



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED:23.02.2023

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020
and
W.M.P(MD)No.7415 of 2020

S.Sampath

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The Director General,
Railway Protection Force, Ministry of Railways,
New Delhi.
- 2.The Principal Chief Security Commissioner,
O/o.Railway Protection Force,
Moore Market, Complex,
Southern Railway,
Chennai-3.
- 3.The Principal Cum Security Commissioner,
Disciplinary Authority,
RPF Training Centre, Kajamalai, Trichy.
- 4.The Deputy Chief Security Commissioner,
Disciplinary Authority for Salem Division,
Southern Railway, Chennai.
- 5.The Deputy Chief Security Commissioner,
Southern Railway, Madurai.

... Respondents



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

WEB COPY

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling the entire records from the 1st respondent pertaining to Letter No.2019/Sec(E)/DAR-3/74, dated 04.02.2020 and quash the same and also for a direction to the second respondent to reinstate the petitioner in the same post and along with all back benefits and fixing a time frame by this Hon'ble Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Ramasamy

For Respondents :Mr.K.R.Laxman,
Standing Counsel

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed to quash the proceedings of the first respondent in Letter No.2019/Sec(E)/DAR-3/74, dated 04.02.2020 and for a direction to the second respondent to reinstate the petitioner in the same post and along with all back benefits within a stipulated period.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner joined the service as a Constable on 25.09.1984 at Villupuram and Subsequently, he was promoted as Assistant Sub-Inspector of Police and then, Sub-Inspector of Police. Subsequently, in



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

WEB COPY

the year, 2016, the petitioner was promoted to the Post of Inspector and posted at Salem. While he was working as an Inspector at Railway Protection Force at Salem, on 08.05.2009, at about 7.30 p.m., he caught a person, by name Gopi, S/o.Palanichamy, carrying three bags of silver ornaments weighing 60 kgs., since while checking he did not produce proper bills. Thereafter, the said Gopi was taken to RPF station. Subsequently, based on the request made by the said Gopi, the petitioner waited for the production of the bills and finally, he got the original bills and after taking photograph of the bills through his camera, the petitioner handed over the three bags of silver ornaments to Gopi. However, subsequently, one Mr.K.Gopalakrishnan, who is a friend of the said Gopi, made a complaint against the petitioner before the Prime Minister's Special Cell through e-mail on 08.05.2019 stating that the petitioner detained the said Gopi demanding a sum of Rs.30,000/- for releasing the silver ornaments. Subsequently, the said complaint was forwarded to the second respondent. Based on the said complaint, the second respondent initiated preliminary enquiry and thereafter, appointed the fourth respondent as Disciplinary Authority. Subsequently, a charge sheet was issued to the petitioner on 05.01.2019. During the enquiry, the petitioner requested the Disciplinary Authority to give some statements



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

WEB COPY

recorded in the preliminary enquiry. However, the petitioner was not supplied with the said documents. Thereafter, the second respondent refused to give the documents sought for by the petitioner stating that there is no necessity for the same to the enquiry. Again, the petitioner applied through Right to Information Act, 2005 and for that, the authorities replied that they are not having that documents. Subsequently, with the available documents, the petitioner co-operated with the enquiry. Thereafter, based on the enquiry report, the second respondent dismissed the petitioner from service. Challenging the said order, the petitioner preferred an appeal before the first respondent. Subsequently, the first respondent passed the impugned order, dated 04.02.2020, confirming the order of punishment imposed by the second respondent. Hence, challenging the same, the petitioner has filed this writ petition with the aforesaid prayer.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would further submit that the impugned order of punishment was passed without giving fair opportunity to the petitioner and without properly appreciating the actual facts. Therefore, both the order of dismissal passed by the second respondent and the impugned order passed by the



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

first respondent is in clear violation of principles of natural justice.

