IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.29871 of 2016

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-819 Year-2013 Thana- VAISALI COMPLAINT CASE District- Vaishali

==

Pappu Kumar, Son of Late Ram Chandra Paswan, Resident of Mohalla- Salimpur Ahra, Dwarika Nath Lane, Gali No.3, Balia Aata Chakki, P.S.- Gandhi Maidan, District- Patna.

... ... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Raju Kumar, Son of Lagandeo Bhagat, Resident of Mohalla- Hathsarganj, Naka No.3, P.S.- Hazipur Town, District- Vaishali

... ... Opposite Parties

==

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ramchandra Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Ahmad Ali, APP
For the O.P. No.2	:	Mr. Dilip Kumar Roy, Advocate

==

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT
Date : 09-10-2023

The present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been preferred for quashing the order dated 07.09.2013 passed by Sri Dharmendra Singh, J.M.Ist Class, Vaishali at Hajipur in Complaint Case No. 819 of 2013, Tr. No. 1436 of 2015/ 1117 of 2016, whereby after enquiry, Ld. Magistrate has taken cognizance of offence punishable under Section 406 of I.P.C. and issued summons against the petitioner. No summons were issued against other co-accused. Quashing of the entire criminal proceeding arising out of the complaint has been also prayed for.

2. The complaint petition has been filed by O.P.

No.2 against the petitioner and six other co-accused. The complainant is brother-in-law of the accused-petitioner Pappu Kumar. Accused No.2 Malti Devi is mother of Pappu Kumar and other co-accused are father, brother and sisters of accused-petitioner Pappu Kumar. The allegation as per the complaint petition is that the accused persons including the petitioner took Rs. 2,00,000/- (Rupees Two lacs) from the complainant (Respondent No.2) on loan for treatment and marriage. However, on demand the accused persons did not return the loan amount of Rs. 2,00,000/- (Rupees Two lacs) to the complainant. The dates of occurrence, as per the complaint, are 12.04.2012 to 24.03.2013. As per further allegation, a paper was executed at 2.00 pm on 12.04.2012 stating that the amount will be paid back by February, 2013. But despite that, money was not paid back. Hence, legal notice was sent to accused no.1 Pappu Kumar and accused no.2 Malti Devi, but the accused persons refused to pay the said amount making false allegation and extending threat. It is further alleged that the accused persons have hatched conspiracy to cheat Rs. 2,00,000/- (Rupees Two lacs) from the complainant.

3. In course of enquiry complainant and two other witnesses namely, Panwati Devi (mother of complainant) and

Rekha Kumari (wife of complainant) were examined on solemn affirmation. During enquiry the complainant has deposed that the occurrence has happened from 12.04.2012 to 24.03.2013 and the accused persons had taken Rs. 2,00,000/- (Rupees Two lacs) from him for marriage and treatment and have executed one paper, but money has not been returned despite even legal notice. As per further deposition, he was also abused and mishandled by the accused persons. Panwati Devi has deposed during enquiry that occurrence has happened about one and half year back. The accused persons have taken loan of Rs. 2,00,000/- (Rupees Two lacs) but the same was not returned by them to the complainant. Rekha Kumari who is wife of complainant and sister of accused-petitioner Pappu Kumar has also deposed that occurrence had happened at 2.00 pm on 12.04.2012 to 24.03.2013. Pappu Kumar had asked for Rs. 2,00,000/- (Rupees Two lacs) and her husband gave Rs. 2,00,000/- (Rupees Two lacs) to him. On demand, money was not paid back.

