

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Criminal Appeal No.D-193-DB of 2015
Date of Decision: December 06, 2021

Rachpal Singh @ Buta Singh ... Appellant

versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present: Mr. Sumit Sharma, Advocate (legal aid counsel),
for the appellant.

Mr. I.P.S Doabia, Addl.A.G, Punjab.

RITU BAHRI, J.

This appeal is against the judgment of conviction and the sentence order dated 20.10.2014 passed by the learned Sessions Judge, Bathinda, convicting the appellant-Rachhpal Singh @ Buta Singh under Sections 302/323 of the Indian Penal Code (for short `the Code') and sentencing him to undergo rigorous imprisonment as under

Under Section 302 IPC	<i>Imprisonment for life and fine of Rs.10,000/-, in default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of six months</i>
Under Section 323 IPC	<i>Rigorous Imprisonment for a period of one year and fine of Rs.5,000/-, in default of payment of fine, to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of one month.</i>

Brief facts of the case, as unfolded in the report under Section 173 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, are that on 17.04.2013 consequent upon the receipt of a wireless message through P.C.R. qua the death of Manpreet Kaur daughter of Rachhpal Singh-appellant, resident of Mati Dass Nagar, Bathinda due to injuries, Inspector Paramjit Singh along with ASI

Sukhpal Singh, HC Kuldip Singh, HC Sukhdev Singh, HC Bikramjit Singh, HC Bharpur Singh and PHG Buta Singh, reached Civil Hospital, Bathinda on a Government vehicle bearing RC No.PB-03W-5977, which was being driven by HC Pritam Singh, where Sukhpal Kaur, mother of Manpreet Kaur, was lying admitted due to injuries and obtained her MLR No. 148/CHB/BTI dated 17.4.2013 from the concerned Doctor, in which two injuries of blunt in nature were reported to have been caused upon Sukhpal Kaur. Inspector Paramjit Singh sought the opinion of the concerned Doctor qua the fitness of Sukhpal Kaur to make a statement and upon her declaring fit by the Doctor, Inspector Paramjit Singh recorded the statement of Sukhpal Kaur to the effect that she is resident of Street No.11, Mati Dass Nagar, Bathinda. Her parental house is in Gidderbaha. She is married to Rachhpal Singh alias Buta son of Chand Singh for the last about twenty years. They were blessed with a daughter, namely, Manpreet Kaur aged about 17-18 years and a son, namely, Gurpreet Singh aged about 15-16 years. After the marriage, her husband became a Sadh. He was not doing any work since long. Whenever they used to ask Rachhpal Singh to do some work, he started quarrelling with them. She is bringing up her children by doing labour. Her daughter Manpreet Kaur appeared in +2 examination and whereas her son Gurpreet Singh appeared in the examination of 9th standard. Her husband instead of providing any maintenance to them, used to extort her earnings and took intoxicants. Being fed up from the daily quarrel, on the 25th day of the previous month, she along with her children went to the house of her sister Malkiat Kaur in Mandi Bariwala. In their absence, her husband set their house on fire, due to which the household articles lying in the house were burnt. On persuasion of their relations, she along with her children returned

to her house on April 11. Even thereafter, there was no change in the behaviour of her husband. On 17.4.2013, she was preparing tea in the morning and at that time her husband Rachhpal Singh and both the children were inside the room. It was about 6.00 a.m., she asked her husband to do some work, upon which he replied that he would not do any work for them and rather he would burn the house. Thereafter, her husband after picking up a match box lying nearby, tried to burn the mattresses as well as the bed sheet. When she tried to stop him from doing so, Rachhpal Singh pushed her and picked up a hammer lying near the bed and gave two hammer blows on her head. When her daughter Manpreet Kaur came forward to rescue her, Rachhpal Singh exhorted by saying that as she is supporting her mother, so he would first deal with her and saying so, he gave repeated hammer blows on the head of Manpreet Kaur. As a result of which, Manpreet Kaur smeared with blood and fell down. In order to save her daughter, she gave a push to Rachhpal Singh, who fell down. On their raising alarm, her husband Rachhpal Singh went to the courtyard of their house along with the hammer. Thereafter, the people from neighbourhood gathered in the street and someone of them made a call. After some time an Ambulance came and she along with her daughter were taken to Civil Hospital, Bathinda. However, Manpreet Kaur succumbed to the injuries on the way to the hospital. She further disclosed that the motive behind the occurrence was that her husband was not doing any work and whatever she earns, he used to consume intoxicants and whenever they asked him to do some work, he used to quarrel with them and it was due to this reason that her husband caused injuries to her