WEB COPY

3. The learned standing counsel appearing for the respondents would submit that the petitioner joined the services as Constable on 25.09.1984. As per the service records of the petitioner, he was awarded with several punishments. Though in several occasions, the petitioner apprehended four silver merchants and handed them over to Sales Tax Department, in one particular incident, one Mr.Gopi, a Silver Merchant was not handed over to Sales Tax Department for further course of action. The petitioner failed to follow the proper procedure in detaining and releasing the Silver Merchant with his materials. The contention of the petitioner that he called Constable Shanmugam to RPF Office to prepare a letter to Sales Tax Department for handing over of silver ornaments to Sales Tax Department is not correct since no such document as claimed by the petitioner was prepared at RPF office on that particular date. Further, the version of the petitioner that he waited for the production of the original bills by the said Gopi cannot be taken into consideration. If at all the said Gopi was not in possession of original bill, the petitioner ought to have immediately made over the unaccounted silver ornaments to Sale Tax Department. Further, the complainant



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

Gopalakrishnan, being a close and childhood friend of Gopi, arrived at the spot and handed over Rs.30,000/- as requested by Gopi and handed over the same to Gopi, who in turn, went inside the RPF office and followed by the same, the three bags of silver ornaments which were detained by the petitioner was released. Being aggrieved by the said incident, the said Gopalakrishnan, sent a complaint to Prime Minister's Cell. Further, all the relevant documents in connection with the fact finding enquiry had been made available to the petitioner during course of departmental enquiry. The documents sought for by the petitioner were not connected to the charges levelled against him in the departmental enquiry. Moreover, the petitioner was provided with reasonable opportunity to defend the charges levelled against him. The petitioner had every right to submit his representation, if any, against the findings of the Enquiry Officer. As the gravity of charges proved against the petitioner were grave in nature and involving moral turpitude which attracted deterrent punishment, the departmental file was forwarded to the second respondent, who in turn awarded punishment. Subsequently, the appeal against the order of the second respondent was disposed of by the first respondent by duly examining the records as per Rule 217 of RPF Rules, 1987 and therefore, there is no irregularity or infirmity in the



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

order passed by the first respondent and prays for dismissal of this writ petition.

4. Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials placed before this Court.

5. Admittedly, the petitioner entered into service as a Constable in the year 1984. Subsequently, he was promoted as Assistant Sub-Inspector of Police and then, Sub-Inspector of Police. In the year, 2016, the petitioner was promoted to the Post of Inspector and posted at Salem. At the time of the incident, the petitioner was employed as Inspector of Police, Railway Protection Force, Salem. The allegation is that the petitioner demanded and received a sum of Rs.30,000/- from one Gopi for releasing the silver ornaments. For which, departmental enquiry was initiated and thereafter, based on the enquiry report, the petitioner was dismissed from service and challenging the same the petitioner filed an appeal and the appeal was also dismissed by the first respondent. Challenging the same, the petitioner has filed this writ petition.



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

WEB COPY

6. Though this Court need not venture into pros and cons of the evidence before the Enquiry Officer, on a perusal of the entire documents reveal that before the Enquiry Officer, there are nine witnesses were examined including the complainant and official witnesses. The complainant Gopalakrishnan, who is the friend of one Gopi made a complaint before the Prime Minister's Cell stating that the petitioner demanded and received a sum of Rs.30,000/- from his friend Gopi for releasing the silver ornaments, which was seized by the petitioner. In the statement of P.W.1-Gopi in categorical terms, he had stated that his friend Gopalakrishnan, videographed the entire incident which was not denied but the receipt of Rs.30,000/- was denied. This Court has seen the videograph recorded and the same reveals that something was handed over to P.W.4-RPF constable. During the enquiry, the petitioner himself admitted that the entire quantity of silver ornaments were seized by the petitioner. If the sales tax receipt is not produced, it has to be handed over to the Sales Tax Department. In the present case, admittedly, the petitioner did not do so. Further, the entire incident was acknowledged by P.W.2, who is the Porter, who carried the silver ornaments. The entire evidence was corroborated by materials. The petitioner being employed in disciplinary force, he is expected to maintain the utmost sincerity and



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

devotion to duty. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the impugned order.