4. Heard Ld. Counsel for the petitioner, Ld. A.P.P. for the State and Ld. Counsel for the Respondent No.2.

5. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the whole case is false, baseless and concocted. He also submits that the present complaint has been filed malafide to harass the petitioner, on account of the fact that younger sister of the petitioner Sharda Kumari was divorced on account of mutual settlement and as per the settlement Rs. 52,000/- (Rupees Fifty two thousand) was to be paid to Sharda Kumari by her husband and being brother-in-law of Sharda Kumari, the complainant has received that amount on behalf of Sharda Kumari, but same money was not given to Sharda Kumari despite demand and the vexatious complaint has been filed by the complainant against the petitioner and his family members. Similar false complaint has been also lodged by the complainant against his elder sister Madhuri Devi and her in-laws family members because Madhuri Devi had also lodged protest to complainant on account of non-payment of the divorce settlement money to Sharda Kumari. He also submits that even as per the complaint and the evidence adduced during enquiry no offence is disclosed. The alleged facts and circumstances show that at most it is a case of non-payment of loan and as such the dispute is civil in nature. By any stretch of imagination, no offence is made out. There has been no allegation of any mensrea since inception. As such, the present complaint is abuse of the process of court and liable to be quashed.

6. However, Ld. A.P.P. for the State and Ld. Counsel for the Respondent No.2 defend the order and submits that there is no illegality or infirmity in the impugned order and there is no justification to quash the impugned order and the criminal proceeding arising out of the complainant.

7. Before I proceed to consider the rival submissions of the parties, it would be pertinent to see the scope and ambit of Section 482 of the Cr. P.C.

8. Section 482 Cr. P.C. saves inherent power of High Court and it reads as follows:-

> "482. **Saving of inherent powers of High Court.**- Nothing in this Code shall be deemed to limit or affect the inherent powers of the High Court to make such orders as may be necessary to give effect to any order under this Code, or to prevent abuse of the process of any Court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice."

9. In **Madhavrao Jiwajirao Scindia Vs. Sambhajirao Chandrojirao Angre, [(1988) 1 SCC 692],** Hon'ble three-Judge Bench of Supreme Court has laid down the law as to quashment of proceedings under Section 482 CrPC as follows :

> "7. The legal position is well settled that when a prosecution at the initial stage is asked to be quashed, the test to be applied by the court is as to whether the uncontroverted allegations as made prima facie establish the offence. It is also for the court to take

> into consideration any special features which appear in a particular case to consider whether it is expedient and in the interest of justice to permit a prosecution to continue. This is so on the basis that the court cannot be utilised for any oblique purpose and where in the opinion of the court chances of an ultimate conviction are bleak and, therefore, no useful purpose is likely to be served by allowing a criminal prosecution to continue, the court may while taking into consideration the special facts of a case also quash the proceeding even though it may be at a preliminary stage."

10. Hon'ble Supreme Court in **State of Haryana vs Bhajan Lal [1992 Suppl (1) SCC 335]**, delivered the land mark judgment on the scope and extent of the jurisdiction of High Court under Section 482 Cr. P.C. It is still holding the field and being consistently followed and relied upon by all Courts including the Apex Court.

11. Hon'ble Apex Court in **Bhajan Lal case (supra)** held as follows:-

> **"102.** In the backdrop of the interpretation of the various relevant provisions of the Code under Chapter XIV and of the principles of law enunciated by this Court in a series of decisions relating to the exercise of the extraordinary power under Article 226 or the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Code which we have extracted and reproduced above, we give the following categories of cases by way of illustration wherein such power could be exercised either to prevent abuse of the process of any court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice, though it may not be possible to lay down any precise, clearly defined and sufficiently channelised and inflexible

guidelines or rigid formulae and to give an exhaustive list of myriad kinds of cases wherein such power should be exercised.

(1) Where the allegations made in the first information report or the complaint, even if they are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety do not prima facie constitute any offence or make out a case against the accused.

(2) Where the allegations in the first information report and other materials, if any, accompanying the FIR do not disclose a cognizable offence, justifying an investigation by police officers under Section 156(1) of the Code except under an order of a Magistrate within the purview of Section 155(2) of the Code.

(3) Where the uncontroverted allegations made in the FIR or complaint and the evidence collected in support of the same do not disclose the commission of any offence and make out a case against the accused.

(4) Where, the allegations in the FIR do not constitute a cognizable offence but constitute only a non-cognizable offence, no investigation is permitted by a police officer without an order of a Magistrate as contemplated under Section 155(2) of the Code.

(5) Where the allegations made in the FIR or complaint are so absurd and inherently improbable on the basis of which no prudent person can ever reach a just conclusion that there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.