The contents of the statement of Sukhpal Kaur, Ex.PA, were

read over and explained to her by Inspector Paramjit Singh and she having admitted the contents thereof to be correct, appended her right signatures on the same, which was also attested by Inspector Paramjit Singh. Inspector Paramjit Singh carried out the police proceedings, Ex.PW-11/A, below the statement of Sukhpal Kaur and thereafter, sent the same to Police Station, Cantt., Bathinda through HC Bikramjit Singh, on the basis of which formal First Information Report, Ex.PW-11/B, under Sections 302 and 323 of the Indian Penal Code was recorded by MHC Kulwinder Singh. The investigation was put into motion, during which, Investigating Officer Inspector Paramjit Singh inspected the dead-body of Manpreet Kaur and prepared the inquest report, Ex.PW-6/C, on the dead-body of Manpreet Kaur, on the identification of Nachhattar Singh and Lakhwinder Singh and recorded the statements of the witnesses under Section 175 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. HC Kuldip Singh and HC Sukhdev Singh were deputed by the Investigating Officer for getting conducted the post mortem examination on the dead-body of Manpreet Kaur through police request, Ex.PW-6/A. Accordingly, the dead-body of Manpreet Kaur was subjected to autopsy in Civil Hospital, Bathinda on 17.4.2013 by a Board of Doctors, consisting of Dr.Nidhi Gupta, Dr.Maninder Singh and Dr.Poonam Dhillon. After the post-mortem examination, the duly stitched dead-body of Manpreet Kaur along with belongings of the deceased, copy of post-mortem examination report, other police papers and viscera of the deceased were handed over to HC Kuldeep Singh, who in turn gave all the documents to the Investigating Officer and the dead-body of Manpreet Kaur was handed over to her heirs. Investigating Officer visited the place of occurrence, inspected the spot, clicked the photographs of the place of occurrence and

prepared rough site plan, Ex.PW-11/D, of the place of occurrence with correct marginal notes at the instance of Gurpreet Singh brother of deceased Manpreet Kaur. Investigating Officer lifted blood stained soil, simple soil and the blood scattered on the pucca portion of the floor along with a piece of blood-stained cloth from the Sofa set, half burnt clothes of the bed sheet and blood-stained pair of shoes from the spot and converted the same into different parcels, sealed with his seal bearing impression 'PS and took the same in possession through recovery memo Ex.PW-2/A, attested by the relevant witnesses. Sample seal impression was also prepared separately and the seal, after use, was handed over to ASI Sukhpal Singh. Statements of the relevant witnesses were recorded under Section 161 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. On return to the Police Station, Investigating Officer deposited the case property in intact condition with the MHC. On 20.4.2013, Inspector Paramjit Singh arrested accused Rachhpal Singh alias Buta after having made him aware about the grounds of arrest vide memo, Ex.PW-7/D. Personal search of accused Rachhpal Singh was conducted, but nothing valuable was recovered and memo, Ex.PW-7/C, in this regard was prepared. Accused produced his blood-stained trouser and shirt before the Investigating Officer. The same were converted into a parcel, sealed with sealed bearing impression 'PS and the same were taken into police possession vide memo, Ex.PW-7/B. On interrogation, accused Rachhpal Singh suffered a disclosure statement to the effect that he has kept concealed a hammer, used in the crime, under the cotton sticks lying in his house, about which he has got an exclusive knowledge and could get the same recovered. His disclosure statement, Ex.PW-7/E, was jotted down, which was signed by accused Rachhpal Singh and witnessed by PW