7. The only issue that is left for the consideration of this Court is the extent to which this Court could interfere with the punishment imposed on a delinquent under Article 226 of the Constitution.

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in ***B.C. Chaturvedi – Vs - Union of India, (1995 (6) SCC 749)***, while dealing with issue relating to the power of the Court relating to judicial review of the order passed by the disciplinary authority, held as under :

“12. Judicial review is not an appeal from a decision but a review of the manner in which the decision is made. Power of judicial review is meant to ensure that the individual receives fair treatment and not to ensure that the conclusion which the authority reaches is necessarily correct in the eye of the court. When an inquiry is conducted on charges of misconduct by a public servant, the Court/Tribunal is concerned to determine whether the inquiry was held by a competent officer or whether rules of natural justice are complied with. Whether the findings or conclusions are based on some evidence, the authority entrusted with the power to hold inquiry has jurisdiction, power and authority to reach a finding of fact or conclusion. But that finding must be based



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

on some evidence. Neither the technical rules of Evidence Act nor of proof of fact or evidence as defined therein, apply to disciplinary proceeding. When the authority accepts that evidence and conclusion receives support therefrom, the disciplinary authority is entitled to hold that the delinquent officer is guilty of the charge. The Court/Tribunal in its power of judicial review does not act as appellate authority to reappreciate the evidence and to arrive at its own independent findings on the evidence. The Court/Tribunal may interfere where the authority held the proceedings against the delinquent officer in a manner inconsistent with the rules of natural justice or in violation of statutory rules prescribing the mode of inquiry or where the conclusion or finding reached by the disciplinary authority is based on no evidence. If the conclusion or finding be such as no reasonable person would have ever reached, the Court/Tribunal may interfere with the conclusion or the finding, and mould the relief so as to make it appropriate to the facts of each case.

13. The disciplinary authority is the sole judge of facts. Where appeal is presented, the appellate authority has coextensive power to reappreciate the evidence or the nature of punishment. In a disciplinary inquiry, the strict proof of legal evidence and findings on that evidence are not relevant. Adequacy of evidence or reliability of evidence cannot be permitted to be canvassed before the Court/Tribunal. In Union of India v. H.C. Goel [(1964) 4 SCR 718 : AIR 1964 SC 364 : (1964) 1 LLJ 38] this Court held at p. 728 that if the conclusion, upon consideration of the evidence reached by the disciplinary authority, is perverse or suffers from patent



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

*error on the face of the record or based on no evidence at all,
a writ of certiorari could be issued.”*

(Emphasis Supplied)

9. The above view has been reiterated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Principal Secy. Govt. of A.P. - Vs - M. Adinarayana, (2004 (12) SCC 579)***, wherein, it has been held as under :-

“23. We have read this charge in the light of allegations in support thereof. In the instant case, it is not disputed that the respondent has neither supplied any prior information on the Government nor did he send any prior intimation to the Government. By not doing this, he has contravened the provisions of Rule 9. The Tribunal has also categorically held that the respondent has not applied for prior information before he purchased the items from the competent authority nor he intimated to the competent authority forthwith soon after the purchase of the several items. Therefore, in our view, the charged officer has violated Rule 9 of the Conduct Rules and thus is guilty of misconduct within Rule 2-H (sic) of the Andhra Pradesh Disciplinary Amendment Act, 1993. In view of the abovesaid finding we hold that respondent is guilty of both the charges framed against him within Rule 2 (b) of the Conduct Rules of 1961 framed under the Amendment Act, 1993.

* * * * *

26. In our opinion, judicial review cannot extend to the examination of the correctness of the charges as it is not an appeal but only a review of the manner in which the decision



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

was made. We have, therefore, no hesitation in setting aside the order of the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal and the judgment of the Division Bench of the High Court for reasons stated (supra). The order passed by the Government removing the respondent from service is in order and, therefore, the appeal filed by the appellant State stands allowed. Further, there will be no order as to costs.”

