



\$~

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Reserved on: 23rd May, 2022Pronounced on: 9th September, 2022

+

CRL.A. 740/2018

VIDHYA BHUSHAN @ SHASHI BHUSHAN Appellant

Represented by: Mr. Adit S. Pujari, Mr.
Maitreya Subramaniam & Mr.
Chaitanya Sundriyal, Advocates

versus

STATE

....Respondent

Represented by: Mr. Tarang Srivastava, APP,
for State with Inspector,
Ashuthosh, PS Aman Vihar.**CORAM:****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA****J U D G M E N T****MINI PUSHKARNA, J.**

1. The present appeal is directed against the judgment dated 21.03.2018 and order on sentence dated 28.03.2018 passed by the learned ASJ-02, North Rohini Courts, Delhi in SC No. 57949/2016, arising out of FIR No. 169/2011 under Section 302 IPC and 25/27 Arms Act, registered at Police Station Aman Vihar, Delhi. The appellant has been convicted to rigorous imprisonment for life under Section 302 IPC and a fine of Rs.5000/-. In default of payment of fine, he has been directed to undergo simple imprisonment for 6 months. The appellant has further been sentenced to rigorous imprisonment for



2 years and a fine of Rs.2000/- under Section 25(1B)(a) Arms Act. In default of payment of fine, the appellant has been directed to undergo simple imprisonment for 2 months. He has further been sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 3 years and a fine of Rs.3,000/- under Section 27(1) of Arms Act, in default whereof he has been sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for 3 months. All the sentences have been directed to run concurrently by the Sessions Court. Benefit of Section 428 Cr.P.C. has also been given to the appellant.

2. Brief facts, as stated in the charge sheet are that on receipt of DD on 05.06.2011, the S.I. on duty, Mahavir Singh along with two constables reached the spot of incident, i.e., DDA ground, Prem Nagar-3. On the spot there was a *pandaal* of *puja* and on the stage near the right side of *pandaal*, blood was lying, and on the curtain on the right side, there was a hole of bullet. On inquiries, it was revealed that one Jyoti Prakash @ Jai Prakash @ J.P. (deceased) had received bullet injury and that he had been taken to hospital.

3. Thereafter S.I. Mahavir Singh reached the hospital and came to know that the injured had died during treatment. He recorded the statement of father of the deceased, PW-3 who stated that his son, the deceased, was residing in Prem Nagar – 3 along with his wife, Rinku @ Lali. The deceased was holding a *yagya* from 30.05.2011, which was to continue till 07.06.2011. The *yagya* was being carried out at DDA ground, near Sukhi Nehar, Prem Nagar – 3. On the date of the incident i.e. 05.06.2011, like every day, the *yagya* started at around 4:30 – 5:00 PM, in which many persons of the locality and their



known joined. At around 7:45 PM after the *Aarti* finished, the deceased went to the stage to help Maharaj ji come down from the aasan and was alighting from the stairs of the stage, when somebody fired from behind the curtain which struck him on his back, and he fell down. When PW-3 peeped through the Shamiyana, he saw one young person having rucksack on his back and having a pistol in his hand. He was running from the back of the Shamiyana and two – three persons from the yagya also ran after him. The said person looked back after running for some distance, and thereafter he ran away into a gali.

4. On the statement of father of the deceased, FIR was registered under Section 302 IPC. On 21.06.2011, on receipt of secret information S.I. Sumit Kumar along with the police party reached the native place of the accused/appellant Vidhya Bhushan @ Shashi Bhushan @ Guddu and he was arrested from his native place. He also made a disclosure statement after his arrest. He was brought to Delhi and an application for TIP was moved, which he refused. Thereafter, his police custody remand was obtained, during which the accused got recovered from village pond of Mubarakpur Dabas, one plastic polythene, which contained one *Katta* and one live cartridge and one empty cartridge, which were seized.

5. After completion of investigation, charges under Sections 302 IPC and 25/27 Arms Act were framed against the appellant, to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

6. The prosecution examined 31 witnesses. The learned Trial Court by the impugned judgment and order convicted and sentenced



the appellant as stated hereinabove. Hence the present appeal on behalf of the appellant.

7. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant strenuously argued that the deposition of prosecution witnesses was riddled with inconsistencies. Mere existence of motive with the appellant cannot form the basis of conviction. The investigation in the present case was defective. Police has failed to investigate the role of PW-25 and PW-8 in the death of the deceased. He also disputed the alleged identification of appellant at the police station on 28.06.2011.

8. On the other hand, learned APP for the State justified the impugned judgment and sentence.

9. Written submissions have been filed on behalf of both the parties, which have been perused along with the entire record of the case.

10. The prosecution case hinges upon direct testimony of cousin brother of the deceased, PW-10, Sandeep, who was 15 years of age at the time of the incident and 17 years at the time of his deposition. He has largely corroborated the version of the incident on the day of firing at the deceased, as given by father of the deceased, PW-3. PW-10 has stated in his deposition that *Ram Katha* was going on in DDA ground, Prem Nagar, which had been organised by the deceased. On 05.06.2011, at about 4:30 to 5 PM *katha* started in which the deceased along with other family members and other persons from the locality were present. After the *katha* at about 7:45 PM and after the aarti, the deceased went to the stage to Maharaj Ji to help him in getting down from the aasan (gaddi). The deceased was helping Maharaj Ji to bring



him down from the stairs, when someone fired from behind the curtains of Shamiyana. The deceased had his backside towards the curtains of the Shamiyana at the time when he was fired at. The bullet hit the deceased on his waist and passed from his chest and he fell down. PW-10 immediately came out of the Shamiyana to look out as to who had fired at the deceased. He saw the accused, appellant herein, carrying pitthu bag on his back and a pistol in his right hand and was running. He chased the appellant, along with two more persons. At the corner of the road, when PW-10 was chasing the appellant, he looked back and PW-10 saw his face. Thereafter, the appellant ran away. He immediately returned back to the Shamiyana where he found the deceased in a pool of blood, whereafter he was taken to hospital. PW-10 also correctly identified the appellant in the court at the time of his deposition. The said witness PW-10 remained consistent and steadfast during his cross-examination as well.

11. The learned Trial Court has relied upon the deposition of PW-10, while rejecting the deposition of PW-3 to the extent that the Trial Court did not find it plausible that PW-3 had also ran after the assailant after the incident of firing. On the other hand, the fact of PW-10 running after the assailant of the deceased was also corroborated by PW-25, who had stated clearly in her cross-examination that it was only PW-10, her brother-in-law, who had chased the assailant.

12. As regards the identity of the accused, PW-10 had categorically stated in his cross-examination that there was temporary arrangement of light in the *puja*. Similarly the Investigation Officer, S.I. Mahavir



Singh, PW-27 who had gone to the spot for conducting initial investigations, also stated in his cross-examination that there were arrangements of light in the ground. Similarly, PW-21, Inspector Manohar Lal, the draftsman who had prepared the scaled site plan by visiting the spot, Ex.PW21/A, has shown high power electric pole and flood light pole in the said site plan. Perusal of the deposition of PW-21 and scaled site plan, Ex.PW21/A clearly show that there was sufficient illumination at the ground and PW-10 had sufficient light to see the assailant while chasing him when he was running away from the spot after firing at the deceased.

13. PW-10 during his deposition has clearly stated that on 28.06.2011, he along with PW-3, father of the deceased, reached at police station Aman Vihar to enquire about the status of the case. In the police station they observed that senior officer Inspector Anil was making inquiries from the accused. He identified the accused and informed the I.O. that the accused had fired on his deceased cousin. The accused had disclosed his name as Vidhya Bhushan @ Shashi Bhushan @ Guddu.

14. It is pertinent to note here that the appellant had refused to undergo TIP on 25.06.2011. The contention raised on behalf of counsel for the appellant that the accused had refused TIP, as he had been shown to the witnesses in the police station, is totally flawed in view of the facts/documents on record. It has clearly come on record that the I.O. moved the application seeking conduct of TIP on 22.06.2011. The TIP was scheduled for 23.06.2011, on which date the TIP proceedings could not take place due to paucity of time. The TIP



proceedings came to be held on 25.06.2011, when the accused refused to join the TIP proceedings on the ground that the witnesses had met him outside the main gate of the jail along with the I.O. However, this objection raised by the appellant is not found to be tenable since in the deposition of the I.O. it has clearly come on record that police custody remand of the accused was obtained for three days only on 27.06.2011. Thus, the appellant was not in police custody before 27.06.2011. It has also come on record that PW-3 and PW-10 have stated that when they went to the police station for finding out the progress of their case on 28.06.2011, they saw the accused in the police station. It was then that PW-3 and PW-10 had informed the police that the accused was the same person who had been seen by them escaping after the incident of firing from the Shamiyana. Though deposition of PW-3 regarding his running after the assailant has been rejected by the learned Trial Court, the veracity of the deposition of PW-10 has been established. Thus, the refusal of the TIP by the appellant on 25.06.2011 goes against the accused.