(6) Where there is an express legal bar engrafted in any of the provisions of the Code or the concerned Act (under which a criminal proceeding is instituted) to the institution and continuance of the proceedings and/or where there is a specific provision in the Code or the concerned Act, providing efficacious redress for the grievance of the aggrieved party.

(7) Where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge.

103. We also give a note of caution to the effect that the power of quashing a criminal proceeding should be exercised very sparingly and with circumspection and that too in the rarest of rare cases; that the court will not be justified in embarking upon an enquiry as to the reliability or genuineness or otherwise of the allegations made in the FIR or the complaint and that the extraordinary or inherent powers do not confer an arbitrary jurisdiction on the court to act according to its whim or caprice."

12. In Smt. Nagawwa Vs. Veeranna Shivalingappa Konujalgi [(1976) 3 SCC 736], while considering the scope of Sections 202 and 204 of Cr. P.C., Hon'ble Supreme Court laid down the following guidelines and grounds on which proceeding would be quashed.

"(1) Where the allegations made in the complaint or the statements of the witnesses recorded in support of the same taken at their face value make out absolutely no case against the accused or the complaint does not disclose the essential ingredients of an offence which is alleged against the accused;

(2) Where the allegations made in the complaint are patently absurd and inherently improbable so that no prudent person can ever reach a conclusion that there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.

(3) Where the discretion exercised by the Magistrate in issuing process is capricious and arbitrary having been based either on no evidence or on materials which are wholly irrelevant or inadmissible; and

(4) Where the complaint suffers from fundamental legal defects, such as, want of sanction, or absence of a complaint by legally competent authority and the like."

13. In **Pepsi Foods Limited & Anr. v. Special Judicial Magistrate & Ors., [(1998) 5 SCC 749]**, Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as follows:

> "28. Summoning of an accused in a criminal case is a serious matter. Criminal law cannot be set into motion as a matter of course. It is not that the complainant has to bring only two witnesses to support his allegations in the complaint to have the criminal law set into motion. The order of the Magistrate summoning the accused must reflect that he has applied his mind to the facts of the case and the law applicable thereto. He has to examine the nature of allegations made in the complaint and the evidence both oral and documentary in support thereof and would that be sufficient for the complainant to succeed in bringing charge home to the accused. It is not that the Magistrate is a silent spectator at the time of recording of preliminary evidence before summoning of the accused. The Magistrate has to carefully scrutinise the evidence brought on record and may even himself put questions to the complainant and his witnesses to elicit answers to find out the truthfulness of the allegations or otherwise and then examine if any offence is prima facie committed by all or any of the accused."

14. In **G. Sagar Suri v. State of U.P., [(2000) 2 SCC 636], Hon'ble Supreme Court** has held as follows:

> "8. Jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Code

has to be exercised with great care. In exercise of its jurisdiction the High Court is not to examine the matter superficially. It is to be seen if a matter, which is essentially of a civil nature, has been given a cloak of criminal offence. Criminal proceedings are not a short cut of other remedies available in law. Before issuing process a criminal court has to exercise a great deal of caution. For the accused it is a serious matter. This Court has laid certain principles on the basis of which the High Court is to exercise its jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Code. Jurisdiction under this section has to be exercised to prevent abuse of the process of any court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice."

15. Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Zandu Pharmaceutical Works Ltd. v. Mohd. Sharaful Haque [(2005) 1 SCC 122**] observed as follows:

> "8. … It would be an abuse of process of the court to allow any action which would result in injustice and prevent promotion of justice. In exercise of the powers, court would be justified to quash any proceeding if it finds that initiation/continuance of it amounts to abuse of the process of court or quashing of these proceedings would otherwise serve the ends of justice. When no offence is disclosed by the complaint, the court may examine the question of fact. When a complaint is sought to be quashed, it is permissible to look into the materials to assess what the complainant has alleged and whether any offence is made out even if the allegations are accepted in toto."