10. In a recent decision in the ***Director General of Police, RPF & Ors. - Vs – Rajendra Kumar Dubey (C.A. No.3820/2020 dated 25.11.20)***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, advertng to various decisions of the Apex Court relating to the interference by the High Court in exercise of its writ jurisdiction with respect to disciplinary proceedings, including the decision in *Chaturvedi's case (supra)*, held as under :-

“12.1 It is well settled that the High Court must not act as an appellate authority, and re-appreciate the evidence led before the enquiry officer.

We will advert to some of the decisions of this Court with respect to interference by the High Courts with findings in a departmental enquiry against a public servant.

In State of Andhra Pradesh v S.Sree Rama Rao, a three judge bench of this Court held that the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution is not a court of appeal over the decision of the authorities holding a departmental enquiry against a public servant. It is not the function of the High Court under its writ jurisdiction to review the evidence, and



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

arrive at an independent finding on the evidence. The High Court may, however interfere where the departmental authority which has held the proceedings against the delinquent officer are inconsistent with the principles of natural justice, where the findings are based on no evidence, which may reasonably support the conclusion that the delinquent officer is guilty of the charge, or in violation of the statutory rules prescribing the mode of enquiry, or the authorities were actuated by some extraneous considerations and failed to reach a fair decision, or allowed themselves to be influenced by irrelevant considerations, or where the conclusion on the very face of it is so wholly arbitrary and capricious that no reasonable person could ever have arrived at that conclusion. If however the enquiry is properly held, the departmental authority is the sole judge of facts, and if there is some legal evidence on which the findings can be based, the adequacy or reliability of that evidence is not a matter which can be permitted to be canvassed before the High Court in a writ petition.

*These principles were further reiterated in the **State of Andhra Pradesh v Chitra Venkata Rao**. The jurisdiction to issue a writ of certiorari under Article 226 is a supervisory jurisdiction. The court exercises the power not as an appellate court. The findings of fact reached by an inferior court or tribunal on the appreciation of evidence, are not reopened or questioned in writ proceedings. An error of law which is apparent on the face of the record can be corrected by a writ court, but not an error of fact, however grave it may be. A writ can be issued if it is shown that in recording the finding of fact, the tribunal has erroneously refused to admit*



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

admissible and material evidence, or had erroneously admitted inadmissible evidence. A finding of fact recorded by the tribunal cannot be challenged on the ground that the material evidence adduced before the tribunal is insufficient or inadequate to sustain a finding. The adequacy or sufficiency of evidence led on a point, and the inference of fact to be drawn from the said finding are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the tribunal.

*In subsequent decisions of this Court, including **Union of India v. G. Ganayutham, Director General RPF v. Ch. Sai Babu, Chennai Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board v T.T. Murali, Union of India v. Manab Kumar Guha**, these principles have been consistently followed.*

*In a recent judgment delivered by this Court in the **State of Rajasthan & Ors. v. Heem Singh** this Court has summed up the law in following words :*

“33. In exercising judicial review in disciplinary matters, there are two ends of the spectrum. The first embodies a rule of restraint. The second defines when interference is permissible. The rule of restraint constricts the ambit of judicial review. This is for a valid reason. The determination of whether a misconduct has been committed lies primarily within the domain of the disciplinary authority. The judge does not assume the mantle of the disciplinary authority. Nor does the judge wear the hat of an employer. Deference to a finding of fact by the disciplinary authority is a recognition of the idea that it is the employer who is responsible for the efficient conduct of their service. Disciplinary enquiries have to abide by the rules of natural justice. But they are not governed by strict rules of evidence which apply to judicial proceedings. The standard of proof is hence not the strict standard which governs a criminal trial, of proof beyond