15. The weapon of offence was also duly recovered upon the disclosure of the appellant. In this regard testimony of PW-31, Inspector Anil Kumar, Investigating Officer is relevant, material portion of which is reproduced as under:

“

.....

As per the disclosure of the accused, he further led the police team to pond of Mubarkpur village and he pointed out a place and told us that he had thrown the weapon of offence in the said pond. I requested the passersby to join the investigation and one



Braham Pal S/o Nawab Singh agreed to join the investigation. Accused alongwith Ct. Haider Mehendi went inside the pond. After the search, accused traced one white colour polythene which was tied up. Same was opened and checked and found one country made pistol alongwith one live cartridge in a black colour cloth bag. On checking the country made pistol, one fired cartridge was recovered inside the chamber of the country made pistol.

I prepared the sketch of country made pistol alongwith live cartridge and fired cartridge which is already Ex. PW16/A bears my signatures at point B. The said weapons and ammunition were converted into a pulanda after same was measured and sealed with the seal of AKG. FSL form was filled. Pulanda was taken into possession vide seizure memo already Ex. PW16/B which bears my signatures at point B.”

16. Further as per PW-26, S.I. Sumit Kumar, he had gone to the native place of the appellant from Delhi on 18.06.2011, and had arrested the appellant on 21.06.2011 from his house, near Deen Dayal Singh Ka Tola, in village Rupas, District Patna, Bihar, vide Arrest Memo Ex.PW18/A. As per his deposition, the appellant was brought to Delhi in muffled face. Since the appellant had refused to undergo TIP on 25.06.2011, his police custody remand was obtained on 27.06.2011. Thereafter, the appellant along with other police team and father of the deceased reached the place of incident and the appellant got recovered a black color bag wrapped in a polythene from inside the pond. The polythene and black color bag were opened and were found to contain one country made pistol and a live cartridge and one empty cartridge, which was found lodged inside the pistol. At the time



of recovery, one public person Brahm Pal was also present.

17. The testimonies of PW-26 and PW-31 with regard to recovery of the weapon of offence, was corroborated with the testimony of PW-16 Brahm Pal, the independent public witness. As recorded by the learned Trial Court, nothing has come out in his cross-examination which could impinge the recovery of the said weapon along with cartridges.

18. In view of the aforesaid testimonies, the contention raised by the counsel for the appellant raising suspicion on the recovery of the weapon of crime, is found to be without any merit. Perusal of the record shows that I.O., Inspector Anil Kumar, PW-31 during his testimony in the court identified the country made pistol, one live cartridge and one empty cartridge, which were recovered at the instance of the appellant. The same were exhibited as P-1 & P-2 respectively. Similarly, PW-10, Sandeep had also identified the said pistol which the appellant was carrying in his hand at the time of running away after firing at the deceased. In view of the aforesaid discussion, the recovery of the weapon has been proved beyond any shadow of doubt by the prosecution.

19. In the case of Geejaganda Somaih Vs. State of Karnataka, (2007) 9 SCC 315, Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as under:

“21. Section 25 of the Evidence Act mandates that no confession made to a police officer shall be proved as against a person accused of an offence. Similarly Section 26 of the Evidence Act provides that confession by the accused person while in custody of police cannot be proved against him. However, to the aforesaid rule of Sections 25 to 26



of the Evidence Act, there is an exception carved out by Section 27 of the Evidence Act providing that when any fact is discovered as discovered in consequence of information received from a person accused of any offence, in the custody of a police officer, so much of such information, whether it amounts to a confession or not, as relates distinctly to the fact thereby discovered, may be proved. Section 27 is a proviso to Sections 25 and 26. Such statements are generally termed as disclosure statements leading to the discovery of facts which are presumably in the exclusive knowledge of the maker. Section 27 appears to be based on the view that if a fact is actually discovered in consequence of information given, some guarantee is afforded thereby that the information was true and accordingly it can be safely allowed to be given in evidence.”

