

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRWP-370-2019

Date of Decision : 23.01.2020

Sunny

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr.R.S. Mundra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, D.A.G., Punjab
for respondents No. 1 to 3

Mr. Pritpal Singh Miglani, Advocate
for respondents No. 4 and 5

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has filed the present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of Habeas Corpus directing respondent No.2 for effecting the release of detenues namely Kanika aged 7 years and Ananya aged 9 months minor daughters of the petitioner who have been kept in illegal custody by respondents No.4 and 5 since 06.02.2019.

2. Briefly stated, the petition has been filed on the averments that Reena Victor wife of the petitioner died after 20 days of the birth of second daughter Ananya due to heart attack in CMC, Ludhiana on 10.06.2018. Respondent No.4, who is real sister in law of the petitioner, came to his house for taking care of newly born child Ananya and after stay of about 4 months took her on the pretext that the petitioner would not be able to take care of her. On 06.02.2019, the petitioner alongwith his elder daughter Kanika went to the house of respondent No.4 where respondents No.4 and 5 tried to persuade the petitioner to convert his religion into Christianity and

on his refusal, the petitioner was thrown out of their house by respondents No.4 and 5 who kept his elder daughter Kanika also with them. His elder daughter Kanika, who was admitted in UKG at Jesus Saviour School, Marauli Kalan, Morinda, absented from that school since 07.02.2019. The petitioner approached respondent No.2 to effect release of the detenues but respondent No.3 took signatures of the petitioner and others on blank papers and turned them out of the police station. The petitioner is having apprehension that respondents No.4 and 5 may forcibly convert his minor daughters to Christianity. The petitioner has accordingly prayed for issuance of a writ in the nature of Habeas Corpus and appointment of Warrant Officer for ensuring release of the detenues.

3. Vide order dated 12.04.2019 passed by Hon'ble Co-ordinate Bench notice of motion (rule nisi) was issued.

4. Learned State Counsel has appeared for respondents No.1 to 3 and opposed the petition.

5. Respondents No.1 to 3 filed reply by way of affidavit of Waryam Singh, PPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police (Central), Ludhiana. In their reply, respondents No.1 to 3 have pleaded that the petitioner had moved an application dated 14.10.2019 with SHO, Police Station, Division No.3, Ludhiana and during inquiry it was found that petitioner himself had given custody of his daughters to respondents No.4 and 5-sister of his wife and her husband and his daughters do not want to live with the petitioner. Respondent No.4 has also filed petition under Sections 7 and 8 of the Guardian and Wards Act, 1890 for her appointment as legal guardian of minor daughters of the petitioner.

6. Mr. Pritpal Singh Miglani, Advocate has appeared for respondents No.4 and 5 and has filed reply to the petition alongwith his power of attorney which is taken on record.

7. In their reply respondents No.4 and 5 have taken preliminary objections as to the petitioner having concealed material facts regarding compromise dated 15.02.2019 between the petitioner and respondents No.4 and 5, the petitioner having no source of income and there being no female member in his family to look after the minor children and the petitioner not having approached the Court with clean hands. In their reply on merits, respondents No.4 and 5 have pleaded that petitioner himself left his minor daughters Kanika and Ananya with respondents No.4 and 5 and agreed vide compromise dated 15.02.2019 that both the children will remain with respondents No.4 and 5. Respondents No.4 and 5 have pleaded that the petitioner is not a wise person. He is addicted to alcohol and indulged in various bad activities. He is not concerned about the welfare and future of the minor daughters. The petitioner is having no sister or brother and there is no other person to look after and take care of the minor children. Kanika was studying in UKG at Jesus Christ School at Marauli Kalan, Morinda. The petitioner was not performing his duties and minor daughter was not sent to school in right time and was not provided food and proper dress and on making of demands regarding pen, pencil, copies and chocolate was given merciless beatings. The petitioner was not depositing the fees of minor daughter. The school authorities made a telephonic call to respondents No.4 and 5 who reached the school and deposited the fee. The respondent No.4 has filed petition under Sections 7 and 8 of the Guardian and Wards Act, 1890 for appointing her as her legal guardian of Kanika and

Ananya. Respondents No.4 and 5 have accordingly prayed for dismissal of the petition.