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

reasonable doubt, but a civil standard governed by a preponderance of probabilities. Within the rule of preponderance, there are varying approaches based on context and subject. The first end of the spectrum is founded on deference and autonomy – deference to the position of the disciplinary authority as a fact finding authority and autonomy of the employer in maintaining discipline and efficiency of the service. At the other end of the spectrum is the principle that the court has the jurisdiction to interfere when the findings in the enquiry are based on no evidence or when they suffer from perversity. A failure to consider vital evidence is an incident of what the law regards as a perverse determination of fact. Proportionality is an entrenched feature of our jurisprudence. Service jurisprudence has recognized it for long years in allowing for the authority of the court to interfere when the finding or the penalty are disproportionate to the weight of the evidence or misconduct. Judicial craft lies in maintaining a steady sail between the banks of these two shores which have been termed as the two ends of the spectrum. Judges do not rest with a mere recitation of the hands-off mantra when they exercise judicial review. To determine whether the finding in a disciplinary enquiry is based on some evidence an initial or threshold level of scrutiny is undertaken. That is to satisfy the conscience of the court that there is some evidence to support the charge of misconduct and to guard against perversity. But this does not allow the court to re-appreciate evidentiary findings in a disciplinary enquiry or to substitute a view which appears to the judge to be more appropriate. To do so would offend the first principle which has been outlined above. The ultimate guide is the exercise of robust common sense without which the judges' craft is in vain.”

In Union of India v. P. Gunasekaran, this Court held that



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

the High Court in exercise of its power under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India shall not venture into re-appreciation of the evidence. The High Court would determine whether : (a) the enquiry is held by the competent authority; (b) the enquiry is held according to the procedure prescribed in that behalf; (c) there is violation of the principles of natural justice in conducting the proceedings; (d) the authorities have disabled themselves from reaching a fair conclusion by some considerations which are extraneous to the evidence and merits of the case; (e) the authorities have allowed themselves to be influenced by irrelevant or extraneous considerations; (f) the conclusion, on the very face of it, is so wholly arbitrary and capricious that no reasonable person could ever have arrived at such conclusion; (g) the disciplinary authority had erroneously failed to admit the admissible and material evidence; (h) the disciplinary authority had erroneously admitted inadmissible evidence which influenced the finding; (i) the finding of fact is based on no evidence.

In paragraph 13 of the judgment, the Court held that :

“13.Under Articles 226 / 227 of the Constitution of India, the High Court shall not :

- (i) re-appreciate the evidence;*
- (ii) interfere with the conclusions in the enquiry, in the case the same has been conducted in accordance with law;*
- (iii) go into the adequacy of the evidence;*
- (iv) go into the reliability of the evidence;*
- (v) interfere, if there be some legal evidence on which findings can be based;*
- (vi) correct the error of fact however grave it may appear to be;*



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

(vii) go into the proportionality of punishment unless it shocks its conscience.”

(Emphasis Supplied)

11. From the ratio laid down above, it is implicitly clear that the Courts, in exercise of its power of judicial review, cannot extend the examination to the correctness of the act of the disciplinary authority, but only limit itself to the manner in which the decision has been arrived at by the authorities and whether the same is in accordance with law. This Court is to test only the correctness of the decision arrived at by the authorities on the basis of the evidence before it and not proceed with the case as if it is an appeal against the impugned order.

12. It has been the consistent view of the Courts that it is always within the domain of the appointing authority to decide on the punishment to be imposed on the delinquent, but the only determination that is left to the Court is the proportionality of the punishment with regard to the gravity of the charges that stood proved against the delinquent. Only when the punishment is disproportionate and shocking to the conscience of the Court, should the Courts interfere with the same in exercise of powers under Article 226 of the Constitution. The Hon'ble



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

Supreme Court, in **Prem Nath Bali – Vs - High Court of Delhi (2015**

(16) SCC 415), has held as under:

“20. It is a settled principle of law that once the charges levelled against the delinquent employee are proved then it is for the appointing authority to decide as to what punishment should be imposed on the delinquent employee as per the Rules. The appointing authority, keeping in view the nature and gravity of the charges, findings of the inquiry officer, entire service record of the delinquent employee and all relevant factors relating to the delinquent, exercised its discretion and then imposed the punishment as provided in the Rules.