Gurbachan Singh and HC Kuldeep Singh. Thereafter, in pursuance of his disclosure statement, accused Rachhpal Singh led the police party to the disclosed place and got recovered the blood-stained hammer. Rough sketch, Ex.PW-7/F, of the hammer was prepared by the Investigating Officer and thereafter, the hammer was taken into police possession after converting the same into a parcel, sealed with scale bearing impression 'PS', through recovery memo, Ex.PW-7/G, attested by PW Gurbachan Singh and HC Kuldeep Singh. Rough site plan, Ex.PW-11/E, of the place of recovery was also prepared by the Investigating Officer. Statements of the relevant witnesses were recorded under Section 161 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. During the course of investigation, on 16.7.2013, Dr.Nidhi Gupta, Medical Officer, Civil Hospital, Bathinda, on police request, Ex.PW-6/G, gave her opinion, Ex.PW-6/H, qua the cause of death of Manpreet Kaur. After the completion of all other necessary formalities of the investigation, challan against accused Rachhpal Singh was presented in the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Bathinda, who after having complied with the provisions contained under Section 207 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, committed to this Court vide order dated July 31, 2013.

There being a prima facie evidence appearing in the report under Section 173 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and the documents annexed with it, accused was charge-sheeted to face trial under Sections 302 and 323 of the Indian Penal Code, to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

Accordingly, the case was fixed for evidence of the prosecution. In order to substantiate its version, prosecution examined Sukhpal Kaur, complainant/injured/eye-witness as PW-1, Gurpreet Singh,

eye-witness as PW-2, Malkiat Kaur as PW-3, Dr.Parminder Bansal, Medical Officer, Civil Hospital, Bathinda as PW-4, Dr Ramandeep Goyal, Medical Officer, Civil Hospital, Bathinda as PW-5, Dr.Nidhi Gupta, Medical Officer, Civil Hospital, Bathinda as PW-6, HC Kuldeep Singh as PW-7, HC Bahadur Singh as PW-8, Veerpal Kaur Draftsman as PW-9, HC Bharpur Singh as PW-10, Inspector Paramjit Singh, Investigating Officer, as PW-11 and thereafter, the learned Public Prosecutor for the State closed the prosecution evidence.

On closure of the prosecution evidence, statement of accused under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure was recorded, but he denied the allegations of the prosecution and contended that he is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He further stated that he was mentally ill and the allegations levelled against him are totally false and baseless. However, accused Rachhpal Singh did not examine any witness in his defence.

The trial Court after going through the entire evidence led by the parties convicted and sentenced the accused-appellant as mentioned above.

Learned counsel for the appellant has vehemently argued that firstly there was delay in lodging the F.I.R and secondly, as per the statement of wife and brother of the appellant, the appellant was a drug addict and thus, he cannot be convicted under Section 302 IPC as he was not in his sense at the time of incident.

Learned counsel for the appellant has further argued that the case of the prosecution is solely based upon testimony of Sukhpal Kaur (P.W.1) and Gurpreet Singh (P.W.2), who are wife and son of the appellant

respectively. Their presence at the spot is highly doubtful and suspicious. Further their testimony cannot be believed as they are close relatives of the appellant.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has supported the conviction and sentence of the accused-appellant.

We have heard learned counsel for the accused and have perused the file with their assistance.

It is not in dispute that in the disclosure statement (Ex P.W.7/E) of the accused-appellant, he stated that he has kept concealed a hammer used in the crime, under the cotton sticks lying in the house. He led the police party to the disclosed place and got recovered the blood stained hammer. The hammer was taken into police possession after converting the same into police parcel, sealed with seal bearing impression 'PS', through recovery memo, Ex P.W.7/G. The disclosure statement was duly signed by the appellant and witnessed by P.W. Gurbachan Singh and HC Kuldip Singh.

