

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (DB) No.865 of 2017

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-113 Year-2001 Thana- DESARI District- Vaishali

Ram Shrekh Singh @ Ram Sarikhan Singh Son of Late Sirisvan Singh,
Resident of Village-Desari, P.S.-Desari, District-Vaishali.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

with
CRIMINAL APPEAL (DB) No. 878 of 2017

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-113 Year-2001 Thana- DESARI District- Vaishali

Nasariya Devi Wife of Ram Sarikhan Singh, Resident of Village- Desari, P.S.-
Desari, District- Vaishali.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

with
CRIMINAL APPEAL (DB) No. 1056 of 2017

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-113 Year-2001 Thana- DESARI District- Vaishali

Munki Devi Wife of late Ram Bachan Singh, Daughter of Sri Ram Sarikhan
Singh Resident of Village- Desari, P.S.- Desari, District- Vaishali.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :
(In CRIMINAL APPEAL (DB) No. 865 of 2017)
For the Appellant : Mr. Manish Kumar No.13, Advocate
Mr. Rohit Kumar, Advocate
Mrs. Priti Kumari, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Dilip Kumar Sinha, APP
(In CRIMINAL APPEAL (DB) No. 878 of 2017)
For the Appellant : Mr. Rohit Kumar, Advocate
Mr. Manish Kumar No.13, Advocate
Mrs. Priti Kumari, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Binod Bihari Singh, APP
(In CRIMINAL APPEAL (DB) No. 1056 of 2017)



For the Appellant : Mrs. Priti Kumari, Advocate
Mr. Rohit Kumar, Advocate
Mr. Manish Kumar No.13, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Ajay Mishra, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIPUL M. PANCHOLI
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL DUTTA MISHRA
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIPUL M. PANCHOLI)

Date : 08-04-2024

These appeals are filed under Section 374(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Code') wherein the three appellants-convicts have assailed the judgment of conviction dated 24.06.2017 and order of sentence dated 28.06.2017, rendered by learned Additional Sessions Judge-III, Vaishali, Hajipur in Sessions Trial No.393/2002, arising out of Desari P.S. Case No.113/2001, whereby the present appellants have been convicted for the offences punishable under Sections 302/149 and 201 of the Indian Penal Code and sentenced to undergo RI for life under Sections 302/149 of the Indian Penal Code and to pay a fine of Rs.1000/- each and in default of payment of fine, the appellants have to undergo imprisonment for one month. The appellants have also been sentenced to undergo RI for three years under Section 201 of the Indian Penal Code and to pay a fine of Rs.500/- each and in default of payment of fine, the



appellants have to undergo imprisonment for 15 days. All the sentences are directed to run concurrently.

2. As these appeals arise out of a common judgment of conviction and order of sentence passed by the concerned Trial Court, the same have been heard together for the sake of convenience.

2.1. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellants at the outset submits that appellant of Criminal Appeal (DB) No.865 of 2017, namely, Ram Shrekh Singh @ Ram Sarikhan Singh has died on 19.01.2018, therefore, in view of the aforesaid statement, Criminal Appeal (DB) No.865 of 2017 stands abated.

3. Brief facts, leading to filing of the present appeals, are as under:-

Fardbeyan of Sakal Singh came to be recorded on 16.06.2001 at 07:30 A.M. at the mango orchard of Jai Mangal Singh alleging therein that marriage of his younger son, namely, Ram Bachan Singh was solemnized with the daughter of Ram Sarikhan Singh four years back. It is further alleged that his son and daughter-in-law often quarreled with Ram Sarikhan Singh (father-in-law of the deceased), Nasariya Devi (mother-in-law of the deceased) and sister-in-law. His son wanted to keep his wife in



Ufraul but his wife wanted to live in her *Naihar*. It is further alleged by the informant that his daughter-in-law had illicit relation with the son of Balak Singh, namely, Jaide Singh who threatened his son many times that if he comes to Ufraul, he will be killed and thrown away. It is also alleged that five days ago, his daughter-in-law went to her *Maike* with her children. The informant further alleged that on 15.06.2001, his son went to his in-laws' house to bring his wife and children. On 16.06.2001, the informant got information that his son was killed and his dead body was hanged on a mango tree. When the informant and his family members went to the mango orchard of Jai Mangal Singh situated in Dharmdasapur (Desari), the informant found the dead body of his son hanged on a mango tree.