16. Hon'ble Supreme Court in **State of Orissa Vs. Saroj Kumar Sahoo, (2005) 13 SCC 540** explaining the ambit and scope of Section 482 CrPC observed as follows:

> ***"8.*** *………. While exercising the powers under the section, the court does not function as a court of appeal or revision. Inherent jurisdiction under the section, though wide, has to be exercised sparingly, carefully and with caution and only when such exercise is justified by the tests specifically laid down in the section itself. It is to be exercised ex debito justitiae to do real and substantial justice for the administration of which alone the courts exist. Authority of the court exists for advancement of justice and if any attempt is made to abuse that authority so as to produce injustice, the court has the power to prevent abuse. It would be an abuse of process of the court to allow any action which would result in injustice and prevent promotion of justice. In exercise of the powers the court would be justified to quash any proceeding if it finds that initiation/continuance of it amounts to abuse of the process of court or quashing of these proceedings would otherwise serve the ends of justice. When no offence is disclosed by the report, the court may examine the question of fact. When a report is sought to be quashed, it is permissible to look into the materials to assess what the report has alleged and whether any offence is made out even if the allegations are accepted in toto."*

17. In Indian Oil Corpn. v. NEPC India Ltd., [(2006) 6 SCC 736], Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as follows:

> " 12. .... The principles, relevant to our purpose are:
>
> (i) A complaint can be quashed where the allegations made in the complaint, even if they are taken at their

face value and accepted in their entirety, do not prima facie constitute any offence or make out the case alleged against the accused.

For this purpose, the complaint has to be examined as a whole, but without examining the merits of the allegations. Neither a detailed inquiry nor a meticulous analysis of the material nor an assessment of the reliability or genuineness of the allegations in the complaint, is warranted while examining prayer for quashing of a complaint.

(ii) A complaint may also be quashed where it is a clear abuse of the process of the court, as when the criminal proceeding is found to have been initiated with mala fides/malice for wreaking vengeance or to cause harm, or where the allegations are absurd and inherently improbable.

(iii) The power to quash shall not, however, be used to stifle or scuttle a legitimate prosecution. The power should be used sparingly and with abundant caution.

(iv) The complaint is not required to verbatim reproduce the legal ingredients of the offence alleged. If the necessary factual foundation is laid in the complaint, merely on the ground that a few ingredients have not been stated in detail, the proceedings should not be quashed. Quashing of the complaint is warranted only where the complaint is so bereft of even the basic facts which are absolutely necessary for making out the offence.

(v) A given set of facts may make out: (a) purely a civil wrong; or (b) purely a criminal offence; or (c) a civil wrong as also a criminal offence. A commercial transaction or a contractual dispute, apart from furnishing a cause of action for seeking remedy in civil law, may also involve a criminal offence. As the nature and scope of a civil proceeding are different from a criminal proceeding, the mere fact that the complaint relates to a commercial transaction or breach of contract, for which a civil remedy is available or has been availed, is not by itself a ground to quash the criminal proceedings. The test is whether the allegations in the complaint disclose a criminal offence or not.

13. While on this issue, it is necessary to take notice of a growing tendency in business circles to convert

purely civil disputes into criminal cases. This is obviously on account of a prevalent impression that civil law remedies are time consuming and do not adequately protect the interests of lenders/creditors. Such a tendency is seen in several family disputes also, leading to irretrievable breakdown of marriages/families. There is also an impression that if a person could somehow be entangled in a criminal prosecution, there is a likelihood of imminent settlement. Any effort to settle civil disputes and claims, which do not involve any criminal offence, by applying pressure through criminal prosecution should be deprecated and discouraged…"

18. In Inder Mohan Goswami v. State of Uttaranchal, (2007) 12 SCC 1, Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed as under :

" 46. The court must ensure that criminal prosecution is not used as an instrument of harassment or for seeking private vendetta or with an ulterior motive to pressurise the accused. On analysis of the aforementioned cases, we are of the opinion that it is neither possible nor desirable to lay down an inflexible rule that would govern the exercise of inherent jurisdiction. Inherent jurisdiction of the High Courts under Section 482CrPC though wide has to be exercised sparingly, carefully and with caution and only when it is justified by the tests specifically laid down in the statute itself and in the aforementioned cases. In view of the settled legal position, the impugned judgment cannot be sustained."