21. Once such discretion is exercised by the appointing authority in inflicting the punishment (whether minor or major) then the courts are slow to interfere in the quantum of punishment and only in rare and appropriate case substitutes the punishment. Such power is exercised when the court finds that the delinquent employee is able to prove that the punishment inflicted on him is wholly unreasonable, arbitrary and disproportionate to the gravity of the proved charges thereby shocking the conscience of the court or when it is found to be in contravention of the Rules. The Court may, in such cases, remit the case to the appointing authority for imposing any other punishment as against what was originally awarded to the delinquent employee by the appointing authority as per the Rules or may substitute the punishment by itself instead of remitting to the appointing authority.”

(Emphasis Supplied)



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

WEB COPY

13. The materials available on record also reveal that the enquiry has been conducted in accordance with law and as per the procedure contemplated under the relevant Rules, though certain discrepancies had crept in the departmental proceedings, as highlighted before this Court by the petitioner. However, it is to be pointed out that departmental proceedings is not a judicial proceedings requiring stern following of all the legal requirements and what is required in the departmental proceeding is the compliance of procedural requirements, which, on the face of the records, stood completely complied with and satisfactory. Though certain discrepancies are alleged in the departmental proceedings, but the said discrepancies would in no way affect the report submitted by the Enquiry Officer, which is in consonance with the Rules. Once the report has been accepted by the disciplinary authority and punishment has been imposed on the petitioner, which has been unsuccessfully challenged by the petitioner before the appellate authorities, this Court is only left with the task to determine whether the punishment imposed on the petitioner is disproportionate to the charges framed and shocks the conscience of the Court.



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

WEB COPY

14. To the above, it can be held without an iota of doubt that the answer to the same cannot be in the affirmative. The punishment imposed on the petitioner, in no way could be termed to be disproportionate to the delinquency and further, it cannot also not be said that it shocks the conscience of this Court. The task entrusted on this Court is only to find out whether the authorities have applied their mind to the materials before imposing the punishment.

15. It is to be pointed out that the petitioner is a member of a disciplined force and a great amount of integrity and honesty is required of individuals holding the posts in the disciplined service. Not only the fate and status of the country is in the hands of the members of the disciplined force, but the rights and liberties of the individual citizens would be greatly hampered if the members of the disciplined commit offences, as has been alleged and proved against the petitioner. It would not only put the fate of the citizens in peril, but would have a jeopardizing effect on the safety and security of the nation and would be in detriment to the livelihood of the citizens.



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

WEB COPY

16. Corruption is a pest, which, if left to go without being nipped in the bud, will eat out the law and order in the nation and would have a cascading effect in all fields and in all forms of employment. The petitioner, being a member of a force, which is required to have the highest standards of integrity and honesty and discipline being paramount, having thrown the qualities to the winds, is nothing but a leech in system, who, if not removed in entirety, will corrupt the entire force. Therefore, prudence warrants that the disciplinary authority should take action in such a manner against such persons, so that, the others do not follow the footsteps of such individuals, thereby, safeguarding the stature of the force.

17. In the above backdrop, this Court, on a perusal of the materials placed, is of the firm opinion that the punishment imposed on the petitioner could in no way be said to be disproportionate and shocking to the conscience of this Court. Interference, if any, with the punishment imposed on the petitioner by this Court would be nothing but misplaced sympathy, which has no room in the justice delivery system, when it is the duty of the Court to see that justice is not only done but should seem to be done. Therefore, the punishment, in the considered view of this



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

WEB COPY

Court, is just and reasonable and this Court is of the opinion that no interference is warranted with the impugned order of punishment passed by the respondents.

18. For the reasons aforesaid, this writ petition is devoid of merit and accordingly, the same is dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

23.02.2023

NCC:Yes/No
Index: Yes/No
pm



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.7966 of 2020

M.DHANDAPANI, J.

pm

W.P.(MD)No.7966 of 2020

23.02.2023