Reference at this stage can further be made to examination of Sukhpal Kaur as P.W.1 who stated that earlier as well, the appellant used to quarrel with her as he was not doing any work. She further testified that her husband Rachhpal Singh instead of earning anything used to extort her earnings. He was also drug addict. On 25.03.2013, the complainant along with her children went to the house of her elder sister Malkiat Kaur in Mandi Bariwala. When she left the house, her husband-appellant set their house on fire, causing a huge loss to the household articles. On persuasion of their relatives, she along with her children returned to her in-laws house on 11.04.2013. But thereafter, on 17.04.2013, her husband again set on fire

the wooden bed lying in the house with the help of match stick, as a result of which, bedding and the bedding cloth got burnt and when she tried to stop him from doing so, he pushed him. She further deposed that accused picked a 'Hathora' (hammer) and gave two 'Hathora' blows in her head. When her daughter Manpreet Kaur came forward to save her, her husband exhorted that who was she, to save her and that he would firstly deal with her and thereafter, he gave repeated blows with the 'Hathora' in the head of her daughter Manpreet Kaur. Her body got embedded with blood and she fell down on the ground. In order to save her daughter, she pushed my husband. She and her son made hue and cry, upon which her husband Rachhpal Singh went away along with the 'Hathora'. The persons from neighbourhood in the street also gathered. Someone of them dialed and the Ambulance came on the spot. Thereafter, she along with her daughter was taken to Civil Hospital, Bathinda, where her daughter succumbed to the aforesaid injuries received from her husband. She was admitted in the hospital and was given treatment. She also stated that she worked as Labourer in order to earn livelihood and whenever, she told to her husband to do some work, he used to fight with her. The testimony of complainant Sukhpal Kaur supported all material particulars by her son Gurpreet Singh, who witnessed the occurrence and stepped into the witness box as P.W.2

In the statement of Inspector Paramjit Singh, Investigating Officer, P.W.11, he stated that on 17.04.2013, he was posted as Inspector/SHO of Police Station, Cantt Bathinda and on the said date, on receipt of information regarding the death of Manpreet Kaur through wireless message from Police Control Room, he along with other police party went to Civil Hospital, Bathinda where on his request, Ex P.W.5/E, Sukhpal Kaur

mother of the deceased Manpreet Kaur, who was admitted there, was declared fit to make statement vide endorsement Ex P.W.5/F by the concerned doctor. After receiving the relevant Ruqa and the MLR of Sukhpal Kaur, he recorded the statement of Sukhpal Kaur, Ex. PA. He further deposed that PWs Nachhatar Singh and Lakhwinder Singh, relatives of the deceased and injured Sukhpal Kaur were joined in the investigation. He inspected the dead body of Manpreet Kaur in the presence of PWs Nachhatar Singh and Lakhwinder Singh and prepared inquest report Ex P.W.6/C. The dead body was then sent for Post Mortem examination through police request. On the demarcation of Gurpreet Singh, site plan Ex P.W.11/D of the place of occurrence was prepared with correct marginal notes. He further testified that from the spot, blood-stained earth, simple earth and the blood scattered on pucca ground, piece of blood stained cloth from Sofa set, half burnt cloth of the bed sheet and blood-stained pair of shoes were taken into possession vide memo Ex P.W.2/A, attested by relevant witnesses, after converting the same into different parcels, sealed with his seal impression 'PS'. He proved the case property i.e parcels as MO-I to MO-6.

Dr. Parminder Bansal, Medical Officer, Civil Hospital, Bathinda was also examined as P.W.4 who stated that on 17.04.2013, he while working as Emergency Medical Officer at Civil Hospital, Bathinda, declared Manpreet Kaur (daughter of the appellant) as already dead on her arrival in the hospital. He proved Ruqa Ex P.W.4/A having been sent to him by Police Control Room, Bathinda.

Dr. Nidhi Gupta appeared as P.W.6 who stated that on 17.04.2013, she while posted as Medical Officer, Civil Hospital, Bathinda

along with Dr. Maninder Singh and Dr. Poonam Dhillon conducted the post-mortem examination on the dead body of Manpreet Kaur. The dead-body was brought by HC Kuldip Singh and was identified by Nachhattar Singh son of Sardara Singh and Lakhwinder Singh son of Nachhattar Singh. Length of the body was 5'. It was dead body of female moderately built and nourished, wearing Salwar, Kameez, white vest and blood stained bra. Rigor mortis and postmortem staining were not present. There was blood in the nose and mouth was closed. Pharynx, Oesophagus, Larynx and Trachea were normal. Chest walls, Ribs and cartilages were grossly healthy. Pleural cavities, lungs, Heart & Pericardium were grossly healthy. Peritoneum, small intestines, large intestines, liver, spleen, kidneys, bladder were healthy. Stomach was healthy and contained semi digested food. Organs of generation were normal. They found the following injuries:

