

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (DB) No.1046 of 2017

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-74 Year-2011 Thana- SHRIKRISHNAPURI District- Patna

Vishal Kumar S/o Ashok Singh, Resident of Village- Sarvdehi, P.S.-
Masaurhi, District- Patna.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

with

CRIMINAL APPEAL (DB) No. 1123 of 2017

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-74 Year-2011 Thana- SHRIKRISHNAPURI District- Patna

Anand Kumar, Son of Awadhesh Singh, at present Resident of Shivir Mandal,
P.S. -Phulwarisharif, District -Patna. Permanent R/o- Mohanpur, P.S.+P.O. -
Patori, District – Samastipur.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

(In CRIMINAL APPEAL (DB) No. 1046 of 2017)

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Krishna Prasad Singh, Sr. Advocate
Ms. Meena Singh, Advocate
Mr. Manoj Kumar Singh, Advocate
Ms. Bhaskar Shankar, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Dilip Kumar Sinha, APP

(In CRIMINAL APPEAL (DB) No. 1123 of 2017)

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Krishna Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Dilip Kumar Sinha, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Rajesh Kumar Singh, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Manish Kumar Singh, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KHATIM REZA

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR)

Date : 26-04-2024

Both the appeals have been heard together and



are being disposed off by this common judgment.

2. We have heard Mr. Krishna Prasad Singh, learned Senior Advocate assisted by Ms. Meena Singh and Mr. Manoj Kumar Singh, the learned Advocates for the appellants/applicants and Mr. Rajesh Kumar Singh, learned Senior Advocate assisted by Mr. Manish Kumar, learned Advocate for the informant.

3. The State has been represented by Mr. Dilip Kumar Sinha, the learned APP

4. Both the appellants have been convicted under Sections 364(A), 302, 201/34 of the Indian Penal Code *vide* judgment dated 29.06.2017 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-VI, Patna in Sessions Trial No. 1045 of 2011 (CIS No. 1140 of 2014), arising out of Sri Krishnapuri P.S. Case No. 74 of 2011. By order dated 06.07.2017, the appellants have been sentenced to undergo R.I. for life, to pay a fine of Rs. 50,000/- each and in default of payment of fine, to further suffer S.I. for ten months under Section 302 of



the IPC; R.I. for life, to pay a fine of Rs. 50,000/- each and in default of payment of fine, to further suffer S.I. for ten months under Section 364(A) of the IPC and R.I. for three years, to pay a fine of Rs. 10,000/- each and in default of payment of fine, to further suffer S.I. for two months under Section 201 of the IPC.

5. The sentences have been ordered to run concurrently.

6. A seventeen year old student *viz.* Rohit Kumar was killed and his dead body was recovered from a bore-well of the Irrigation Department. The deceased was a student of FIIT JEE coaching classes, who had not returned home on 01.05.2011 by afternoon. Sensing some foul play, the uncle of the deceased *viz.* Niraj Kumar (P.W. 1) lodged an FIR before the Sri Krishnapuri police station on 01.05.2011 only, which was registered as Sri Krishnapuri P.S. Case No. 74 of 2011 dated 01.05.2011 under Section 365 of the Indian Penal Code.



7. In the FIR, it was alleged that the deceased had gone to the FIIT JEE coaching institute, Boring Canal Road on 01.05.2011 but he did not return. He had two mobile telephones in his possession. The numbers of the mobile telephones were given in the written report. The deceased had gone out of the house on his scooty bearing registration No. BR-01AW-1599.

8. This was the basis for the police to swing into action.

9. It appears that the police was clueless for quite some time and an effort was made to know about the friends of the deceased. During the course of investigation, the family members of the deceased disclosed that appellant/Vishal Kumar was one of his closest friends. This provided the smoking gun to the police to look for appellant/Vishal Kumar. When the investigator reached the house of appellant/Vishal Kumar, his father met him, who disclosed that appellant/Vishal Kumar had left for Delhi on 30th of April.



He personally talked to appellant/Vishal Kumar on telephone in presence of the investigator, who told his father that he shall be back home within a couple of days.