20. Reference may also be made to the case of State of Himachal Pradesh Vs. Jeet Singh, (1999) 4 SCC 370, wherein Hon’ble Supreme Court has held as under:

“26. There is nothing in Section 27 of the Evidence Act which renders the statement of the accused inadmissible if recovery of the articles was made from any place which is “open or accessible to others”. It is a fallacious notion that when recovery of any incriminating article was made from a place which is open or accessible to others, it would vitiate the evidence under Section 27 of the Evidence Act. Any object can be concealed in places which are open or accessible to others. For example, if the article is buried in the main roadside or if it is concealed beneath dry leaves lying on public places or kept hidden in a public office, the article would remain out of the visibility of others in normal circumstances. Until such article is disinterred, its



hidden state would remain unhampered. The person who hid it alone knows where it is until he discloses that fact to any other person. Hence, the crucial question is not whether the place was accessible to others or not but whether it was ordinarily visible to others. If it is not, then it is immaterial that the concealed place is accessible to others.”

21. The recovered weapon, country made pistol of .315 bore marked as F-1, was sent to FSL, Ballistics Division along with one 8 mm/.315 cartridge, which was live, marked as A-1. One 8 mm/.315 cartridge case marked as Ex.EC-1, which was found lodged in the said weapon itself at the time of recovery, was also sent. One pink colored tent curtain marked Ex.T1 having one suspected hole marked as H1 was also sent.

22. As per Ex. PW-5/D, the following were sent for forensic examination:-

- (i) Ex. 1-1: One sealed plastic container containing blood stained bullet lead seized from the scene of crime.
- (ii) Ex. 1-2: One sealed cloth *pullanda* containing country made pistol and one used empty cartridge.
- (iii) Ex. 1-3: One sealed cloth *pullanda* containing tent curtain having gunshot hole duly sealed.

23. After detailed examination, the Ballistics Division of Forensic Science Laboratory, Government of NCT of Delhi submitted its examination report. As per the FSL Report, Ex. PX-II, following opinions were given:

“



(4) *The individual characteristics of firing pin marks and breech face marks of the cartridge case marked exhibit 'EC1' and on the test cartridge cases marked as 'TC1' to 'TC3' were examined & compared under the Comparison Microscope Model Leica DMC and were found identical. Hence, it is opined that the cartridge case marked exhibit 'EC1' has been fired through the country made pistol .315" bore marked Exhibit 'F1'.*

(5) *The swab taken at and around the hole marked as 'H1' of the tent curtain marked exhibit 'T1' was analysed along with control swab in the Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer (AAS) for detection of Gunshot Residue (GSR) particles. As a result of AAS analysis, GSR particles could be detected in the swab taken from the hole marked as 'H1' of the tent curtain marked exhibit 'T1'.*

(6) *The exhibits marked 'F1'/'A1' & 'EC1' are firearm/ammunition as defined in the Arms Act 1959.*

.....”

24. As per the FSL report, Ex. PX-II gunshot residue particles were detected in the hole of the curtain through which the bullet was fired and travelled towards the deceased. This supports the prosecution story that firing was done on the appellant from behind the curtain. The empty cartridge recovered from the gun however could not be connected to the blood stained bullet recovered from the spot due to insufficient striation marks.

25. PW-13, Dr. Manoj Dhingra, CMO, Mortuary, SGM Hospital has been examined by the prosecution, who has proved the Post-Mortem Report of the deceased as Ex.PW13/A. He has opined that the



cause of death was due to shock and haemorrhage consequent upon the firearm injury, which was sufficient to cause the death in ordinary course of nature. His deposition further confirmed that the deceased was shot from a close range, thus, corroborating the version of the prosecution that the appellant had fired upon the deceased from behind the curtain from close range, which resulted in his death. Reference to the Post-Mortem Report, Ex. PW-13A shows that the deceased suffered the following injuries upon external examination:-

“External examination (injuries)”

