinary Authority.

12. The 1st respondent herein had examined the petitioner and a well defined order has been passed and the appellate authority, the 2nd respondent herein has upheld the order passed by the 1st respondent. The 1st respondent states that no other penalty can be imposed because as per the latest rules prevailing, having more than one wife living or contracting the 2nd marriage while the 1st Wife is living, itself is a disqualification and hence dismissal from service is well found and sought for dismissal of the writ petition.

12. Heard the learned counsel for the respective parties and perused the documents placed on record.

13. From the above, it is admittedly clear that the petitioner has not questioned or challenged the order passed by the 1st and 2nd respondents on the ground enquiry not being

conducted properly or enquiry is vitiated by not following the procedures, as contemplated under the Service Rules, nor the petitioner has taken a stand that he has not offered sufficient opportunity or documents during the enquiry, hence the enquiry conducted by the Department is not challenged.

14. It is the case of the petitioner that he belong to Muslim Community and his personal law permits Bigamy and in accordance with personal law, 2nd marriage is valid and the 1st wife had deserted him on her own will. Further, the petitioner married the 2nd wife after obtaining no objection certificate issued by the Jamath Committee at Krishnagiri District, which the petitioner has enclosed at page No.1 of the additional typed set of papers. On perusal of the said document, especially the enquiry report, the charges levelled against the petitioner was based on the letter of complaint dated nil, received by the respondents, viz., Office of the Commandant, CISF Unit, Bellampalli on 14.10.2009 from the petitioner's wife Mubeen Taj, stating that her husband has caused harassment to her and neglected her along with her two children, she in her letter categorically stated that the petitioner had got married with another lady and living with her in the Singareni Unit.

15. The petitioner's 1st wife, viz., Mubeen Taj also pleaded that her name should not be deleted in the family nomination in the service document and service register of the petitioner. It is seen from the documents that after receiving such complaint, the 1st respondent, being disciplinary authority, had issued charge memorandum under Rule 36 of CISF [Amendment] Rules, 2007 dated 11.05.2010 sought written explanation from the petitioner within 10 days from the receipt of the said memo.

16. It is seen from the petitioner's representation dated 22.05.2010, that the petitioner has not denied the charge, however, stated that he has not committed any misconduct or violated any Rules and there is no indiscipline in his part. The petitioner has also stated in his reply that he belongs to Muslim community and his Muslim personal law permits Bigamy His further representation is that as his 1st wife deserted him, he obtained certificate from Jamath, who permitted him to conduct second marriage and as per his personal law and advice of his religious leaders, on 27.07.2008, he married one Reshma.

17. Pertaining to the 2nd charge, the petitioner contended that though immediately after the 2nd marriage was performed and immediately on his transfer on 11.04.2009 from Bangalore Airport, a copy of the report and marriage certificate was sent to the authorities. However, his second wife's name was not recorded in the service record and such he was told that he cannot include Reshma's name in the LTC application and should

show the name of the 1st wife, Mubeentaj due to that reason only, the petitioner was compelled to give his LTC application dated 21.08.2009 for himself and for his 1st wife and the petitioner denied the charges.

18. On the perusal of the Departmental enquiry report, it is clear that the petitioner was given sufficient opportunity and in fact there is no claim by the petitioner that an enquiry was conducted in an improper manner. The petitioner had marked documents and had given statement before enquiry officer and during which charge the petitioner admitted that he had been married to Mubbeen Taj and she is alive and as per the family details furnished by the petitioner in Form III dated 28.04.2006, he has stated that his wife is Mubeen Taj. However he married another lady on 27.07.2008 and subsequently the petitioner had applied for family leave travel concession for the block year 2008-2009 in the name of his 1st wife, Mubeen Taj vide application dated 12.09.2009. Though the 1st wife is not living with him, the petitioner undisputably living in the government family accommodation with the 2nd wife Reshma, but concealed the same.

19. It could be seen from the enquiry report that the categorical finding has been arrived at by the enquiry officer on the admission made by the petitioner. Though the articles of charge framed against the petitioner by charge memorandum dated 11.05.2010 stood proved, based on the enquiry report, a final order came to be passed on 02.09.2010 by the 1st respondent herein, who in exercise of power conferred under Rule-32 read Schedule-1 of CISF Rules-2001 had awarded the penalty of dismissal from service, as prescribed under Section 34(1) of CISF Rules with immediate effect.