10. It further appears that in the meantime, the scooty belonging to the deceased was spotted somewhere near Sheikhpura in the district of Patna, which was seized. The seizure was made by the Air Port police station against a Sanha No. 25 dated 01.05.2011. This was done at about 6:30 P.M. On the seat cover of the scooty, there were blood spots.

11. The seizure list (Ext. 6) but was not made any use of by the investigating agency.

12. The police, in fact, did not take it into account for proceeding with the investigation and only proceeded with the investigation on the lines of finding out the whereabouts of the friends of the deceased, who could be the best persons to know as to what had happened.



13. Perhaps, this was for the reason that the deceased had gone to the FIIT JEE coaching classes and had not returned till afternoon.

14. The mobile telephone numbers which were provided to the police, which was in the possession of the deceased, was put on surveillance.

15. It was found that on one of the telephones belonging to the deceased, there were several messages. In one of the messages sent by the deceased to the recipient, it appeared that there was a plan to visit some place in the afternoon. That telephone number was taken note of and was shown to the family members of the deceased. The family members of the deceased immediately located that the aforementioned telephone number belonged to appellant/Vishal Kumar. The telephone number was registered in the name of one Antaryami Singh, who is the grand-father of the appellant/Vishal Kumar.

16. The CDR analysis further disclosed that the



location of the carrier of the aforementioned telephone was somewhere around Maner. This prompted the police to further make inquiries and it was found that the appellant/Vishal Kumar was at Maner at the house of his maternal uncle. The police went to Maner on 04.05.2011 and interrogated appellant/Vishal Kumar. Initially, he showed some reluctance to speak out the truth, but later he broke down and confessed his guilt. His confession apparently was recorded on 04.05.2011. He had made an inculpatory statement about himself and appellant/Anand Kumar having killed the deceased.

17. Based on the aforementioned confession, the dead body of the deceased is said to have been recovered from the bore-well of the Irrigation Department situated next to Jagjivan Stadium, falling under the jurisdiction of Phulwari Sharif police station.

18. In the confession of appellant/Vishal Kumar, positive role was attributed to appellant/Anand Kumar. Appellant/Anand Kumar was arrested from his



house who led the police to the room in his rented accommodation, from where the blood stained clothes of Vishal Kumar and Anand Kumar which had been washed was recovered and seized.

19. The police thought it fit to shut the case, finding that the appellants had killed the deceased.

20. A serious objection has been raised by the appellants with respect to the aforementioned confession and the consequent recovery of the dead body of the deceased from the bore-well.

21. Before dealing with the aforementioned arguments, we deem it appropriate to refer to certain facts which are part of the record.

22. What is very amazing and agonizing as well is that on the Sanha Number 25 dated 01.05.2011, which was lodged by the family members of the deceased, the scooty of the deceased was seized from Sheikhpura. Thus, the seizure would have been known to the family members of the deceased. This information



was withheld for reasons which remain unknown. The FIR which was registered by P.W. 1 was after the seizure, in the night of 01.05.2011, but still there was no reference of such seizure of scooty sometimes in the evening of 01.05.2011. This appears to be rather strange.

23. The other peculiar aspect of the case is that at the instance of the accused persons, an information was sought as to the factum of search of the house of the maternal uncle of the appellant/Vishal Kumar, where Vishal is said to have been arrested on 04.05.2011. It was certified by the Officer-in-Charge of the Maner police station that no raid or arrest was made in village Balua, the village home of the maternal uncle of appellant/Vishal Kumar either on 03.05.2011 and 04.05.2011. The report further indicated that no one was arrested. The aforementioned report has been brought on record at the instance of the accused vide Ext. D/2.

24. This effort was made by the accused



perhaps to demonstrate that there was no arrest made of appellant/Vishal Kumar on 04.05.2011 as touted by the prosecution, when he had made a confession regarding him and Anand Kumar having conspired and killed the deceased.

25. Be it noted that the entire prosecution rests on the confession of appellant/Vishal Kumar, which led to the recovery of the dead body.

26. Another herculean effort made by the accused eventuated in bringing forth certain information which strikes at the root of the prosecution case. At the instance of the accused, through the mechanism of RTI, it was learnt that the blood spots on the wall of the room of the Irrigation Department at Khagaul near the bore-well was detected on 01.05.2011 only which was being investigated independently.