1. *Firearm entry wound 2.2cm x 2cm with abrasion collar around it, tattooing in area of 3.5x3.5cm and blackening in area of 5.2x5.2cm around it, present over right back of chest 6.5cm right to midline and 31cm below and midline of clavicle. The wound is directed posterior to anterior, right to left, below to upwards piercing underlying muscles and fracturing underlying 10 rib posteriorly with fracture fragments of bone turning inwards and effusion of blood in soft tissues. On further dissection wound is going into abdominal cavity piercing right lobe of liver, diaphragm and right lung lower part with effusion of blood in adjoining soft tissues.*
2. *Firearm exit wound 2.8cm x 1.2cm oval in shape margins slightly everted present over right side and front of chest 5cm right to midline and 16.5cm below right clavicle. On fine dissection 5rib is fractured with fractured fragments coming out wards and effusion of blood in soft tissues and below it track is meeting with above described entry wound.*
3. *Laceration 1x0.5x0.5cm present over right thumb with fracture of distal phalanges of right thumb.”*

26. The aforesaid injuries are in conformity with the injuries caused from close range, as detailed in the *Modi’s Medical Jurisprudence and*



Toxicology. Tattooing and blackening has been noted around the injuries of the deceased in the Post-Mortem Report, which shows that firing took place from close range.

27. *Modi's Medical Jurisprudence and Toxicology* gives a table as regards the nature of injuries when they are caused by close distance shots from firearms. The said table is reproduced as below:-

***“CLOSE DISTANCE PHENOMENA OBSERVED IN
FIREARM INJURIES OR SHOT HOLES ON
CLOTHING***

<i>Phenomena</i>	<i>Range and Remarks</i>
<i>1. Flame/burning/ scorching/singeing.</i>	<i>Revolvers/pistols- within about 5-8 cm generally. Rifles- within about 15-20 cm generally. Shotguns- may show evidence of scorching upto 30-10 cm</i>
<i>2. Smoke/powder marks.</i>	<i>Rifles generally upto about 30 cm (blackening) and about 100 cm (powder residues). Handguns upto about 60 cm. Shotguns upto about 100 cm generally.</i>
<i>3. Tattooing</i>	<i>Handguns upto about 60 cm. Rifles upto 75 cm generally. Shotguns upto 100-300 m (may be found after</i>



	<i>careful search at higher range).</i>
--	---

28. Perusal of the Post-Mortem report Ex. PW13/A shows that there was firearm entry wound as well as firearm exit wound on the body of the deceased, meaning thereby that the bullet did not lodge itself inside the body of the deceased. One blood stained bullet lead was seized from the place of incident. Ex. PW5/D shows that the said blood stained bullet lead was submitted to the Forensic Science Laboratory as Ex. 1-1 in a sealed plastic container, duly sealed with the seal of AKG. However, no opinion on the bullet could be given due to insufficient striations. The Post-Mortem Report i.e. PW13/A has given a categorical opinion that death was due to shock and haemorrhage consequent upon firearm injury number 1 i.e. the firearm entry wound. It is clearly opined in the Post-Mortem Report that firearm injury number 1 was sufficient to cause death in ordinary course of nature.

29. Ex. PW 28/A, FSL Report, clearly states that human blood was detected on Ex.6, which was the blood stained bullet recovered from the site of the incident. Similarly, the FSL report also clearly states that human blood was detected on the carpet Ex.4 and 'blood stained earth', Ex. 3. Thus, human blood was detected on the bullet recovered from the site, which caused injury to the deceased.

30. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Swaran Singh Vs State of Punjab*, (2000) 5 SCC 668 has held as follows:-

"25. The evidence of PW 1 and the post-mortem reports was to the effect that the single wound on the right side of



the chest of Shamsher Singh and several wounds on Amar Singh were blackened. "Blackening is caused by smoke deposit. Smoke particles are light. They do not travel far. Therefore, smoke deposit, i.e., blackening is limited to a small range." [See Forensic Science in Criminal Investigation & Trials (3rd Edn.), p. 280; Fisher, Svensson, and Wendel's Techniques of Crime Scene Investigation (4th Edn., p. 296).] The fact that the firing was at close range supports the evidence of the eyewitnesses and runs contrary to the defence account of the incident. The situs of the wounds found by PW 1 on the deceased also bear out the eyewitnesses' testimony of the incident."