8. On 28.11.2019 order allowing the petition was dictated but before the same could be signed it transpired that some important aspects of the matter had neither being referred in the pleadings nor raised at the time of arguments and in view of the observations in ***Kushalbhai Ratan Bhai Tohit and others Vs. State of Gujarat (SC) : 2014 RCR (Criminal) 819*** the matter was listed for re-hearing. Vide order dated 12.12.2019, the petitioner and respondents No.4 and 5 were directed to file their respective affidavits giving information on the following aspects :

- (i) their profession/occupation/source of income, educational background and particulars of their moveable/immovable properties and residential accommodation; and
- (ii) particulars regarding other family members living with them, their educational background and present profession/occupation.

9. The petitioner was directed to specifically reply in the affidavit to the averments as to there being no female members in his family and submit as to who will take care of minor daughters in case custody is entrusted to him while respondents No.4 and 5 were directed to reply in the affidavit to the apprehension pleaded by the petitioner as to conversion of minor daughters to Christianity.

10. In compliance with the above said order, the petitioner and respondent No.5 have filed their affidavits.

11. The petitioner Sunny has in his affidavit dated 07.01.2020 sworn to the following facts that :-

- (i) he is currently working as a salesman with M/s New Friends

Car Bazar, Main G.T. Road, Morinda (Ropar) and he is earning Rs.10,000/- to Rs.15,000/- on average basis on each month based on his performance;

- (ii) he had completed regular Diploma in Electrical Engineering from Doaba Polytechnic College, Ghataur, Mohali in first division;
- (iii) he is having bank balance of about Rs.35,000/-and he is living alongwith his father and grandmother in his ancestral house which is double storey building consisting of 7 rooms, kitchen, one washroom and a huge varanda;
- (iv) his father Sh. Amir Chand had recently retired from the position of Asstt. Jr. Specialist (Electrician) from the office of Sr. Xen/Electrical Maintenance, Ropar and is drawing monthly pension of Rs.28,416/- apart from the total balance of Rs.45 lacs he received during retirement and his father has total bank balance of Rs.57,83,438/- in his account and his father also owns a residential plot in posh colony namely Sun City-2 at Ropar;
- (v) his grandmother namely Vidya Devi and retired father Sh. Amir Chand are there at home to take care of his both minor daughters in the absence of the deponent and to make the situation more comfortable, he will employ a female maid servant at his home for the day-to-day care and ubringing of his minor daughters till he finds a suitable match to get remarried.

12. Respondent No.5 Samual has in his affidavit dated 08.01.2020 sworn to the following facts:-

- (i) he is under matric and working as driver at National Laboratory Ludhiana and getting salary of Rs. 11,000/- per month and he is also doing part time job;
- (ii) he has his own house in Ludhiana and he is residing in his own house alongwith his wife and daughter aged 26 years;
- (iii) his wife is matriculate and is also doing private job and getting salary of Rs. 10,000/- per month;

- (iv) his daughter is educated upto B.B.A. and doing tuition work in the house and earning Rs. 5,000/- per month. The total income of his family is Rs. 35,000/- per month; and
- (v) he will never convert the religion of the minor daughters of the petitioner to Christianity.

13. I have heard learned Counsel for the parties and gone through the relevant record.

14. Mr. R.S. Mundra, learned Counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is employed as Salesman M/s New Friedns Car Bazar, Main G.T. Road, Morinda and is earning Rs.10,000/- to Rs.15.000/- per month. His father, who is retired and getting pension of Rs.28,416/- and his grandmother are living with him. The petitioner has sufficient means to maintain both of his minor daughters. The minor daughters will be looked after by father and grandmother of the petitioner in his absence. The allegations as to the petitioner being drug addict and having abandoned and neglected minor daughters are wrong. In view of the provisions of Section 6 of the Hindu Minority and Guardianship Act, 1956, the petitioner is legal guardian of minor daughters and entitled to their custody and respondents No.4 and 5 have illegally detained both the minor daughters without any lawful justification or order by any Competent Authority. The welfare of the minor daughters will be best served by restoring their custody to the petitioner. Therefore, writ in the nature of Habeas Corpus may be issued for effecting their release from illegal custody of respondents No.4 and 5 and restoring them to custody of the petitioner.

