

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 815 OF 2014

Netaji Nanasaheb Tele
Age 28 years, Occ. Agriculture
R/o. Peth, Tq. Osmanabad
District Osmanabad

...Appellant
(Ori. Accused)

versus

The State of Maharashtra

...Respondent

(Copy to be served on Additional
Public Prosecutor, High Court of
Judicature at Bombay,
Bench at Aurangabad)

.....
Mr. A. B. Kale Advocate for the appellant-accused
Mr. R.D. Sanap, A.P.P. for respondent-State
Mr. Manoj Shelke, advocate to assist the A.P.P.
.....

**CORAM : V. K. JADHAV AND
SANDIPKUMAR. C. MORE, JJ.
DATED : 10th JANUARY, 2022**

JUDGMENT (PER V.K. JADHAV, J.) :-

1. This appeal is directed against the judgment and order of conviction passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Osmanabad dated 10.12.2014 in Sessions Case No. 99 of 2014.

2. Brief facts giving rise to the prosecution case are as follows:-

a) Deceased Nanasaheb was the father of appellant-accused. The appellant-accused was working as priest at Kolhapur and Shirdi.

On 02.12.2013, he had been to the house at village Ter, Tq. and district Osmanabad. The incident had taken place on the same day at about 9.00 p.m. At about 9.00 p.m. the appellant-accused returned to the house. He took dinner. P.W.1 Sonali and P.W.2 Pallavi were in their respective rooms. After taking dinner, the appellant-accused when started going out, deceased Nanasaheb had obstructed him and told that he was not doing any work and should not come to the home. Thereupon, the appellant-accused slapped his father on his cheek. Deceased Nanasaheb became angry and questioned the appellant-accused as he has slapped his father. However, the appellant-accused took out knife (Sura) kept hidden near his abdomen and stabbed his deceased father on his chest and left side of stomach. The appellant-accused thereafter, pushed P.W.1 Sonali and ran away. Deceased was immediately taken to the Government Hospital, however, he was declared dead on arrival.

b) On the complaint Exh.15, lodged by P.W.1 Sonali, at about 1.00 a.m. on 3.12.2013, crime No. 137 of 2013 came to be registered for the offence punishable under Sections 302 and 323 of I.P.C. against the appellant-accused. P.W.12 Dy. S. P. Rameshwar Khanal had investigated the crime. He has visited the Tel Rural Hospital and drew inquest panchanama Exh.25. He has visited the spot of incident and drew spot panchnama Exh.23 in presence of panchas. He has thereafter collected sample of blood found on the

spot of incident by cotton swab. The said spot of incident is in the house of deceased at Ter. He has also recorded the statements of witnesses and also effected the arrest of appellant-accused on 03.12.2013 by drawing arrest panchanama Exh.36.

c) On 4.12.2013, the appellant-accused has made disclosure statement in presence of panchas that he is ready to produce the blood stained clothes which were on his person at the time of incident and the weapon knife (Suri) used for commission of crime kept at hidden place. Thus, memorandum panchnama Exh.37 was prepared. Thereafter, the appellant-accused took the police party and panch witnesses in Sai Baba temple, which is in the field at Ter. The appellant-accused went inside the temple and brought one bag containing one shirt, one pant and one Suri. The clothes were stained with blood. There were also blood stains on Suri. Accordingly, the said articles came to be seized by drawing recovery panchanama Exh.38. Further, the police constable had produced clothes of deceased and the investigating officer, Dy. S.P. Mr. Rameshwar Khanal has seized the said clothes under panchanama Exh.39. On 03.01.2014 he has sent the seized clothes and blood samples of deceased to chemical analysis at Aurangabad in sealed condition. He has recorded the statements of witnesses. He has also collected the post mortem report and on completion of investigation submitted charge sheet against the appellant-accused. Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Osmanabad has framed charge against

the appellant-accused for the offence punishable under Sections 302 and 323 of I.P.C. The contents of the charge were read over and explained to accused in vernacular, to which he denied and claimed to be tried. The defence of the appellant-accused is of false implication.

d) The prosecution has examined in all 13 witnesses to substantiate the charge levelled against the appellant-accused. The learned Additional Sessions Judge by impugned order dated 10.12.2014 in Sessions Case No. 99 of 2014 convicted the appellant-accused for the offence punishable under Section 302 of I.P.C. and sentenced him to undergo life imprisonment and to pay fine of Rs.5000/- i/d to suffer R.I. for one year. The operative part of the order passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Osmanabad in Sessions Case No. 99 of 2014 is reproduced herein below:-

Order

“1. Accused Netaji Nanasaheb Tele is convicted under Section 235(2) of Code of Criminal Procedure for offence punishable under Section 302 of Indian Penal Code and sentenced to undergo life imprisonment and to pay fine of Rs.5000/- (Rs. Five thousand only), in default to suffer rigorous imprisonment for one year.