3.1. After recording of the *fardbeyan* of the informant, formal FIR came to be lodged and thereafter the Investigating Officer commenced the investigation. During the course of investigation, the Investigating Officer recorded the statement of the witnesses, visited the place of occurrence and the dead body of the deceased was sent for postmortem. After investigation was over, the Investigating Agency filed charge-sheet against the accused before the concerned Magistrate Court.



3.2. As the case was exclusively triable by court of sessions, the learned Magistrate committed the same to the concerned sessions court where the same was registered as Sessions Trial No.393/2002.

3.3. During course of trial, the prosecution had examined 14 witnesses, namely, P.W.-1, Punit Singh, P.W.-2, Kapileshwar Singh, P.W.-3, Baleshwar Singh, P.W.-4, Uma Nath Singh, P.W.-5, Manish Kumar Singh, P.W.-6, Etwaria Devi, P.W.-7, Bishesar Paswan, P.W.-8, Kabutri Devi, P.W.-9, Sakal Singh, P.W.-10, Dr. Pankaj Kumar Singh, P.W.-11, Chandeshwar Singh, P.W.-12, Deepak Kumar, P.W.-13, Basudeo Singh and P.W.-14, Ram Prasad Ram. Documentary evidence was also produced before the Trial Court. Thereafter further statement of the accused under Section 313 of the Code came to be recorded. After conclusion of the trial, the Trial Court convicted the present appellants for the aforesaid offences as stated hereinabove.

4. Heard Mr. Manish Kumar, Mr. Rohit Kumar and Mrs. Priti Kumari, learned counsels for the appellants and Mr. Dilip Kumar Sinha, Mr. Binod Bihari Singh and Mr. Ajay Mishra, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

5. Learned counsels for the appellants submit that the present is a case of circumstantial evidence and there is no eye



witness to the occurrence in question. It is submitted that the prosecution has failed to complete the chain of circumstances from which it can be established that the present appellants have committed the alleged offences despite which the Trial Court has recorded the judgment of conviction and order of sentence, therefore, the same be quashed and set aside. Learned counsel further submits that as per the case of the informant, who is father of the deceased, his *fardbeyan* was recorded in the mango orchard of Jai Mangal Singh. However, while giving deposition before the Court, the informant has stated that his *fardbeyan* was recorded in the police station. It is also submitted that there are major contradictions and inconsistencies in the deposition of the prosecution witnesses including the informant. It is also contended that the informant and the wife of the informant came to know from the village people that the dead body of their son is hanging on a mango tree. However, the person who had informed the informant as well as his wife has not been examined by the prosecution. It is also submitted that P.W.-1 is father-in-law of another son of the informant and even as per his deposition before the Court, his statement was recorded by the police after 2 ½ months from the date of occurrence and, therefore, the theory of the prosecution that P.W.-1 had seen the deceased in the house of



the appellants on the previous night of the occurrence may not be believed looking to his conduct.

5.1. Learned counsels for the appellants thereafter contended that P.W.-10, the doctor who had conducted the postmortem on the dead body of the deceased has specifically deposed that he did not find any external or internal injury on the person of deceased except injury no.1. Injury No.1 was a ligature mark. It is also submitted that the said doctor has specifically admitted during cross-examination that injury no.1 is possible if one hang himself. It is also pointed out from the said deposition that as per the doctor the time elapse since death is more than 36 hours, therefore, the theory of the prosecution is not supported by the medical evidence.

5.2. Learned counsels would thereafter submit that as per the deposition given by P.W.-8 Kabutri Devi, who is *Bhabhi* of the deceased, the deceased used to consume liquor and previously he set fire in the house and several times he also tried to commit suicide by hanging himself. Learned counsel, therefore, submitted that the deceased was having suicidal tendency and, therefore, the present one is not a case of murder but it may be a case of suicide.



5.3. Learned counsel for the appellants, therefore, urged that these appeals be allowed and the impugned judgment of conviction and order of sentence be quashed and set aside.

6. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutors have vehemently opposed the present appeals. It is submitted that though in the present case, there is no eye witness to the occurrence in question, the deceased was lastly seen in the house of the appellants on the previous night of the occurrence and on the next day morning the dead body of the deceased was found hanging on a mango tree which was near the house of the appellants. It is further submitted that the motive on the part of the appellants for commission of the alleged offences is also on record and, therefore, though it is a case of circumstantial evidence, the prosecution has succeeded in completing the chain of circumstances from which it is proved that the appellants have killed the deceased and thereafter his dead body was hanged on a mango tree. Learned APP, therefore, urged that no error is committed by the Trial Court while passing the impugned judgment of conviction and order of sentence and all these appeals be dismissed.

7. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and having gone through the materials placed on record, it would



emerge that the prosecution had examined 14 witnesses with a view to prove the case against the appellants. However, P.W.-2, P.W.-3 and P.W.-5, who are independent witnesses, have not supported the case of the prosecution and they have been declared hostile. P.W.-11 and P.W.-12 are formal witnesses.

8. P.W.-1, Punit Singh is father-in-law of one of the sons of the informant. The said witness has stated in his examination-in-chief that about two years ago, on Friday at 8 O'clock in the night, he was returning from Desari Bazar and when he reached near the door of Ram Sarekh Singh, he saw that Ram Bachan Singh was asking his wife to go to her in-laws' house but she was not ready to go. In the morning, Ram Bachan Singh was tied with a lungi and hanged on a tree. The orchard belonged to Jai Mangal Singh. The orchard was situated 2-4 ropes (unit of distance) away from the house of the accused persons.

8.1. This witness has stated in his cross-examination that his statement was recorded by the police after 2 ½ months from the date of occurrence. It is further stated that he heard *hulla* about a dead body hanging from a tree and went to see it. He met the father of the deceased in the evening after the occurrence. It is further stated by this witness in his cross-examination that the day on which he returned from Desari, he did not meet with the father



of Ram Bachan. This witness further stated in his cross-examination that he cannot say that Ram Bachan was separated from his father or not

9. P.W.-4, Uma Nath Singh is brother-in-law of the informant and he deposed in his examination-in-chief that the son of Sakal Singh was married with the daughter of Ram Sarikh Singh (since dead) twelve years ago. Ram Bachan was murdered six years ago. This witness further deposed that in the evening before the murder, the deceased was at his place and said that he was going to his in-laws' house. The next day morning, this witness heard that Ram Bachan had been murdered.

9.1. This witness has stated in his cross-examination that he told the police that he could not tell how Ram Bachan was murdered. This witness further stated in his cross-examination that he did not tell the police that he had come to my place on the eve of his murder. This witness did not tell the police that Ram Bachan was talking about going to his in-laws' house. P.W.-4 further stated in his cross-examination that he did not tell the police that Ram Bachan was asked to stay at his house. The informant is his brother-in-law.

10. P.W.6, Etwaria Devi is mother of the deceased who deposed in her examination-in-chief that her daughter-in-law,



Munki Devi wanted to live in her *Naihar*. Munki Devi went to her *Naihar* 4-5 days before the occurrence. It is further deposed that her son Ram Bachan went to his in-laws' house to bring his wife and children. P.W.-6 further stated in her examination-in-chief that her son has been murdered by Ram Sarikh, his wife and Munki Devi.

10.1. P.W.-6 has stated in her cross-examination that her son used to visit his in-laws' house regularly. The relation was cordial between her son and his wife. It is further stated that her daughter-in-law last went to her maternal home on Thursday in the month of *Aashadh*. The occurrence took place on the next day. This witness further stated in her cross-examination that Ram Bachan did not go to her in-laws' house on their request but he went on his own accord. When he did not return at night, this witness understood that he had gone to his in-laws' house. It is further stated that her son was not killed before her. P.W.-6 saw the dead body of her son in the police station. This witness further stated in her cross-examination that there was sign of injury on the body of her son. Her son was wearing a *lungi* and a shirt. The *lungi* was green in colour. Her son had gone from home wearing that *lungi*. The shirt was of brown colour.