15. On the other hand, Mr. Pritpal Singh Miglani, learned Counsel for respondents No.4 and 5 has argued that the petitioner has no regular source of income and will be unable to maintain minor children. There is no

female member in the family of the petitioner to look after the minor children. The petitioner is addicted to alcohol and indulges in bad activities. He is not concerned about the welfare and future of the minor daughters. Kanika was studying in UKG at Jesus Christ School at Maruli Kalan, Morinda. The petitioner was not performing his duties and minor daughter was not sent to school in right time and was not provided food and proper dress and on making of demands regarding pen, pencil, copies and chocolate was given merciless beatings. The petitioner was not depositing the fees of minor daughter. The school authorities made a telephonic call to respondents No.4 and 5 who reached the school and deposited the fee. Under compromise dated 15.02.2019, the petitioner had agreed that both his minor daughters shall remain in custody of respondents No.4 and 5. Respondent No.4 has already filed the petition under Sections 7 and 8 of the Guardian and Wards Act, 1890 for her appointment as their legal guardian which is pending. It will not be in the welfare of the minor children to hand over their custody to the petitioner. Kanika, who is aged about 7 years, is not ready to live with the petitioner. The petitioner does not deserve to be granted custody of the minor children and the petition may be dismissed.

16. Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, D.A.G., Punjab, learned State Counsel for respondents No.1 to 3 has submitted that the petitioner may be relegated to the remedy of approaching and directed to abide by the order of the Guardian Judge under the Guardian and Wards Act, 1890.

17. On perusal of the material on record and consideration of submissions made by learned Counsel for the parties, I am of the considered view that the petition deserves to be allowed.

18. In *Tejaswini Gaud and Ors. Vs. Shekhar Jagdish Prasad Tewari and others : 2019 (3) R.C.R. (Civil) 104*, Honble Supreme Court observed as under:-

“13. Writ of habeas corpus is a prerogative process for securing the liberty of the subject by affording an effective means of immediate release from an illegal or improper detention. The writ also extends its influence to restore the custody of a minor to his guardian when wrongfully deprived of it. The detention of a minor by a person who is not entitled to his legal custody is treated as equivalent to illegal detention for the purpose of granting writ, directing custody of the minor child. For restoration of the custody of a minor from a person who according to the personal law, is not his legal or natural guardian, in appropriate cases, the writ court has jurisdiction.

18. Habeas corpus proceedings is not to justify or examine the legality of the custody. Habeas corpus proceedings is a medium through which the custody of the child is addressed to the discretion of the court. Habeas corpus is a prerogative writ which is an extraordinary remedy and the writ is issued where in the circumstances of the particular case, ordinary remedy provided by the law is either not available or is ineffective; otherwise a writ will not be issued. In child custody matters, the power of the High Court in granting the writ is qualified only in cases where the detention of a minor by a person who is not entitled to his legal custody. In view of the pronouncement on the issue in question by the Supreme Court and the High Courts, in our view, in child custody matters, the writ of habeas corpus is maintainable where it is proved that the detention of a minor child by a parent or others was illegal and without any authority of law.

19. In child custody matters, the ordinary remedy lies only under the Hindu Minority and Guardianship Act or the Guardians and Wards Act as the case may be. In cases arising out of the

proceedings under the Guardians and Wards Act, the jurisdiction of the court is determined by whether the minor ordinarily resides within the area on which the court exercises such jurisdiction. There are significant differences between the enquiry under the Guardians and Wards Act and the exercise of powers by a writ court which is of summary in nature. What is important is the welfare of the child. In the writ court, rights are determined only on the basis of affidavits. Where the court is of the view that a detailed enquiry is required, the court may decline to exercise the extraordinary jurisdiction and direct the parties to approach the civil court. It is only in exceptional cases, the rights of the parties to the custody of the minor will be determined in exercise of extraordinary jurisdiction on a petition for habeas corpus.”