2. He is acquitted under Sec. 235(1) of Code of Criminal Procedure of the offence punishable under Sec. 323 of Indian Penal Code.

3. Set off under Section 428 of Code of Criminal Procedure be given to accused.

4. Muddemal property clothes and Suri (knife), being worthless be destroyed after appeal period.

5. Copy of this judgment be given free of cost to the accused immediately.”

3. Learned counsel for the appellant-accused submits that deceased Nanasaheb had two wives viz. Radhabai and Sumanbai. Radhabai had two sons viz. Shahaji and Tanaji. P.W.1 Sonali is the wife of Tanaji. Sumanbai has two sons viz. Balaji and appellant-accused Netaji and one daughter Indubai. Said Sumanabi was the first wife of deceased Nanasaheb. The appellant-accused Netaji is elder to Balaji. The appellant-accused is unmarried. Learned counsel submits that P.W.1 Sonali and P.W.2 Pallavi are the only eye witnesses to the incident. P.W.1 Sonali is the wife of Tanaji and P.W.2 Pallavi is the wife of Shahaji. The said Shahaji and Tanaji are the sons of deceased Nanasaheb born from second wife Radhabai. So far as the fist wife Sumanbai is concerned, Balaji and appellant-accused Netaji are two sons and also one daughter Indubai. Learned counsel submits that deceased Nanasaheb has transferred entire agricultural land in the names of husbands of P.W.1 Sonali and P.W.2 Pallavi. The appellant-accused whenever visited village Ter he was asking for partition of land, however, deceased Nanasaheb

and husband of P.W.2 Pallavi viz. Shahaji were not ready to give land to the appellant-accused. Learned counsel submits that P.W.1 Sonali and P.W.2 Palvi are highly interested witnesses. They had no opportunity to witness the incident. They are not eye witnesses to the incident. Learned counsel submits that there was scheduled load-shedding at village Ter on 02.12.2013 from 7.00 p.m. to 10.00 p.m. The defence has also examined junior Engineer of M.S.E.D.C.L. at Ter as defence witness No.1 viz. Santosh Rajput. Learned counsel therefore, submits that there was no electricity in the house of deceased Nanasaheb at the time of alleged incident and as such, there was no occasion for P.W.1 Sonali and P.W.2 Pallavi to witness the actual incident. Learned counsel submits that the appellant-accused has been falsely implicated in connection with the present crime. Learned counsel submits that the panch witness about memorandum pancahnama Exh.37 and recovery panchanama Exh.38 have not supported the prosecution case in any manner. Learned counsel for the appellant-accused submits that appellant-accused thus entitled for benefit of doubt.

4. In the alternate, learned counsel for the appellant-accused submits that as per the prosecution story, the incident had taken place without any premeditation in the heat of passion on account of grave and sudden provocation. As per the prosecution story, deceased Nanasaheb has told the appellant-accused that he was not doing anything and further directed him not to come in the house.

Learned counsel submits that on this grave and sudden provocation the appellant-accused if reacted in the manner as alleged, the same is not murder and it amounts to culpable homicide for which the appellant should have been convicted under Section 304 Part I of I.P.C. and not under Section 302 of I.P.C. Learned counsel submits that the appellant-accused undergone the sentence to the extent of 7 years so far. In the alternate he may be convicted under Section 304 Part I of I.P.C. and sentenced to imprisonment which he has already undergone.