19. In **R. Kalyani v. Janak C. Mehta [(2009) 1 SCC 516]**, **Hon'ble Supreme Court**, interpreting the inherent powers of the High Court under Section 482 CrPC, has laid down the law as under:

"15. Propositions of law which emerge from the said decisions are:

(1) The High Court ordinarily would not exercise its inherent jurisdiction to quash a criminal proceeding and, in particular, a first information report unless the allegations contained therein, even if given face value and taken to be correct in their entirety, disclosed no cognizable offence.

(2) For the said purpose the Court, save and except in very exceptional circumstances, would not look to any document relied upon by the defence.

(3) Such a power should be exercised very sparingly. If the allegations made in the FIR disclose commission of an offence, the Court shall not go beyond the same and pass an order in favour of the accused to hold absence of any mens rea or actus reus.

(4) If the allegation discloses a civil dispute, the same by itself may not be a ground to hold that the criminal proceedings should not be allowed to continue.

16. It is furthermore well known that no hard-and-fast rule can be laid down. Each case has to be considered on its own merits. The Court, while exercising its inherent jurisdiction, although would not interfere with a genuine complaint keeping in view the purport and object for which the provisions of Sections 482 and 483 of the Code of Criminal Procedure had been introduced by Parliament but would not hesitate to exercise its jurisdiction in appropriate cases. One of the paramount duties of the superior courts is to see that a person who is apparently innocent is not subjected to persecution and humiliation on the basis of a false and wholly untenable complaint."

20. Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Ramveer Upadhyay & Anr Vs. State of UP & Anr (2022 SCC Online SC 484)** has held as follows:-

"27. Even though, the inherent power of the High Court under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C., to interfere with criminal proceedings is wide, such power has to be exercised with circumspection, in exceptional

> cases. Jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C is not to be exercised for the asking."

21. **Hon'ble Supreme Court** in **Paramjeet Batra v. State of Uttarakhand, (2013) 11 SCC 673** held as follows:

> "12. While exercising its jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Code the High Court has to be cautious. This power is to be used sparingly and only for the purpose of preventing abuse of the process of any court or otherwise to secure ends of justice. Whether a complaint discloses a criminal offence or not depends upon the nature of facts alleged therein. Whether essential ingredients of criminal offence are present or not has to be judged by the High Court. A complaint disclosing civil transactions may also have a criminal texture. But the High Court must see whether a dispute which is essentially of a civil nature is given a cloak of criminal offence. In such a situation, if a civil remedy is available and is, in fact, adopted as has happened in this case, the High Court should not hesitate to quash the criminal proceedings to prevent abuse of process of the court."

22. In **Vesa Holdings (P) Ltd. [Vesa Holdings (P) Ltd. v. State of Kerala, (2015) 8 SCC 293, Hon'ble Supreme Court** held as follows:

> "13. It is true that a given set of facts may make out a civil wrong as also a criminal offence and only because a civil remedy may be available to the complainant that itself cannot be a ground to quash a criminal proceeding. The real test is whether the allegations in the complaint disclose the criminal offence of cheating or not. In the present case there is nothing to show that at the very inception there was any intention on behalf of the accused persons to cheat which is a condition precedent for an offence under Section 420 IPC. In our view the complaint does not disclose any criminal offence at all. The

> criminal proceedings should not be encouraged when it is found to be mala fide or otherwise an abuse of the process of the court. The superior courts while exercising this power should also strive to serve the ends of justice. In our opinion, in view of these facts allowing the police investigation to continue would amount to an abuse of the process of the court and the High Court [Maniprasad v. State of Kerala, 2011 SCC OnLine Ker 4251] committed an error in refusing to exercise the power under Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code to quash the proceedings."