20. As against this order passed by the 1st respondent, an appeal was preferred to the 2nd respondent who inturn confirmed the order passed by the 1st respondent by its order dated 16.11.2010 and upheld the order passed by the disciplinary authority and rejected the appeal filed by the petitioner and while doing so, the 2nd respondent confirmed the penalty awarded to the petitioner by the disciplinary authority vide order dated 02.09.2010.

21. The main argument put forward by the learned counsel for the petitioner is that when the personal law provides for 2nd marriage even when the 1st wife is alive or marriage between the 1st wife is in persistence, the 2nd marriage cannot be considered as an illegal. The learned counsel also stated that the penalty awarded against the petitioner is very harsh to the nature of the charges made against the petitioner. On both accounts, this Court is unable to accept the arguments put forth by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

22. The petitioner has filed No objection certificate issued by Jamath, Marriage certificate and the Judgment in M.C.No.2 of 2010 by way of additional typed set and on perusal of the same, it is evident that the petitioner's 1st wife, Mubeen Taj has filed M.C.No.2 of 2010 before the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Krishnagiri and after considering all the facts, the said court has granted a sum of Rs.1,000/- for the children, viz., 2nd and 3rd petitioners therein for their maintenance till they attain majority. It is to be pointed out that the 1st wife of the petitioner, viz., Mubeen Taj had filed maintenance petition on 12.01.2010, i.e., prior to the filing of the present Writ Petition, which is on 13.02.2010, hence, the petitioner's contention that the petitioner does not know the whereabouts of his 1st wife as well as her children, cannot be accepted.

23. For useful reference, the powers under Section 34 of CISF Rules 2001, are extracted hereunder:

"34. Nature of Penalties - The following penalties may, for good and sufficient reasons and as hereinafter provided, be imposed on an enrolled member of the Force, namely:- Major Penalties - i) dismissal from service which shall ordinarily be a disqualification for future employment under the Government; (ii) removal from service which shall not be a disqualification for future employment under the Government; (iii) compulsory retirement; (iv) reduction to a lower time scale of pay, grade, post or service which shall ordinarily be a bar to the promotion of the Government servant to the time scale of pay, grade, post or service from which he was reduced with or without further directions regarding conditions of restoration to the grade or post or service from which enrolled member of the Force was reduced and his seniority and pay on such restoration to that grade, post or service; (v) save as provided for in clause (viii) below - reduction to a lower stage in the time scale of pay for a specified period with further directions as to whether or not the enrolled member will earn increments of pay during the period of such reduction and whether on the expiry of such period, the reduction will have the effect of postponing the future increments of his pay. Minor penalties - (vi) Censure; (vii) withholding of his promotion; (viii) Reduction to a lower stage in the time scale of pay y one stage for a period of not exceeding three years, without cumulative effect and not adversely affecting his pension; (ix) withholding of increment of pay; (x) fine to any amount not exceeding of 7 days pay.

Explanation - The following shall not amount to a penalty within the meaning of this rule, namely:-
-16- (a) withholding of increment of an enrolled member for failure to pass a departmental examination in accordance with the rules or orders or the terms of his appointment; (b) stoppage of increment of an enrolled member at the efficiency bar in a time scale of pay on the ground of his unfitness to cross the bar; (c) non-promotion of an enrolled member whether in a substantive or officiating capacity, after consideration of his case, to a rank or post for promotion to which he is eligible; (d) reversion of an enrolled member officiating in a higher rank or post to a lower rank or post, on the ground that he is considered after trial, to be unsuitable for such higher rank or post or on any administrative grounds unconnected with his conduct; (e) reversion of an enrolled member appointed on probation to any other rank or post during or at the end of the period of probation in accordance with the terms of his appointment or the rules and orders governing such probation; (f) replacement of the services of an enrolled member whose services had been borrowed from any department of the Central Government or State Government or any authority under the Central Government or the State Government at the disposal of the Central Government or the State Government or the authority from which the services of such enrolled member had been borrowed; (g) compulsory retirement of an enrolled member in accordance with the provisions relating to his superannuation or retirement; (h) Termination of service - (i) of an enrolled member appointed on probation during or at the end of the period of his probation, in accordance with the terms of his appointment or the rules and orders governing such probation; or (ii) of a temporary enrolled member in accordance with the provisions of rule 25; or (iii) of an enrolled member, employed under an agreement, in accordance with the terms of such agreement: (I) treatment of absence from duty as "dies-non" ordered by a competent authority under rule 55:

24. The authorities are empowered to invoke any one of the above provision while dealing or while awarding penalties to the delinquent employee, which includes dismissal from service also. As far as the professionalism of the penalty awarded, this Court is of the view that the petitioner deliberately suppressed 2nd marriage conducted. The petitioner got married to one Reshma during the subsistence of marriage with 1st wife namely,