27. It was only on 04.05.2011 at about 07:30 A.M., that it was learnt that a dead body was thrown in the bore-well. An excavation was made in front of local



people and in their presence, the dead body of Rohit was recovered.

28. This signifies that much before the confession of appellant/Vishal Kumar was recorded, the place from where the dead body was recovered was identified. In fact, the blood spots on the wall of the room near the hydraulic campus of the Irrigation Department was a stand alone finding of the local police, which had raised eyebrows and therefore, it was attempted to be found out whether anything had happened in and around the bore-well. This was completely unconnected, at that time, with the investigation of the Sri Krishnapuri P.S. Case No. 74 of 2011 *i.e.* the present case.

29. With these two documents, the effort of the appellants is to demonstrate that only after the dead body was recovered on 04.05.2011, the investigating agency thought it fit to go for a co-referential and close the investigation. It was precisely for this reason that a



serious objection has been raised with respect to the veracity of appellant/Vishal Kumar and appellant/Anand Kumar having confessed their guilt and the recovery being consequent to their confession.

30. Before we proceed further, it would also be relevant to refer to the inquest report as also the post-mortem report of the deceased. The inquest of the deceased (Ext. 4) discloses that the dead body was put in a sack and thrown in the bore-well. The witnesses to the inquest *viz.* Sanjit Kumar and Lal Babu Paswan have not been examined at the Trial.

31. It is not the case of the prosecution that the appellants after killing the deceased, put the dead body in a sack and threw it in the bore-well. That apart, the post-mortem examination on the dead body was done on 05.05.2011 at 10:30 A.M. Approximately ten injuries were found on the person of the deceased but what is relevant to note is that even though it was the month of May and the dead body was kept in a sack and



thrown in the bore-well, no decomposition had started. The post-mortem reflects that it was done hastily and without noting the essential aspects especially when the time fixed for death was placed at 3 - 4 days from the post-mortem examination. There is no reference of any decomposition or swelling or of any other feature suggesting that the deceased was killed and his dead body was packed in a sack and thrown in the bore-well.

32. All this, the learned Advocates appearing for the appellants argued, is an attempt of the police to anyhow make such discovery of the dead body synchronous with the story woven by the prosecution, perhaps only for the purposes of showing to the public that there had been a breakthrough in this murder mystery.

33. The Trial Court, after having examined 27 witnesses on behalf of the prosecution and one as a Court witness, convicted both the appellants and sentenced them as stated earlier.



34. Out of those 27 witnesses, almost all the family members, viz., P.Ws. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 20 are hearsay witnesses, who had no idea about the cause of occurrence, the manner of occurrence or even that the appellants were the perpetrators of the crime. P.Ws. 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15 and 16 are all formal witnesses. Rest of the witnesses are official witnesses.

35. In fact, it has been contended by the appellants and rightly so that the entire prosecution case would get busted if the evidence of P.W. 22/the investigator is examined in some detail.

36. Prabhat Bhushan Srivastava/P.W. 22 was the Investigator of the case who, after first round of cross-examination was recalled for further cross-examination. He has stated before the Trial Court that on 01.05.2011, on receipt of the written report by P.W. 1 dated 01.05.2011, the subject FIR was registered for investigation under Section 365 of the IPC. The first move of P.W. 22 was to go to FIIT JEE institute to



inquire whether the deceased had attended his class on that day. No information could be obtained there. However, on the statement of the family members of the deceased, the name of appellant/Vishal transpired as one of the closest friends of the deceased. It was on that basis that P.W. 22 had taken out the call details and had analyzed the same.

37. On an analyses of the CDR of the telephones of the deceased and appellant/Vishal, he concluded that on 01.05.2011 at about 2 o'clock in the day, the deceased was near Boring Road. This observation was on the basis of the tower location of the telephone.