19. In ***Ruchi Majoo v. Sanjeev Majoo, 2011(3) R.C.R. (Civil) 122,***

Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:-

"37.Proceedings in the nature of habeas corpus are summary in nature, where the legality of the detention of the alleged detenu is examined on the basis of affidavits placed by the parties. Even so, nothing prevents the High Court from embarking upon a detailed enquiry in cases where the welfare of a minor is in question, which is the paramount consideration for the Court while exercising its parens patriae jurisdiction. A High Court may, therefore, invoke its extraordinary jurisdiction to determine the validity of the detention, in cases that fall within its jurisdiction and may also issue orders as to custody of the minor depending upon how the Court views the rival claims, if any, to such custody.....”

20. In ***Nil Ratan Kundu v. Abhijit Kundu : 2008(3) R.C.R.(Civil)***

936, it was held by Hon'ble Supreme Court as under:-

*"53. In **Goverdhan Lal v. Gajendra Kumar, AIR 2002 Raj 148** the High Court observed that it is true that the father is a natural guardian of a minor child and therefore has a preferential right to claim the custody of his son, but in matters concerning the*

custody of a minor child, the paramount consideration is the welfare of the minor and not the legal right of a particular party. Section 6 of the 1956 Act cannot supersede the dominant consideration as to what is conducive to the welfare of the minor child. It was also observed that keeping in mind the welfare of the child as the sole consideration, it would be proper to find out the wishes of the child as to with whom he or she wants to live.

*54. Again, in **M.K. Hari Govindan v. A.R. Rajaram**, AIR 2003 Mad 315 the Court held that custody cases cannot be decided on documents, oral evidence or precedents without reference to "human touch". The human touch is the primary one for the welfare of the minor since the other materials may be created either by the parties themselves or on the advice of counsel to suit their convenience.*

*55. In **Kamla Devi v. State of H.P.**, AIR 1987 HP 34 the Court observed:*

"13. ... the Court while deciding child custody cases in its inherent and general jurisdiction is not bound by the mere legal right of the parent or guardian. Though the provisions of the special statutes which govern the rights of the parents or guardians may be taken into consideration, there is nothing which can stand in the way of the Court exercising its parens patriae jurisdiction arising in such cases giving due weight to the circumstances such as a child's ordinary comfort, contentment, intellectual, moral and physical development, his health, education and general maintenance and the favourable surroundings. These cases have to be decided ultimately on the Court's view of the best interests of the child whose welfare requires that he be in custody of one parent or the other."

56. In our judgment, the law relating to custody of a child is fairly well settled and it is this: in deciding a difficult and complex question as to the custody of a minor, a court of law should keep in mind the relevant statutes and the rights flowing

therefrom. But such cases cannot be decided solely by interpreting legal provisions. It is a human problem and is required to be solved with human touch. A court while dealing with custody cases, is neither bound by statutes nor by strict rules of evidence or procedure nor by precedents. In selecting proper guardian of a minor, the paramount consideration should be the welfare and well-being of the child. In selecting a guardian, the court is exercising parens patriae jurisdiction and is expected, nay bound, to give due weight to a child's ordinary comfort, contentment, health, education, intellectual development and favourable surroundings. But over and above physical comforts, moral and ethical values cannot be ignored. They are equally, or we may say, even more important, essential and indispensable considerations. If the minor is old enough to form an intelligent preference or judgment, the court must consider such preference as well, though the final decision should rest with the court as to what is conducive to the welfare of the minor."

21. In **Gohar Begam Vs. Suggi alias Nazma Begam, AIR 1960 SC**

93 Hon'ble Supreme Court set aside order of High Court of Bombay declining issuance of writ of Habeas Corpus and ordered restoration of custody of illegitimate child of Gohar Begam illegally detained by her mother's sister Kariz Begam to Gohar Begam in view of her entitlement to its custody under Mohammedan Law.

22. In **Tejaswini Gaud's Case (Supra)** appellants were given custody of minor girl child Shikha due to illness and subsequent death of her mother Zalam and also due to illness of her father respondent Shekhar Jagdish Prasad. Subsequently, the appellants refused to hand over custody of the minor girl child to her father and thereby illegally detained the minor girl child. Hon'ble Supreme Court upheld the judgment of Bombay High

Court restoring custody of minor child Shikha to her father from custody of

the appellants while granting access/visitation rights to the appellants.