31. The motive to kill by the appellant was also firmly established by the prosecution. By the deposition of PW-8, PW-11 and PW-12 it has come on record that wife of the deceased was earlier in a relationship with the appellant. Reference in this regard may be made to the deposition of PW-8. The said witness during the course of his deposition has stated that Rinku @ Lali, wife of the deceased was a tenant in two-room set on the first floor in the house owned by him, wherein she lived with the deceased. He deposed that Rinku @ Lali had told him that 15-20 days after her marriage to the deceased, one Guddu had come to threaten her that he will not allow her to live in peace, and that the said Guddu had resided in his house as a tenant. PW-8 remained steadfast in his deposition regarding threat by the appellant to wife of the deceased during the course of his cross-examination.

32. Deposition of PW-11, Sanjay is also material on the aspect of motive. PW-11 has deposed that in the year 2009, appellant used to



reside in his house in one room on the first floor with his wife Lali. They stayed for around two and a half months on rent and appellant used to quarrel with Lali, due to which she was upset. Thereafter the appellant vacated his house and shifted to some other house. Lali had left the appellant and married with somebody else. PW-11 identified the appellant present in the court during his deposition. PW-11 remained unwavering in his deposition even during his cross-examination and remained steady in his statement that the appellant and wife of the deceased stayed as husband and wife as tenants in his house.

33. Similarly, the prosecution has been able to establish the motive of the appellant through deposition of PW-12 Rajender Singh. The said witness has deposed that Rinku @ Lali was earlier married to one Rajjan Singh. Thereafter, she started residing with accused in a rented house belonging to PW-8, Shamsheer, after leaving Rajjan Singh. The relations between accused and Rinku @ Lali were strained. Thereafter, the accused left for his native place in Bihar leaving behind Rinku @ Lali in the said rented accommodation. When the accused returned back to Delhi after about one and a half months, he came to know that she had married the deceased. The said witness remained unswerving on this aspect of the deposition even during his cross-examination.

34. Considering the aforesaid depositions it is clear that the marriage of Rinku @ Lali with the deceased was the bone of contention, which drove the appellant to kill the deceased. As rightly held by the learned Trial Court, the cumulative effect of the



testimonies of PW-8, PW-11 & PW-12 is that the accused was badly hurt by the marriage of Rinku @ Lali with the deceased.

35. The submission on behalf of the appellant regarding failure to investigate the role of PW-25 and PW-8, is also without any merit. The said aspect has been dealt by the learned Trial Court and well explained in paragraph-41 of the impugned judgment as follows:

“41.....The said argument though attractive at first glance, does not carry any force as from the testimony of PW10 it is clear that it was the accused, who ran away from the spot after firing upon the deceased from the pistol and he was also chased by PW10 and certain other public persons, and the witnesses of motive PW8, PW11, PW12, PW16 and PW25 have clearly deposed that the accused was looking for an opportunity to eliminate the deceased, as she had married the deceased in his absence, which was not to his liking and he had also confided with PW.12 that he would not spare the deceased and that the accused had also visited him after the incident seeking shelter, at that time he was also carrying a bag on being asked what was being carried in the bag, he stated that it was not useful thing for him. Thereafter, the accused had also taken Rs. 250/- from him and had also asked him to keep the said bag. Later on, recovery of the pistol along with live cartridge, and empty cartridge lodged in the said pistol concealed in the pond, which was recovered at the instance of the accused pursuant to his disclosure statement, shows the exclusive knowledge of the accused with regard to this fact, which clearly proves the culpability of the accused. Therefore, this argument also does not carry any force.”

36. Thus, the facts of the present case and evidence on record



including the medical evidence, the FSL report and oral testimony, clearly establish that injuries had been caused by the appellant, which ultimately led to death of the deceased. The case as made out by the prosecution, is established beyond reasonable doubt.

37. In view of the aforesaid discussion, we find no error in the impugned judgment of conviction and order of sentence. The same are upheld.

38. Appeal is accordingly dismissed.

39. Copy of the judgment be sent to the Superintendent Jail for updating the records and intimation to the appellant.

**(MINI PUSHKARNA)
JUDGE**

**(MUKTA GUPTA)
JUDGE**

September 9, 2022

au

नस्यमेव जयते