Learned counsel for the appellant-accused in order to substantiate his submissions placed reliance on the following cases:-

- I) Budhimanta Naik vs State of Orissa, reported in 2014 SCC Online Ori. 621;
- ii) Budhi Singh vs. State of H.P., reported in 2012 (13) SCC 663

5. Learned A.P.P. submits that there are two eye witnesses to the incident. Their evidence cannot be rejected out-rightly for the sole reason that they are interested witnesses. The evidence of P.W.1 Sonali and P.W.2 Pallavi is consistent, reliable and trustworthy. They are natural witnesses to the incident. The incident had taken place in the house itself in between 9.00 p.m. to 9.30 p.m. and as such there could not have been any independent witness. Learned A.P.P. submits that both the witnesses have categorically denied that there

was no electricity in the house at the relevant time. On the other hand, the defence witness has also not in a position to tell as to in which area the house of deceased Nanasaheb is situated and whether there was load-shedding as per the schedule.

6. Learned A.P.P. submits that so far as alternate submission is concerned, deceased Nanasaheb-father has merely scolded his son for not doing anything and further in the heat of anger directed him not to come in the house. Learned A.P.P. submits that same cannot be treated as grave and sudden provocation. On the other hand, the appellant-accused immediately reacted and slapped his deceased father. However, deceased Nanasaheb when questioned about slapping, the appellant-accused took out a knife hidden by him in the abdomen and caused as many as 10 penetrative injuries on the person of deceased Nanasaheb. Learned A.P.P. submits that the appellant-accused has invited the provocation by slapping his father deceased Nanasaheb and further seeking excuses for re-acting upon the said provocation, by treating it as sudden and grave. Learned A.P.P. submits that there is no substance in this appeal and the same is liable to be dismissed.

7. We have perused the material exhibits tendered by the prosecution, the evidence of the prosecution witnesses; the statement of the appellant-accused recorded under Section 313 of Criminal Procedure Code and the impugned judgment.

8. So far as the homicidal death in this case is concerned, the same is not seriously disputed by the defence. The prosecution has examined P.W.3 Dr. Mukund Mane, who has conducted the post mortem examination on the dead body of deceased Nanasaheb on 03.12.2013. On external examination, he has noted following 10 injuries on the person of deceased Nanasaheb.

- i) Penetrative wound of 3.5 x 1.7 cm. horizontal directed down word on right clavical,
- ii) Penetrative injury between right second and third rib, adm. 4X1x cm,
- iii) Penetrative incised wound on left first and second rib, adm.4x1x8,
- iv) Penetrative injury on left medial to nipple, adm. 4X1x10,
- v) Penetrative injury on apigastrium of right lobe of liver, 5x8x15 cm,
- vi) Penetrative injury on left mid axillary line, adm. 3.5x1 cm, in intra-poster space,
- vii) Penetrative injury on left axillary line, 3.5x1 cm, in 7th intra-poster space.
- Viii) CLW on left mid-arm, 3.5x1 cm,
- ix) CLW on left fore-arm, 4.5x1 cm,
- x) CLW on left fore-arm, 6 cm.

9. On internal examination, P.W. 3 Dr. Mukund Mane has noted

following injuries:-

- i) Lacerted wound on apical and redial lobe at right lung,
- ii) Lacerted wound on left upper lobe of lung,
- iii) Wound in epigamium of abdominal wall,
- iv) There was massive haemorrhage in peritoneum,
- v) Lacerted wound on right lobe of liver, adm.10 cm. associated with external injury no.5.

10. According to P.W.3 Dr. Mukund Mane, the injuries found on lungs were associated with external injury Nos. 1 to 3. In his opinion, from the external and internal injuries found on the person of deceased, he died due to multiple penetrative injuries with internal injury to lung and liver and even laceration with massive haemorrhage. Accordingly, he has issued post mortem notes, which bears his signature and marked at Exh.20. In his considered opinion, the external and internal injuries found on the person of deceased are sufficient to cause death in ordinary course of nature. He has further opined that the penetrative injuries found on the person of deceased Nanasaheb are possible by article 8 knife (suri). There is nothing in the cross examination to draw inference about the death other than the homicidal death.

11. Deceased Nanasaheb was having two wives. The appellant-accused is step brother of husband P.W.1 Sonali and P.W.2 Pallavi.

It has been merely suggested to the witnesses in the cross examination about the dispute in respect of partition of land, however, no document has been placed on record to substantiate the same nor the witnesses were confronted with any such document indicating the dispute about partition of agricultural land.