23. In the present case the petitioner being father is natural and legal guardian under Section 6 of the Hindu Minority and Guardianship Act, 1956 and has legal right to custody of both his minor daughters. On death of wife of the petitioner on 11.06.2018, custody of second daughter Ananya was entrusted to respondent No.4. Subsequently, on visit of the petitioner to house of respondents No.4 and 5 on 06.02.2019 alongwith his elder daughter Kanika, custody of elder daughter Kanika was also taken by respondents No.4 and 5. The petitioner cannot be said to have abandoned or neglected his minor daughters. Only due to the peculiar circumstance of death of wife of the petitioner soon after birth of minor Ananya, respondents No.4 and 5 had taken care of minor Ananya after her birth and custody of minor Kanika, who continued to live with the petitioner, was taken over by them since 06.02.2019. Respondents No.4 and 5 have claimed that the petitioner had by way of compromise dated 15.02.2019 agreed to hand over the custody of both of his minor daughters to respondents No.4 and 5. However, a perusal of compromise dated 15.02.2019 shows that the parties had merely agreed that the matter will be settled in the gathering of their relatives. Respondents No.4 and 5 have not placed any document to show that any settlement was arrived at between the parties at such gathering of the relatives and that under any such settlement custody of his minor daughters was given by the petitioner to respondents No.4 and 5. The petitioner has sworn that he has completed **Diploma in Electrical Engineering** from Doaba Polytechnic College, Ghataur, Mohali and is currently working as a **salesman** with M/s New Friends Car Bazar, Main G.T. Road, Morinda (Ropar) and he is earning **Rs.10,000/- to Rs.15,000/-**

on average basis each month based on his performance and that his father, who had retired from the position of Asstt. Jr. Specialist (Electrician) from the office of Sr. Xen/Electrical Maintenance, Ropar is drawing monthly pension of Rs.28,416/-, has bank balance of Rs.57,83,438/- and also owns a residential house in the village and plot in Sun City-2 at Ropar. Respondent No.5 has stated in his affidavit that he is **under matric** and working as **driver** at National Laboratory Ludhiana and getting salary of **Rs.11,000/-** per month and he is also doing part time job; he has his own house in Ludhiana and he is residing in his own house alongwith his wife and daughter aged 26 years; his wife is **matriculate** and is also doing private job and getting salary of **Rs.10,000/-** per month and his daughter is educated upto **B.B.A.** and doing tuition work in the house and earning **Rs.5,000/-** per month. The material on record negates comparative financial affluence of respondents No. 4 and 5 in comparison to the petitioner and his father. Prima facie the petitioner and his father are having sufficient means to maintain the minor daughters of the petitioner. Respondents No.4 and 5 have claimed that petitioner is addicted to alcohol but respondents No.4 and 5 have not produced any document to sustain their plea. Respondents No 4 and 5 have not produced any cogent material to show that the petitioner maltreated or neglected his elder minor daughter Kanika when she remained in his custody prior to 06.02.2019. Grand mother of the petitioner, who is stated to have brought him up on death of his mother, is also living with him and the plea taken by respondents No.4 and 5 in their reply that there is no female member in the family of the petitioner is proved to be wrong. Care of minor daughters of the petitioner can be taken by his grand mother and father. The petitioner has also stated that he will employ a female maid

servant at his home for the day-to-day care and upbringing of his minor daughters till he finds a suitable match to get remarried. On the other hand, respondents No.4 and 5 are both employed and their daughter aged about 26 years, who is at present taking tuition classes, is likely to get married or take up employment in the near future. Respondents No.4 and 5 cannot, therefore, be said to be in any comparatively preferable and advantageous position for taking care of the minors Kanika and Ananya and their ordinary comfort, contentment, health, education and intellectual development. Admittedly, the petitioner and his family members are Hindus by religion whereas respondents No.4 and 5 are christian by religion. The petitioner has ventilated in the petition his apprehension that respondents No.4 and 5 may convert his minor daughters to Christianity although respondents No.4 and 5 have denied this allegation. While giving due weight to minors Kanika and Ananya's ordinary comfort, contentment, health, education, intellectual development and favourable surroundings, their moral and ethical development cannot be ignored and their upbringing in their natural family which professes Hindu religion will also be just and proper to their moral and ethical development. Therefore, welfare of the minor daughters of the petitioner which is the paramount consideration lies in restoration of their custody to their father who cannot be deprived of the mutual love and affection.