11. P.W.-7, Bishesar Paswan has stated in his examination-in-chief that the wife of Ram Bachan wanted to live in her *Naihar* and the relationship between them was not good. This witness further deposed that four days before the incident, wife of the deceased went to her house and threatened that if you come there, you will get your body chopped off.

11.1. P.W.-7 has stated in his cross-examination that on the next day of the incident, his statement was recorded in the police station. At that very time, Sakal Singh, the informant was present in the police station. This witness further stated in his cross-examination that he did not give such a statement before the police that when wife of Ram Banchan was going to her parents' house, she had threatened her husband that if he came there, he would be killed. This witness did not tell the police that Ram Bachan had gone to his in-laws' house in front of him. Village Upraul is about three kilometers north of Desari. Sakal Singh has registered the land in the name of wife of Bhujendra after the incident. This witness also stated in her cross-examination that he went to the police station. The dead body was kept outside the police station. This witness did not see any injury. It is stated that he did not see any bleeding from any part. The deceased was



wearing shirt and pant. There it came to light that the in-laws had murdered Ram Bachan.

12. P.W.-8, Kabutri Devi is *Bhabhi* of the deceased who has deposed in her examination-in-chief that Ram Bachan was her brother-in-law. The marriage of Ram Bachan was solemnized 11½ years ago. The incident took place 6½ years ago. The wife of Ram Bachan went to her house ten days before the occurrence. This witness further deposed that in the evening of the day of incident, Ram Bachan had gone to his in-laws' house to bring his wife and children back. That night Ram Bachan was murdered in his in-laws' house.

12.1. P.W.-8 has stated in her cross-examination that she knows Punit Singh of Dharmdaspur. He is father-in-law of her *Devar* (brother-in-law), namely, Bhujendra Singh. Dharmdaspur railway station is one kilometer east of Desari. It is further stated that house of Punit is situated south of the railway line. Munki Devi lives in her *Naihar*. The father-in-law of this witness never called Munki and her children. It is further stated by this witness in her cross-examination that the marriage of her brother-in-law, namely, Bhujendra Singh was solemnized with the daughter of Punit Singh. Punit Singh is the witness of this case. It is also stated by this witness during cross-examination that she is not aware that



after the death of Ram Bachan, her father-in-law has transferred the property to Bhudendra's wife. Ram Bachan had attempted to commit suicide by hanging himself several times. This witness further stated that she went to the police station at 10:00-11:00 A.M. The dead body of Ram Bachan was kept there. She did not see any sign on the dead body.

13. P.W.-9, Sakal Singh is the informant of this case who has deposed in his examination-in-chief that marriage of his son was solemnized ten years ago with the daughter of Ram Sarekh Singh. The incident took place six years ago. The wife of his son wanted to live in her parents' house. The son of the informant went to his in-laws' house to bring his wife back. It is further deposed that Ram Bachan was killed at night and hanged with a tree in the orchard of Jai Mangal Singh. Ram Sarekh Singh and other seven persons killed his son. They went to Desari. The police also came there and recorded his statement.

13.1. The informant has stated in his cross-examination that her daughter-in-law went to her *Naihar* 4-5 days before the incident. The daughter-in-law of the informant went to her home happily. The son of the informant did not go after meeting him. This witness specifically admitted in his cross-examination that he knew from village people that his son has gone to his in-laws'



house to bring his wife. The village people told this fact at the place of occurrence. The informant cannot tell the names of persons who told him about his son going to his in-laws' house. It is further stated by this witness in his examination-in-chief that Ram Bachan had sold his son's and daughter's share and went away. After the incident, the informant did not transfer his land to anyone. It is further stated by this witness in his cross-examination that his son has been separated from him for ten years. The information of death of Ram Bachan was given by a boy. That boy told that after killing Ram Bachan, his body was hanged in an orchard. This witness did not go to the orchard of Jai Mangal. It is stated by this witness in his cross-examination that he did not see the dead body of his son after his death.

14. P.W.-10 is the doctor who conducted postmortem on the dead body of the deceased and found following ante-mortem injuries:

(1) Circular Bruise about 1/2" x 1/3" encircling whole length of the neck. Transverse (sic..) round the neck high up in neck above the thyroid.