12. The evidence of P.W.1 Sonali and P.W.2 Pallavi is consistent, reliable and trustworthy. We do not think that they are interested witnesses. They have deposed about the incident as it had happened in the house. At that time their both mother-in-laws and their respective husbands were not present in the house. Their evidence is consistent on the point that at about 9.00 p.m. the accused returned to the house and after taking dinner when he started to leave the house, at that time, deceased Nanasaheb had asked him that since he was not doing any work he should not come at home. Thereupon the appellant-accused has slapped to his father deceased Nanasaheb on his cheek. Thereupon deceased Nanasaheb had questioned about slap to father. Thereupon, the appellant-accused took out a weapon knife (Suri) hidden near his abdomen and stabbed injuries of deceased Nanasaheb more than once and there was bleeding. The appellant-accused thereafter ran away since both the witnesses have raised hue and cry. The evidence of P.W.1 Sonali and P.W.2 Pallavi is corroborated by medical evidence.

13. Even though the panch witnesses have not supported the prosecution case so far as memorandum and recovery panchanama are concerned, however, P.W.12 Dy.S.P. Rameshwar Khanal has deposed about disclosure made by the appellant-accused during his police custody and accordingly produced his blood stained clothes and weapon used for commission of crime from hidden place situated at Sai Temple, Ter. Those articles are white colour shirt having blood stains, one faint black colour full pant having blood stains and one iron knife having scales and blood stains were on the blade. C.A. report Exh.44 speaks about blood stained clothes of deceased Nanasaheb as well as the clothes of the appellant-accused and also on the weapon knife (sura) and the said blood was of blood group "B". As per C.A. report Exh.45 the blood group of deceased Nanasaheb was "B".

14. So far as the evidence of defence witness is concerned, even though D.W.1 Santosh Rajput has deposed about the time table of load-shedding Exh.52 at village Ter on 02.12.2013. However, in cross examination, he has admitted that it does not reveal that there was load-shedding in Peth area of village Ter on 02.12.2013 from 7.00 p.m. to 10.00 p.m.. Furthermore, P.W.1 Sonali has deposed that there were two inverters in their house. She has denied that at the time of incident, there was no light in the drawing room and in front of their house. She has denied that she went to the spot of incident only after noticing that her father-in-law was lying outside

door of drawing room. She has also denied that she has not witnessed the incident. P.W.2 Pallavi has also denied the same suggestion.

15. The prosecution has thus proved the case beyond reasonable doubt against the appellant-accused. There are eye witnesses to the incident. Their evidence is cogent, reliable and trustworthy. The evidence of eye witnesses is duly corroborated by medical evidence so also the recovery of clothes of accused and weapon having blood stains of blood group of deceased Nanasaheb.

16. We are not impressed by the alternate argument made on behalf of the appellant-accused. Exception 1 to Section 300 of I.P.C. speaks as to when culpable homicide is not murder. In terms of Exception 1 of Section 300 culpable homicide is not murder if the offender, while deprived of the power of self-control by grave and sudden provocation, causes the death of person who gave the provocation or causes the death of any other person by mistake or accident. The said exception is subject to proviso and the explanation with illustrations only reproduced herein below as relevant for present discussion:-

Exception 1 of Section 300 of I.P.C. with explanation alongwith illustrations read as under:-

“Exception 1.- When culpable homicide is not murder.-

Culpable homicide is not murder if the offender whilst deprived of the power of self control by grave and sudden provocation, causes the death of the person who gave the provocation or causes the death of any other person by mistake or accident.

The above Exception is subject to the following provisos:-

First.- That the provocation is not sought or voluntarily provoked by the offender as an excuse for killing or doing harm to any person.

Secondly.- That the provocation is not given by anything done in obedience to the law, or by a public servant in the lawful exercise of the powers of such public servant.

Thirdly.- That the provocation is not given by anything done in the lawful exercise of the right of private defence.

Explanation.- Whether the provocation was grave and sudden enough to prevent the offence from amounting to murder is a question of fact.

Illustrations

(a) A. under the influence of passion excited by a provocation given by Z, intentionally kills Y, Z's child. This is murder, in as much as the provocation was not given by the child, and the death of the child was not caused by accident or misfortune in doing an act caused by the provocation.