- “1. 6 cm X 8 cm lacerated wound of the scalp over left parietal region 4 inches above left ear, underlying bones of the skull fractured. Clotted blood was present. Brain matter coming out.*
- 2. 4 cm x 6 cm lacerated wound of the scalp 4 inches behind left ear.*
- 3. 6 cm x 8 cm lacerated wound of scalp in center of head underlying bone was fractured with clotted blood present Brain matter was coming out.*
- 4. 6 cm X 10 cm lacerated wound of the scalp just above the neck. Underlying bone fractured and clotted blood was present. Brain matter was coming out.*

Dr.Nidhi Gupta (PW-6) further testified that in their opinion, the cause of death was due to head injury, which was ante-mortem in nature and sufficient to cause death in the ordinary course of nature. She further opined that probable time that elapsed between injury and death was sudden

and between death and postmortem examination was within 12 hours. This witness further deposed that after post-mortem examination, they handed over the dead body, its belongings, copy of post-mortem report, police inquest papers numbering 1 to 23, duly signed by them, including inquest report, Ex.PW-6/C, to HC Kuldip Singh.

Dr.Ramandeep Goyal (PW-5) further testified that on 17.04.2013, he while posted as Medical Officer, Civil Hospital, Bathinda, medico legally examined Sukhpal Kaur and opined that the patient was conscious, oriented and her BP was 120/80 mmhg. He found the following injuries.

“1. A lacerated wound 1.3 cm X 0.4 cm bone deep on right frontal parietal region at level of anterior hairline 6 cm above middle third of right eyebrow. Fresh bleeding was present. Tenderness was present. X-ray and surgical opinion were advised.

2. A diffuse swelling around occipital tuberosity with small laceration in middle about 1 cm X 0.3 cm X 0.3 cm. Tenderness was present. X-ray and surgical opinion were advised.

The argument of learned counsel for the appellant that there is a delay in lodging of the First Information Report has rightly been discarded by the Court below by relying upon a judgment titled as ***State of Rajasthan vs. N.K. (accused), 2000 Criminal Law Journal 2205***. The relevant portion of the judgment reads as under:-

“wherein it has been categorically observed by the Hon'ble Apex Court that mere delay in lodging the First Information Report cannot be ground itself for throwing the entire prosecution case over board. The Court has to seek an explanation for delay and test the truthfulness and plausibility of the reasons assigned. If the delay is explained to the satisfaction of the Court, it cannot be counted against the prosecution. This Court further relies upon another authority titled as ***Sher Singh and another Vs. State of Haryana 2011(1) Criminal Court Cases 381 (SC)***, wherein the occurrence took place at 6.00

a.m., whereas the FIR was lodged at 7.20 p.m. Police Station was at a distance of 12 kms. The deceased had been shifted to Civil Hospital, where he died. ASI had visited Civil Hospital and recorded the statement of wife of deceased. It was held that it must be borne in mind that in a case where the complainant is the wife, it is but natural that she should be completely distraught by the turn of events and if there is some delay in recording of her statement that cannot be taken against the prosecution in any way. Yet in another authority titled as **Avtar Singh Vs. State of Punjab, 2003(4) Recent Criminal Reports 904**, there was a delay of two days in lodging the FIR, the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court categorically held that it would itself not be a ground to throw out the prosecution case when it was otherwise proved by evidence, which could not be doubted.

The next argument of learned counsel for the appellant that the case of the prosecution is solely based upon testimonies of Sukhpal Kaur (P.W.1) and Gurpreet Singh (P.W.2), who are wife and son of the appellant respectively and thus is liable to be discarded keeping in view the fact that they are close relatives of the appellant, is also liable to be dismissed, keeping in view the judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in a case of ***Briender Poddar vs. State of Bihar***, 2011 (3) RCR (CrI) 510, which was subsequently relied upon by the Hon'ble Apex Court as well as by this Court in a number of judgments. In para No. 14 to 16, it has been observed as under:-

“14. Now coming to the question of reliance by the prosecution on witnesses who are related to the deceased, we find that the law is well-settled that merely because the witnesses are related is not a ground to discard their evidence. On the other hand, the court has held that in many cases, the relations are only available for giving evidence, having regard to the trend in our present society, where other than relations, witnesses are not available. It is of course true that the evidence of the interested witnesses have to be carefully scrutinised. We find that the High Court has scrutinised the evidence of the relations with due care and caution.