Mubbeentaj, who as per the letter received by the office on 14.10.2009 alleged that the petitioner had developed illegal relationship with Reshma and after developing illicit intimacy with Reshma had neglected the 1st wife, Mubbeentaj and her two children and infact in the said complaint, it is stated that the petitioner had harassed her and her children. However, when the complaint was given by Mubbeentaj, she was not called and examined during the enquiry. However, the enquiry proceeded based on the declaration and admission made by the petitioner. The petitioner indisputably has admitted the 2nd marriage conducted when the marriage between the 1st wife was subsisting. That apart, the petitioner has also admitted that while making applications for LTC, he has mentioned his wife name as Mubeen Taj in his application dated 28.09.2009 while he has already married the 2nd wife as early as 27.07.2008.

25. Under these circumstances, when the Rules provide for appropriate action and the awarding of punishment, the authorities have also considered the intensity of the charge levelled against him and thought it fit to impose maximum penalty under Section 34(i) of CISF Rules, 2001. This Court, does not find any infirmity or disproportionate punishment has been awarded to the petitioner.

26. When the 1st marriage is in subsistence, having deserted the 1st wife and two children incrementally and had contracted the 2nd marriage, further alleging through her also, a child had born and had also stated that the petitioner's 1st wife went away with another person, is unsustainable one. The pathetic situation of the 1st wife is that to prevail her name in the service register of the petitioner, she had approached the authority, but with no other go, she had made a complaint about the 2nd marriage.

27. This Court has taken a view in conformity with the award passed by the disciplinary authority, which later came to be confirmed by the appellate authority.

28. As far as the main issue that the petitioner's counsel argued is that the petitioner's personal law provide for 2nd marriage and when personal law, provides for such marriage, even though the service law prohibits or penalise such 2nd marriage when in subsistence of 1st marriage, the personal law will prevail over the statute. I do not find any bigger logic in such argument, it is clear from the records available and from the submission made by the petitioner himself during the enquiry and even in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition that he had contracted the 2nd marriage when the 1st marriage was in persistence. However, he sets a foot firm that his personal law provides for multiple marriages that cannot be questioned

under the service law, to which he is associated with. I am unable to accept such contentions. Also, the petitioner by producing a letter from the Jamath, which certifies that the petitioner can contract 2nd marriage and using such certificate, the petitioner had an audacity to contract the 2nd marriage, deserting not only his first wife but also his two children, who had been complained against the petitioner for desertion, which complaint came to the light by the authorities. The petitioner, despite having contracted the 2nd marriage, had utilised the name of 1st wife for issuance of LTC and more than that, the staff quarters provided for the family is being occupied and utilised by the second wife and the petitioner, which was not disputed by the petitioner.

29. No authority except the Court of law can exercise judicial power in the adjudication of disputes. No personal law can declare a marriage as null and void and the power to dissolve such marriage vest only with the Court of Law. Neither a religious organisation nor the village panchayat headed by village headmen can dissolve any marriage for that matter or even by consent of parties. Even after 70 years of Independence, still the practice of dissolving the marriages by religious organisation and village heads are still prevalent in our country.

30. It may not be out of place to mention the decision rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in (2014) 7 Supreme Court Cases 707, [Vishwa Lochan Madan V. Union of India and Others] wherein the issue in this Case before the Hon'ble Supreme Court is with regard to the Fatwa issued by the religious organisation, viz., Dar-ul-Qazas in which the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held hereunder:

'13. As it is well settled, the adjudication by a legal authority sanctioned by law is enforceable and binding and meant to be obeyed unless upset by an authority provided by law itself. The power to adjudicate must flow from a validly made law. Person deriving benefit from the adjudication must have the right to enforce it and the person required to make provision in terms of adjudication has to comply that and on its failure consequences as provided in law is to ensue. These are the fundamentals of any legal judicial system. In our opinion, the decisions of Dar-ul-Qaza or the Fatwa do not satisfy any of these requirements. Dar-ul-Qaza is neither created nor sanctioned by any law made by the competent legislature. Therefore, the opinion or the Fatwa issued by Dar-ul-Qaza or for that matter anybody is not adjudication of dispute by an authority under a judicial system sanctioned by law. A Qazi or Mufti has

no authority or powers to impose his opinion and enforce his Fatwa on any one by any coercive method. In fact, whatever may be the status of Fatwa during Mogul or British Rule, it has no place in independent India under our Constitutional scheme. It has no legal sanction and can not be enforced by any legal process either by the Dar-ul-Qaza issuing that or the person concerned or for that matter anybody. The person or the body concerned may ignore it and it will not be necessary for anybody to challenge it before any court of law. It can simply be ignored. In case any person or body tries to impose it, their act would be illegal. Therefore, the grievance of the petitioner that Dar- ul-Qazas and Nizam-e-Qaza are running a parallel judicial system is misconceived.