23. It emerges from the aforesaid statutory provisions and the case laws that for taking cognizance of any offence and issuing summons to any accused in a complaint case, there must be a prima facie offence made out on the basis of the allegation made in the complaint and the statements made by the complainant and his witnesses during inquiry under Section 202 Cr.P.C. However, such allegation or the statements should not be patently absurd and inherently improbable to a prudent mind. Moreover, the allegation/statements made in the complaint and during inquiry under Section 200 Cr. P.C. should be examined as a whole, but the veracity of such statements could not be examined at this stage. The statements have to be taken at their face value to see whether *prima facie* case is made out or not. Moreover, if the given set of facts makes only a civil dispute, the complaint or the cognizance/summoning order should be quashed to prevent abuse of the process of court and promote ends of justice.

24. Now, the question for consideration is, whether the allegation made in the complaint or the statements of the witnesses as recorded in support of the same taken at their face value make out any case against the accused.

25. Section 406 of the Indian Penal Code provides for punishment for Criminal breach of trust, whereas Section 405 of the Indian Penal Code defines Criminal breach of trust.

26. The essential ingredients of Section 405 of the Indian Penal Code as explained by Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Binod Kumar & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar & Anr. [2014 AIR SCW 6310 :: AIR 2015 SC (Criminal) 18**] are as follows:

> "(a) a person should have been entrusted with property, or entrusted with dominion over property;
>
> (b) that person should dishonestly misappropriate or convert to his own use that property, or dishonestly use or dispose of that property or wilfully suffer any other person to do so;
>
> (c) that such misappropriation, conversion, use or disposal should be in violation of any direction of law prescribing the mode in which such trust is to be discharged, or of any legal contract which the person has made, touching the discharge of such trust."

27. In **Sadhupati Nageswara Rao Vs. State of Andhra Pradesh (2012) 8 SCC 547,** Hon'ble Supreme Court has held:

> "The basic requirement to bring home the accusations under Section 405 are the requirements to prove conjointly (*i*) entrustment, and (*ii*) whether the accused was actuated by dishonest intention or not, misappropriated it or converted it to his own use to the detriment of the persons who entrusted it."

28. In **Binod Kumar Case** (Supra) certain amounts were due and payable to a contract worker. When the amount due was not paid due to a termination of the contract, the worker filed a Criminal case. This Criminal case was quashed by Hon'ble Supreme Court finding that no offence is made out as per the alleged facts and circumstances.

29. In the case on hand, I find that as per the allegation, the complainant had given Rs.2,00,000/- to the Accused-Petitioner towards loan, but on demand the same was not repaid to him. However, Accused-Petitioner claims that the complaint was filed without any basis, only with intent to harass the Accused/Petitioner, as per whom, there was matrimonial dispute between his sister Sharda Kumari and her husband. However, on settlement, Rs.52,000/- was to be paid to Sharda Kumari by her husband. The complainant being brother-in-law of Sharda Kumari, received the settlement amount of Rs.52,000/- on behalf of Sharda Kumari from her husband. However, on demand of that amount, the present complaint has been filed malafide with intent to harass the Accused-Petitioner. Be as it may. After going by the allegation, I find that the alleged amount was paid by the complainant to the Accused-Petitioner by way of loan and not by way of entrustment. On demand, the loan amount was not repaid to him. I also find no allegation on the part of the complainant that there was *mens rea* on the part of the Accused-Petitioner, since the inception, not to repay the amount to him. As such, basic ingredient of entrustment is missing in the allegation to attract Section 406 IPC. For want of any allegation of *mens rea* since inception to repay the loan amount, even Section 420 IPC would not get attracted.

30. Hence, in my view, the complaint does not disclose any offence, much less offence under Section 406 or Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code. The alleged facts and circumstances in the present case, at most, constitute a dispute of purely civil nature between the parties for which remedy lies before a civil court by filing recovery civil suit like money suit. The present Complaint is apparently abuse of the process of Court and is liable to be quashed. Accordingly, the cognizance order dated 07.09.2013 passed by Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Vaishali at Hajipur in Complaint Case No. 819 of 2013, Tr. No.

1436 of 15/ 1117 of 16 and the Criminal Proceeding arising out of the same is quashed and set aside. The application stands allowed, accordingly.

(Jitendra Kumar, J.)

Ravishankar/S. Ali./Chandan-

AFR/NAFR	AFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	23.03.2024
Transmission Date	23.03.2024