15. In this connection, the learned counsel for the appellant has relied on a few decisions of this court. Reliance was placed on the decision of this Court in the case of Rajendra and Another v. State of Uttar Pradesh [(2009) 13 SCC 480]. In that case, though in the F.I.R., throttling was alleged and

no injury mark was found on the neck of the deceased and the Doctor in cross examination suggested the possibility of suicide, this Court held that in such a case holistic approach should be taken (Para 10) and ultimately dismissed the appeal. We are of the view that the said decision does not, in any way, render any assistance to the appellant in this case.

16. Two other decisions which have been cited by learned counsel for the appellant were rendered in the case of Namdeo v. State of Maharashtra [(2007) 14 SCC 150] and in the case of State of Maharashtra v. Ahmed Shaikh Babajan and Others [(2009) 14 SCC 267] which dealt with the question of appreciation of evidence of interested witnesses. Both those decisions follow the well-settled principle that just because evidence is given by the interested persons that is no ground for discarding the same. We have already held that in the instant case, the evidence given by PWs 5, 6, 7 and 8 is quite cogent and clearly established the prosecution case.”

Reference at this stage can further be made to a case titled as ***Chander Mohan Tiwari and another vs. State of Madhya Pradesh***, AIR 1992 SC 891, wherein it has been held that being parents of the victim they would be the least deposed to falsely implicate the accused or substitute them in place of the real culprits.

Thus, in the present case as well, the statement of Sukhpal Kaur (P.W.1) and Gupreet Singh (P.W.2) cannot be discarded merely on the ground that they are wife and son respectively of the appellant-accused. There was no occasion to false depose against the appellant by the above witnesses. Further in the said incident, Sukhpal Kaur also sustained injuries and she was medico legally examined by Dr. Ramandeep Goyal, as mentioned above. Their presence on the spot thus cannot be doubted in any manner.

The next argument of learned counsel for the appellant that since the appellant was a drug addict, he cannot be convicted under Section 302 IPC as he was not in his sense at the time of incident.

This argument is also liable to be discarded, as the accused-

appellant has not led any evidence to show that he was under the influence of drugs.

The appeal is liable to be dismissed as it is on the disclosure statement of the appellant, the hammer was taken into police possession after converting the same into police parcel, sealed with seal bearing impression 'PS', through recovery memo, Ex P.W.7/G. The disclosure statement was duly signed by the appellant and witnessed by P.W. Gurbachan Singh and HC Kuldip Singh.

Keeping in view the recovery of blood stained hammer on the disclosure statement of the appellant (Ex.PW-7/E) coupled with the statement of eye witnesses Sukhpal Kaur (P.W.1) and Gupreet Singh (P.W.2), the accused has rightly been convicted and sentenced by the Court below. Dr. Nidhi Gupta (PW-6) further testified that the cause of death of Manpreet Kaur was due to head injury, which was ante-mortem in nature and sufficient to cause death in the ordinary course of nature. It has also come on record that earlier also the appellant in the absence of family members, set the house on fire, due to which the household articles lying in the house were burnt. The appellant was not doing anything and used to extort the earnings of her wife.

After going through the entire facts, we hold that the prosecution evidence is reliable and trustworthy. The prosecution has completed the chain of circumstances from the date of alleged incident. The prosecution has followed all the procedures under the Act and successfully proved that the accused was guilty of the offences charged.

In the light of the above discussion, we are of the opinion that the judgment of conviction and the sentence order dated 20.10.2014

passed by the learned Sessions Judge, Bathinda, does not require any interference by this Court.

Consequently, the appeal is dismissed.

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE

06.12.2021
G Arora

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

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