38. During this period, a number of messages were received and sent from the telephone of the deceased. From one of the telephone numbers, viz., 7250547173, a message had been received on the telephone of the deceased asking him as to why he was not picking-up the telephone and also seeking



confirmation whether the program at 02:15 P.M. was on. This gave an impression to the Investigator that perhaps the deceased had made plan with someone to visit some place. On further inquiry, it was found that the telephone No. 7250547173 belonged to one Antaryami Singh. This fact was told to the father of the deceased, who certified that such telephone number was of appellant/Vishal, who was a close friend of Rohit and Vishal is the grandson of Antaryami Singh, in whose name the telephone was registered.

39. There is yet another disclosure in the deposition of P.W. 22, namely, that the father of the deceased had told him that on 01.05.2011, the father of Vishal had made him talk to Vishal on telephone who had said that he was in Delhi at that time.

40. This was never brought to the notice of the Investigator earlier during the course of investigation.

41. Based on this disclosure and entertaining doubts about the correctness of the statement made by



Vishal that he was in Delhi, the tower location was attempted to be found. It was located that the telephone carrier was present somewhere in Maner jurisdiction. On further inquiry, the Investigator learnt that Vishal has a relative at Maner.

42. He along with his team, thereafter, went to Balua village, falling under the Maner Police Station where Vishal was located. On being told that he was making wrong statements, Vishal broke down and confessed his guilt before the Investigator.

43. The confession has been brought on record as Ext.- 9.

44. After the afore-noted confession, a peculiar procedure was adopted by P.W. 22 in sending one P.S.I. Satendra Kumar (P.W. 19) to the place where appellants/Vishal and Anand had dumped the dead-body. Afore-noted Satendra Kumar confirmed that in a room near the bore-well, there were blood spots on the wall and the same had been seized. Since Vishal had



disclosed that the dead body was thrown in the well, the investigator concluded that there was confirmation of the information given by appellant/Vishal.

45. He has further disclosed before the Trial Court that along with Vishal, he had visited the house of appellant/Anand, who also confessed his guilt and gave him the clothes worn by him and Vishal which had blood stains and which had been washed and kept hidden in his house. Thereafter, he is said to have recovered bottles of chloroform and ether from the house of Vishal as also a plastic syringe and two telephones. On interrogating appellants/Vishal and Anand about the purpose of killing, it was disclosed to him that such kidnapping was for the purposes of demanding ransom but no such telephone call could be made by them as the deceased was thrown in the bore-well without retrieving the telephone from him. It was only for this reason, P.W. 2 was told by the appellants, that no ransom call was made by the appellants.



46. While being questioned further before the Trial Court, P.W. 22 disclosed that he had learnt on 06.05.2011 about the recovery and seizure of the scooty of the deceased by the Airport Police Station. He had sent Satendra Kumar (P.W. 19) to bring that scooty which had been seized by the Airport police. He has admitted before the Trial Court that he could not lay his hands upon any eyewitness of the deceased being taken from FIIT JEE to any place or of the killing of the deceased. There was no evidence about the demand of any ransom.

47. What is striking now is the admission of the investigator that the dead-body was not recovered in his presence. He had not even got the dead body identified by anybody. No investigation was made by him with respect to the friends of the deceased or the holder of the mobile telephones which was in possession of the deceased. He had not even recorded in the police diary about the recovery of the scooty of the deceased.



48. All these disclosures made by P.W. 22, it has been argued, have corroded the credibility of his deposition. He had not recorded the fact about the father of the deceased having gone to the father of appellant/Vishal when a prevaricating statement was made by Vishal, which sent him doubting about the correctness of such version.

49. This perhaps was the starting point of investigation and doubting the complicity of appellant/Vishal. It was necessarily to be recorded or else it would only lead to the inference that this was only the fecundity of his imagination and an *a posteriori* assumption about the appellants having killed the deceased.

50. While reneging from his earlier statement, he has further stated that he had learnt about the recovery of the blood stained scooty on 03.05.2011 through his own sources and not through anyone of the members of the family of the deceased.



51. We have gone through and referred to the deposition of P.W. 22 in detail only for the reason of testing the arguments made on behalf of the appellants that the entire story of confession and the consequent recovery is false and that when a dead body was recovered and was identified to be of the deceased of this case, a short-cut approach was adopted by the investigator to have a confession recorded by the two friends of the deceased.