24. Respondents No.4 and 5 have no legal right to detain minor daughters of the petitioner in their custody without any order by Competent Court appointing either of them as guardian of the minors and declaring the petitioner to be unfit for being guardian of his minor daughters so as to disentitle the petitioner to their custody. Respondent No.4 has filed petition

under Sections 7 and 8 of the Guardian and Wards Act, 1890 which is pending before the Guardian Judge at Ludhiana but no order for appointment of respondent No.4 as guardian and declaring the petitioner to be unfit for being guardian of minor Kanika and Ananya has been passed by the said Court so far. Section 17 (3) of the Guardian and Wards Act, 1890 provides that if the minor is old enough to form an intelligent preference, the court may consider that preference. Since, the elder daughter of the petitioner is aged about 7 years only and younger daughter is aged about 1½ years at the time of passing of this order, I am of the considered view that they cannot be said to be old enough to form an intelligent preference as to in whose custody they want to live. The petitioner cannot be relegated to avail the remedy of filing petition under Sections 7 and 8 of the Guardian and Wards Act, 1890 or take recourse to proceedings under Section 6 of the Hindu Minority and Adoption Act, 1956 and wait till decision of the same.

25. The facts of the present case are similar to those of ***Gohar Begam's Case (Supra) and Tejaswani Gaud's Case (Supra)*** and observations therein are also applicable to the facts of the present case. In the facts and circumstances of this case, the father, being the natural guardian, was justified in invoking the extraordinary remedy seeking custody of his minor daughters under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The petitioner being natural and legal guardian is entitled to custody of his minor daughters from respondents No. 4 and 5 who are illegally detaining them. However, minor Kanika is now studying in Wylie Memorial Senior Secandory School, Brown Road, Ludhiana and her education will be adversely affected by handing over her custody to the pettioner immediately before completion of the academic session as she may not now get

admission in school at Morinda. Therefore, it will be appropriate that her custody is handed over to the petitioner with effect from 01.04.2020 so that she may get admission in school at Morinda with commencement of the new academic session. Minor Ananya is not only emotionally attached to respondents No.4 and 5 due to her rearing so far by them but also to her elder sister Kanika who is living with her since 06.02.2019, and ordering of handing over of her custody alone immediately to the petitioner will be an emotional set back to her due to deprivation of the company of her elder sister Kanika and it will be appropriate that her custody is also handed over to the petitioner with effect from 01.04.2020 with that of minor Kanika. Therefore, the petition is allowed and rule nisi is made absolute and writ of habeas corpus is issued directing the respondents No.2 and 3 to effect release of minor Kanika and Ananya from custody of respondents No.4 and 5 and ensure restoration of their custody to the petitioner with effect from 01.04.2020.

26. Restoration of custody of the minor daughters to the petitioner from the custody of respondents No.4 and 5 might cause some problems initially but the same will be neutralized with the passage of time. Till the time the younger minor daughter of the petitioner familiarises with his grandmother, the petitioner arranges the assistance of a maid servant and his minor daughters are comfortably settled down in the atmosphere of the petitioner's house, respondents No. 4 and 5 will be entitled to have access to minor daughters of the petitioner in his house for period of three months from the date of handing over of their custody to the petitioner or such longer time as the Guardian Judge, Ludhiana may order during pendency or at the time of decision of the petition filed by respondent No.4.

27. In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, the parties are left to bear their own costs.

28. For the sake of abundant caution, it is clarified that nothing in this order shall influence or bind the Guardian Judge, Ludhiana in adjudication of the petition filed under Sections 7 and 8 of the Guardian and Wards Act, 1890 on merits on the basis of the evidence to be produced by the parties and the petitioner shall be, even after restoration of the custody of minor daughters to him, bound to abide by and comply with the decision of the Guardian Judge, Ludhiana subject to appeal/revision.

29. Registry is directed to send a copy of this order for requisite compliance to respondent No.2 who shall submit compliance report thereafter for being placed on record of the case.

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

23.01.2020

Kavneet Singh

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No