(b) Y gives grave and sudden provocation to A. A, on this provocation, fires a pistol at Y, neither intending nor knowing himself to be likely to kill Z, who is near him, but out of sight. A

kills Z. Here A has not committed murder, but merely culpable homicide.

(c) A is lawfully arrested by Z, a bailiff. A is excited to sudden and violent passion by the arrest and kills Z. This is murder, inasmuch as the provocation was given by a thing done by a public servant in the exercise of his powers.

(d) A appears as a witness before Z, a Magistrate, Z says that he does not believe a word of A's deposition and that A has perjured himself. A is moved sudden passion by these words and kills Z. This is murder.

(e) A attempts to pull Z's nose. Z, in the exercise of the right of private defence lays hold of A to prevent him from doing so. A is moved to sudden and violent passion in consequence, and kills Z. This is murder, inasmuch as the provocation was given by a thing done in the exercise of the right of private defence.

(f) Z strikes B. B is by this provocation excited to violent rage. A, a bystander intending to take advantage of B's rage; and to cause him to kill Z, puts a knife into B's hand for that purpose. B kills Z with the knife. Here B may have committed only culpable homicide, but A is a guilty of murder."

17. The provocation must be of such nature as to deprive the accused of the power of self control. The bare statement made by the accused that he regarded the provocation as grave cannot be accepted by the Court. The court has to apply an objective test for deciding whether the provocation was grave or not. If reasonable man likely to lose to self control as a result of such provocation and if

the answer is in affirmative, the provocation will be classified as grave and the answer is in negative the provocation is not grave. It is well settled that before a provocation can held to be grave, the court must satisfy that the provocation was sufficient serious to arouse a person's passion.

18. Further in order to bring the case in Exception 1, the appellant-accused has not only to establish the provocation as grave but also to establish that it was sudden. The provocation must be unanticipated. If the accused invites provocation in order to justify his homicide the provocation cannot be said to be sudden. It is for the court to find out from the evidence as to whether the accused acted on the impulse of moment or in the heat of anger or he had time to cool down and whether killing of deceased was deliberate.

19. So far as phrase "provocation" is concerned, it is well settled that the same depends upon facts that it causes, or may cause sudden and temporary loss of self control.

20. In the instant case, deceased Nanasaheb has just questioned his son appellant-accused in the manner, usually the father does with the son. The appellant-accused was admittedly doing the work of priest. Thus, father has questioned that he was not doing any work and he should not come to the home. Even for the sake of discussion, we assume that father had scolded his son appellant-

accused certainly not in filthy language, the appellant-accused reacted in harsh manner and slapped his father on his cheek. Obviously, deceased Nanasaheb got annoyed because of that slap and questioned about the same to his son appellant-accused. The appellant-accused is thus claiming excuses for reacting upon the said provocation allegedly given to him by his father. The first proviso of Explanation 1 thus squarely applies to the facts and circumstances of the present case. Furthermore, we are unable to pursue ourselves that the appellant-accused had lost his self control as a result of such provocation. Even assuming that father has scolded his son appellant-accused in the manner which provoked the appellant-accused to react on it, however, we are unable to pursue ourselves that such provocation is grave. No reasonable man is likely to loose self control as a result of such provocation from the father. The appellant-accused has not only slapped the father on his cheek but when the father questioned about slapping on his cheek, took out weapon hidden near his abdomen and caused as many as 10 injuries on the person of his father deceased Nanasaheb. We are shocked to see the penetrating wounds on the dead body of deceased Nanasaheb as noted by P.W.3 Dr. Mukund Mane while conducting the post mortem examination. There was instantaneous death of deceased Nanasaheb on the spot itself. Thus, we are not inclined to consider that the appellant-accused acted on the impulse of moment and while his passions still out of control committed the crime. The appellant-accused inflicted injuries on the person of

deceased Nanasaheb with murderous intention. In the given set of facts, no other inference could be drawn.