52. In this context, we are further amazed to find that the mother of the deceased had told the investigator that her husband (father of the deceased) had informed the Airport Police about the scooty of the deceased having been abandoned near the Government Middle School, Sheikhpura. All the family members of the deceased had told the Investigator that after 01:30 in the afternoon of 01.05.2011, the mobile telephone of the deceased was found to be switched off. He agreed that when a telephone is switched off, no tower location



would be recoverable. The tower location is found only when the telephone is kept in the operating condition. This further renders the prosecution to be doubtful.

53. Ultimately, P.W. 22 admitted that he was not present at the place of recovery. When all this had come to the fore before the Trial Court, P.W. 22 was recalled and he made an even more startling disclosure that all the entries in the case diary of Sri Krishnapuri P.S. Case No. 74 of 2011, *i.e.*, this case, from 01.05.2011 to 16.05.2011 was not in his hand writing and he would not even identify as to whose hand writing was that.

54. Thus the entire story put up by the prosecution debunked.

55. The recovery of the dead body has been recorded by one Bela Som (P.W. 17), the Sub-Inspector of Police. She has disclosed that on 04.05.2011, she was present at the Hydraulic Pump, Khagaul till about 06:00 P.M. The bore-well had been dug-up 20 feet



deep. From the excavation, the personal possession of the deceased along with the dead body of the deceased was found.

56. A seizure list in her handwriting was prepared (Ext.-3). The aforementioned seizure list was signed by two of the witnesses. The inquest was prepared by her in three copies which also was signed by two of the witnesses (Exhibit- 4). The dead body challan (Exhibit- 5) was also prepared by her. In her cross-examination, she stated that she had been posted in Phulwari Sharif police station since 2007. The registration of the Sri Krishnapuri case regarding the missing of Rohit Kumar Singh was known to Phulwari Sharif police station.

57. One Rakesh Dubey, the then Dy. S.P. and S.A. Hasmi, S.I. were posted in the Phulwari Sharif Police Station. They were aware of the blood spots in the room near the bore-well on 01.05.2011.

58. We pause here for a moment to repeat that the story of confession leading to the recovery does not



appear to be correct for the reason that the recovery of the dead body was not on the basis of any confession; rather the Police Officers of Phulwari Sharif Police Station had some apprehension that some occurrence had taken place nearby. Since they knew about the registration of the present case in S.K.Puri Police Station, it was very convenient for them to have linked such recovery to the so-called confession of the appellants.

59. With respect to the recovery of the scooty belonging to the deceased on 01.05.2011, constable Dulmu Deogan (P.W. 18) has testified before the Trial Court that the recovery was made and seizure list prepared at the instance of the family members of the deceased, who had lodged Sanha with the Airport Police Station.

60. On perusal of the afore-noted deposition of P.Ws. 22, 19, 17 and 18, it becomes abundantly clear that there was no connection between the recovery of



the dead body of the deceased of this case and the so called confession of the appellants.

61. This exposé of the police of dealing with this matter in such a cack-handed manner has resulted in two young persons remaining in jail for several years without there being any evidence against them.

62. The judgment and order of conviction and sentence is primarily based on the recovery of the dead body on the basis of confession of the appellants.

63. From the evidence of P.W. 22, the investigator, it is absolutely clear that the so called confession is a got-up document. We say so for the reason that the requirement of recording the confession by a police officer in whose custody is the maker of such confession, has not been followed.

64. In ***Ramanand @ Nandlal Bharti vs. State of U.P., 2022 SCC OnLine SC 1396***, the Supreme Court has adumbrated that the first thing that the I.O. should do is to call for two independent



witnesses at the police station and in their presence, the accused be asked to make an appropriate statement pointing out the place where he is said to have hidden the dead body or the weapon of offence. If such statement is made before the independent persons, the exact statements are required to be incorporated/recorded. Once this is done, the I.O. with the police party ought to proceed to the particular place as may be led by the accused and from there, if any *corpus delicti* is discovered, then that process also has to be recorded.

65. The Supreme Court had opined that this is how the law expects the I.O. to draw the discovery Panchnama as contemplated under Section 27 of the Evidence Act.

66. The evidence in the present case completely excludes the presence of the I.O. at the time of the recovery. Even P.W. 17 who had overseen the recovery does not say that the appellant was brought there.