(2) On dissection of the Brain-

Brain & meninges are congested and petechial Hemorrhage present.



dissection of Thorax-

Lungs are markedly congested with haemorrhagic catches. Emphysematous bullae.

Right side heart full of dark blood. Left side heart empty.

Dissection of Abdomen-

All abdominal viscera are dark & congested. Stomach contains six oz. of semi-digested food. Loops of small & large intestine contain gas and fecal matters.

On dissection of Inj. No.1-

There is extra vesicular under sub cutaneous tissue petechial haemorrhage present.

Substance used- Ligature Mark.

(3) Time elapsed since death- More than 36 hours from the time of P.M. examination.

Cause of death- In my opinion death has been due to asphyxia (Respiratory blockage) due to hanging as a result of ligature mark which is sufficient to cause death in ordinary course of nature.

14.1. P.W.-10 in his cross-examination has specifically stated that he did not find any external or internal injury on the person of deceased except Injury No.(1). Injury No.(1) is possible if one hangs himself.



15. P.W.-11, Chandeshwar Singh P.W.-12, Deepak Kumar are formal witnesses who proved the handwriting and signature of Chitranjan Thakur and S.I. Ram Prasad Rai.

16. P.W.-14, Ram Prasad Rai is the first Investigating Officer who had carried out the investigation. This witness deposed in his examination-in-chief that on 16.06.2000, he was posted in Desari Police Station. It is also deposed that he had recorded the statement of witnesses and inspected the place of occurrence. The dead body was hanging from the mango tree tied with a piece of *lungi*. It is further deposed that he prepared the inquest report.

16.1. P.W.-14 has stated in his cross-examination that he did not find anything on the spot except dead body.

17. P.W.-13, Basudeo Singh is the second Investigating Officer who has taken over the charge on 02.09.2001. This witness has deposed in his examination-in-chief that he took charge from Ravi Bhushan (Police Inspector) and recorded the statement of Uma Nath Singh, Baleshwar Singh, Punit Singh, Manish Kumar and Janak Prasad Singh. All witnesses have supported the case of the prosecution. It is further deposed by this witness that Manish told that the dead body of Ram Bachan Singh was hanged on a mango tree. He was killed by strangulation. The wife of the



deceased had illicit relation with a person and she did not reside in her in-laws' house. It is further deposed by P.W.-13 that he recorded the statement of Uma Nath Singh who supported the prosecution case.

17.1. P.W.-13 has stated in his cross-examination that he recorded the statement of Manish after 08.09.2001. He recorded the statement of Manish in Desari *Bazar*. The witness appeared in person. He did not give notice. The names of Manish and Uma Nath are not mentioned in the *fardbeyan* as witnesses. This witness further stated in his cross-examination that he did not inquire on the point that how Manish and Uma Nath reached at the place of occurrence and for what purpose.

18. We have re-appreciated the entire evidence led by the prosecution before the Trial Court. As referred hereinabove, P.W.-2, P.W.-3 and P.W.-5, who are independent witnesses, have not supported the case of the prosecution and, therefore, they were declared hostile. P.W.-11 and P.W.-12 are the formal witnesses, therefore, the case of the prosecution rests on the deposition given by P.W.-1, P.W.-4, P.W.-6, P.W.-7, P.W.-8 and P.W.-9 who are relatives of the deceased. P.W.-10 is the doctor who had conducted the postmortem on the dead body of the deceased whereas P.W.-14 is the first Investigating Officer and had carried out the



investigation and P.W.-13 is the second Investigating Officer who had filed charge-sheet against the accused.

19. It is not in dispute that in the present case, there is no eye-witness to the occurrence in question and the case of the prosecution rests on circumstantial evidence. With a view to prove the theory of last seen together, the prosecution had examined P.W.-1, Punit Singh. It is pertinent to note that P.W.-1, Punit Singh is father-in-law of one of the sons of the informant. As per his version, on the previous night at about 08:00 P.M. when he reached near the doors of Ram Shrekh Singh (accused), he saw Ram Shrekh, his wife, Ram Bachan Singh and others. He had heard the conversation made between the said persons and thereafter on the next day morning, he came to know that dead body of the deceased was hanging on a mango tree. It is pertinent to note that during cross-examination, the said witness has specifically admitted that he reached at the place of occurrence after getting the news of death of the deceased and on the very same day, he met the informant. He specifically admitted that he did not inform about the deceased being seen lastly in company of the accused in the house of the accused on the previous night to the police or to the informant. Though he is near relative of the informant, such information was not given to them. He has also