21. In the case of ***Budhimanta Naik vs. State of Orissa (supra)*** relied upon by learned counsel for the appellant, in para 15 Orissa High Court has made the following observations:-

“15. Undisputedly, the death of the deceased was homicidal in nature. From the evidence of Pws 1 and 2 it is clear that despite being the father the deceased abused the appellant and accused Achuta in filthy language and thereafter, the present appellant dealt a blow on the head of the deceased, as a result of which the deceased fell down on the ground. The appellant gave successive blows. The occurrence took place at; 11.30 a.m. and the F.I.R. was lodged at 5.30 p.m. Thereafter, the police came and shifted the injured (deceased) to the hospital-While the deceased was under treatment, he succumbed to the injuries. P.W.7 (Doctor) also specifically stated that injury Nos. 1 and 3 were grievous in nature and injury Nos. 2 and 4 were simple in nature. He also admitted that if immediate treatment would have been given to the deceased there was chance of survival. From the above, it is crystal clear that the appellant had no intention or motive to kill the deceased. It appears that on account of grave and sudden provocation due to filthy abuses by the father, the appellant lost his balance and assaulted the deceased causing his death.”

In the facts of the case cited, deceased father abused appellant-accused Achuta in filthy language and thereafter the appellant dealt a blow on the head of deceased. Deceased died in

the hospital while under treatment. P.W.7 doctor has also opined that injury Nos. 1 and 3 were grievous in nature and injury Nos. 2 and 4 were simple in nature. The doctor has further admitted that if immediate treatment would have been to the deceased there was chance of survival. In the backdrop of this, in the cited case, it is clear that there was no intention or motive to kill the deceased and it amounts to grave and sudden provocation due to filthy language of the father, the appellant lost his balance and assaulted the deceased causing his death. The appellant-accused allegedly used the weapon wooden baton.

22. In the instant case, however, the appellant-accused assaulted his father with an intention to commit his murder. There was no sudden and grave provocation. The appellant-accused has inflicted near about 10 external injuries on the person of his deceased father with the help of knife. In the internal examination, the injuries were found on the lobe of lung, liver and there was massive haemorrhage in peritoneum associated with external injury no.5 and injuries on the lung associated with injury Nos. 1 to 3. There was an instantaneous death of deceased Nanasaheb.

23. In the case of ***Budhi Singh vs. State of H.P. (supra)*** relied upon by learned counsel for the appellant, in para No. 19 and 20 the Supreme Court has made the following observations:-

"19. As we have discussed above, premeditation and intention to kill are two vital circumstances amongst others which are to be considered by the Court before holding the accused guilty of an offence under Section 302 or 304 IPC. At the cost of repetition, we may notice that from the prosecution evidence, it is not established that the accused had the intention to kill the deceased or it was a premeditated crime. The learned counsel appearing for the State has contended that the very fact that the accused had come out with a tobru completely establishes the intention to kill and, thus, the offence would fall under Section 302 IPC. It cannot be disputed that the accused came out with a tobru but, at the same time, it is also clear that this is the most easily available weapon in that part of the hills and is used regularly by the communities. Beyond this factor, there is no evidence of animosity, premeditation or intention to kill. The accused did give a blow by tobru on the head of the deceased which proved fatal. This was result of the grave and sudden provocation where father of both the deceased and the accused was being abused, assaulted and ill-treated by the deceased, who was in a drunken state.

20. Thus, in the facts of the present case, a sudden and grave provocation took place which would bring the offence within the ambit of exception 1 of Section 300 IPC and hence under Section 304 Part I IPC as the accused had caused such bodily injury to the deceased which, to his knowledge, was likely to cause death as he had inflicted injuries on the head of the deceased. Having held the accused guilty of an offence under Section 304 Part I IPC, we award the sentence of 10 years rigorous imprisonment and to a fine of Rs.5,000/- in default thereto to undergo further imprisonment of six months."

24. In the instant case, the appellant-accused is guilty of offence punishable under Section 302 of I.P.C.. The appellant-accused had intention to kill his father. He had kept weapon knife hidden near his abdomen. The appellant-accused is admittedly doing the work of priest. We find no reason for the appellant-accused to carry the weapon knife for visiting his own house. Thus, the ratio laid down in the above cited case cannot be made applicable to the facts and circumstances of the present case, in any manner.

25. In view of above, we are of the considered opinion that the prosecution has proved the case against the appellant-accused in its entirety. There is no substance in this appeal and the same is thus liable to be dismissed. Hence, the following order:-

O R D E R

Criminal appeal is hereby dismissed.

(SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE J.)

(V. K. JADHAV, J.)

rlj/