67. Could it then be called a recovery at the instance of the appellant which fact would have been admissible under the Evidence Act?

68. The further requirement under law is that before accepting the evidence and discovery, it must be proved and the I.O. in his deposition is obliged under law to prove the contents of such Panchnama and only when it is proved successfully, the prosecution would be in a position and would have the justification for relying upon such evidence and only then the Trial Court could accept such evidence.

69. In ***Jafarudheen and Ors. vs. State of Kerala (2022) 8 SCC 440*** while dealing with the scope and ambit of Section 27 of the Evidence Act, it was observed that Section 27 of the Evidence Act is an exception to Sections 24 to 26 of the Evidence Act. Admissibility under Section 27 is relatable to the information pertaining to a fact discovered. This provision merely facilitates the proof of a fact discovered



in consequence of information received from a person in custody accused of an offence. It thus incorporates the theory of "*confirmation by subsequent facts facilitating a link to the chain of events*".

70. It is for the prosecution to prove that the information received from the accused is relatable to the fact discovered. The object is to utilize it for the purpose of recovery as it ultimately touches upon the issue pertaining to the discovery of a new fact through the information furnished by the accused.

71. The provisions of Section 27 of the Evidence Act is prone to misuse and therefore, the Courts have to be very circumspect in accepting it as an evidence. The recovery under Section 27 must satisfy the Court's conscious. It is not unknown that the prosecution sometimes takes undue advantage of the custody of the accused. Therefore, a Court has to remain conscious of the witness's credibility and the other evidence produced while dealing with the recovery



under Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act.

72. This aspect of misuse of Section 27 of the Evidence Act was highlighted by Supreme Court in ***Kusal Toppo and Anr. vs. State of Jharkhand (2019) 13 SCC 676*** and ***Geejaganda Somaiah v. State of Karnataka, (2007) 9 SCC 315***. It was observed by the Supreme Court that Section 27 is frequently misused by the police and the Courts are required to be vigilant about its application.

73. In the case at hand, the recovery of the dead body does not at all appear to be relatable to the confession made by the appellants. The confession apparently was made on 04.05.2011. We have found it to be rather strange that no time has been given by P.W. 22 of the recording of confession. This was not inadvertent but with a purpose. The appellant/Vishal Kumar is said to have been arrested from Maner. We have noted that there was no raid or arrest in Maner on 03.05.2011 and 04.05.2011. According to P.W. 22, the



confession of Vishal was recorded at Raja Bazar. How was he brought from Maner to Raja Bazar remains unknown. In this context, not recording the time of the confession assumes importance.

74. The recovery of the dead body though was made on 04.05.2011 only but the evidence does not suggest that it was on the basis of confession. The investigator had not even gone to the place of recovery. Neither the appellants were taken to that place. The investigation with respect to blood spots in the room near the bore-well from where the dead body was recovered was detected on 01.05.2011 only. Investigations were made independently of this case and ultimately after digging the bore-well, the dead body was recovered. It is quite possible that because the registration of the present case in Srikrishnapuri police station was known to the Phulwarisharif police station, both the police stations had an easy way out of linking the recovery of the dead body of Rohit to the confession



of the appellants.

75. This is no evidence in the eyes of law.

76. This evidence per force has to be rejected.

77. The Trial Court unfortunately did not see through the aforementioned scheme of the investigating agency of closing the case without any effort. This is abominable especially when it concerns the life of young people.

78. For the aforementioned reason viz. not finding the recovery to be at the instance of the appellants which is the only basis for convicting them, we set aside the judgment of conviction and order of sentence of the appellants and acquit them of all charges.

79. The appeals are allowed.

80. The appellants are in jail. They are directed to be released from jail forthwith if not wanted in any other case.

81. Let a copy of this judgment be dispatched to the Superintendent of the concerned Jail forthwith



for compliance and record.

82. The records of this case be returned to the
Trial Court forthwith.

83. Interlocutory application/s, if any, also
stand disposed off accordingly.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

(Khatim Reza, J)

Sauravkrsinha/-
krishna

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	29.04.2024
Transmission Date	29.04.2024