admitted that his statement was recorded by the police after 2 ½ months from the date of occurrence. Thus, we are of the view that the aforesaid version of the said witness is nothing but an after thought and it is specific case of the defence that the informant executed the deed with regard to the land in favour of daughter of P.W.-1 (daughter-in-law of the informant). P.W.-4 is brother-in-law of the informant whose statement was recorded by the second Investigating Officer after 08.09.2001, i.e., after 2 ½ months from the date of occurrence and the said witness has for the first time deposed before the Court that on the previous evening, deceased met him and informed that he is going to his in-laws house. However, during cross-examination, he has admitted that he had not stated about the said aspect to the police while giving the statement.

20. P.W.-6, mother of the deceased, during cross-examination, has stated that her daughter-in-law had willingly gone to her house and on the second day her son went to the house of her daughter-in-law. She had further stated that when her son did not return in the night, she thought that he must have gone to his in-laws house. The said witness has also stated that mark of injury was found on the body of her son and blood was found on the cloth of her son. However, it is relevant to note that P.W.-7 has



specifically admitted during cross-examination that he did not find any mark of injury or blood on the body of the deceased. Even P.W.-10, the doctor, who had conducted the postmortem on the body of the deceased, stated during cross-examination that he did not find any external or internal injury on the person of the deceased except injury no.1 which was ligature mark. Thus, we are of the view that there are major contradictions and inconsistencies in the deposition of the prosecution witnesses.

21. Thus, from the said deposition, it is revealed that previously the deceased had tried to commit suicide by hanging himself.

22. At this stage, deposition of P.W.-10, the doctor, is also required to be examined closely. The doctor has specifically stated that time elapse since death is more than 36 hours from the time of postmortem examination. It is relevant to note that postmortem was conducted on 16.06.2001 at about 01:40 P.M. However, as per P.W.-1, the deceased was found in the company of the accused at about 08:00 P.M. on 15.06.2001. It is also relevant to note that the said witness, P.W.-10 specifically admitted that injury no.1 is possible if one hang himself. We have gone through the postmortem report and the deposition of P.W.-10 and we are of the view that the prosecution has failed to prove the homicidal



death of the deceased and possibility of committing suicide by the deceased cannot be ruled out.

23. At this stage, it is relevant to note that inquest report is also not separately exhibited and surprisingly the entire case diary has been exhibited. Further, the Investigating Officer did not find any incriminating material at the place of occurrence. The Investigating Officer also did not record the statement of the persons who are residing near the mango orchard (place of occurrence).

24. Thus, from the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the present case, we are of the view that the prosecution has failed to complete the chain of circumstances from which it can be established that the present appellants have killed the deceased and thereafter his dead body was hanged on a mango tree. Even the motive on the part of the appellants to kill the deceased is also not proved by leading any cogent evidence. From the reasoning recorded by the Trial Court, we are of the view that the Trial Court has, on the basis of the presumptions and assumptions, recorded the judgment of conviction and order of sentence against the appellants.



25. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, the impugned judgment of conviction and order of sentence are required to be quashed and set aside.

26. Accordingly, Criminal Appeal (DB) No.878 of 2017 and Criminal Appeal (DB) No.1056 of 2017 are allowed and the judgment of conviction dated 24.06.2017 and order of sentence dated 28.06.2017, rendered by learned Additional Sessions Judge-III, Vaishali, Hajipur in Sessions Trial No.393/2002, arising out of Desari P.S. Case No.113/2001 are quashed and set aside. The appellants of Criminal Appeal (DB) No.878 of 2017 and Criminal Appeal (DB) No.1056 of 2017 are on bail, they are discharged from the liabilities of their respective bail bonds.

(Vipul M. Pancholi, J.)

(Sunil Dutta Mishra, J.)

Sanjay/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	10.04.2024
Transmission Date	10.04.2024