14. As observed earlier, the Fatwa has no legal status in our Constitutional scheme. Notwithstanding that it is an admitted position that Fatwas have been issued and are being issued. All India Muslim Personal Law Board feels the "necessity of establishment of a network of judicial system throughout the country and Muslims should be made aware that they should get their disputes decided by the Quazis". According to the All India Muslim Personal Law Board "this establishment may not have the police powers but shall have the book of Allah in hand and sunnat of the Rasool and all decisions should be according to the Book and the Sunnat. This will bring the Muslims to the Muslim Courts. They will get justice".

15. The object of establishment of such a court may be laudable but we have no doubt in our mind that it has no legal status. It is bereft of any legal pedigree and has no sanction in laws of the land. They are not part of the corpus juris of the State. A Fatwa is an opinion, only an expert is expected to give. It is not a decree, not binding on the court or the State or the individual. It is not sanctioned under our constitutional scheme. But this does not mean that existence of Dar-ul-Qaza or for that matter practice of issuing Fatwas are themselves illegal. It is informal justice delivery system with an objective of bringing about amicable settlement between the parties. It is within the discretion of the persons concerned either to accept, ignore or reject it. However, as the Fatwa gets strength from the religion; it causes serious psychological impact on the person intending not to abide by that. As projected by respondent No. 10 "God fearing Muslims obey the Fatwas". In the words of respondent No. 10 "it is for

the persons/parties who obtain Fatwa to abide by it or not. It, however, emphasises that "the persons who are God fearing and believe that they are answerable to the Almighty and have to face the consequences of their doings/deeds, such are the persons, who submit to the Fatwa". Imrana's case is an eye-opener in this context. Though she became the victim of lust of her father in law, her marriage was declared unlawful and the innocent husband was restrained from keeping physical relationship with her. In this way a declaratory decree for dissolution of marriage and decree for perpetual injunction were passed. Though neither the wife nor the husband had approached for any opinion, an opinion was sought for and given at the instance of a journalist, a total stranger. In this way, victim has been punished. A country governed by rule of law cannot fathom it.'

31. A close reading of the Judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court it is categorically clear that the adjudication by the legal authority sanctioned by the law is enforceable and binding and meant to be obeyed unless upset by an authority provided by law itself. The power to adjudicate must flow from a validly made law.

32. As far as the present case is concerned, the petitioner, who got employed as CISF personnel, is governed by the appropriate fundamental rules of CISF which does not permit contracting of 2nd marriage in the presence of or subsistence of the first marriage. The petitioner's second marriage in the name of religion cannot be accepted. A woman may be from any religion, but, when deserted by men she is addressed with a prefix as a destitute woman. The trauma underwent by a destitute woman and children cannot be explained in words. These organisations has the name of religion cannot encourage second marriages in the subsistence of first marriage. The organisation has got no power under the eye of law to issue direction or even give opinion to dissolve marriage or to give permission to contract any marriage as no religious organisation can exercise the power of Court under any circumstances and such exercise made by the Jamath or any other religious organisation is condemnable and such interference by any religious organisation should be dealt with very seriously by the concerned authorities. The petitioner being in uniform service, has to act as a model for other person in the community and should not act otherwise.

33. Under these circumstances and guided by the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the above referred

case, this Court is of the view that the personal law cannot come into play or aid the service jurisprudence. Therefore, this Court is of the opinion that the punishment awarded to the petitioner is just and equitable and no interference is warranted.

In the result, the Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs.

ssd

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(C.O)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Commandant
CISF Unit,
SCCL, Singareni,
Bellampalli, Andhrapradesh

2. The Deputy Inspector General,
Central Industrial Security Force,
South Zone Head Quarters,
Rajaji Bhavan, Rajaji Nagar,
Chennai - 600 090

+1cc to Mr.R.Meenakshi, Advocate, SR.No.68508

+1cc to Mr.B.Ramaratnam, Advocate, SR.No.68869

W.P.No.28792 of 2010

Kak(18/09/2019)

सत्यमेव जयते

WEB COPY