

CRR-1051-2008 (O & M)

2024:PHHC:148498



::1::

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Date of Decision: 12.11.2024

1. CRR-1051-2008 (O&M)

Jagdish Chand ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and ors. ...Respondents

2. CRR-1537-2017 (O&M)

Jagdish Chand ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and anr. ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Rajesh Bansal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Singh Chaudhary, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. R.S. Mamli, Advocate,
for respondents No.2 to 5 (in CRR-1051-2008)
and for respondent No.2 (in CRR-1537-2017).

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

CRM-14044-2017 and CRM-20321-2018 in CRR-1537-2017

This is an application (CRM-14044-2017) under Section 5 of the
Limitation Act seeking condonation of delay of 2321 days in filing this revision
petition.

CRR-1051-2008 (O & M)

2024:PHHC:148498



::2::

The reply to the aforesaid application filed by way of application (CRM-20321-2018) on behalf of the respondent No.2 is taken on record subject to all just exceptions.

For the reasons mentioned in the application (CRM-14044-2017), the same is allowed. Delay of 2321 days stands condoned.

These applications stand disposed of.

CRM-33975-2024 in CRR-1051-2008 & CRM-36006-2024 in CRR-1537-2017

The applications (CRM-33975-2024 and CRM-36006-2024) in the aforementioned revision petitions are for the grant of permission to pursue the presents revision petitions on behalf of the petitioner i.e. Jagdish Chand who is stated to have expired on 05.03.2019.

For the reasons mentioned in the aforesaid applications, the same are allowed and the applicant-Rajender Kumar son of the petitioner Jagdish Chand (since deceased) is allowed to pursue the main revisions petitions.

The applications (CRM-33975-2024 and CRM-36006-2024) stand disposed of.

CRR-1051-2008 and CRR-1537-2017

This order shall dispose of two revision petitions bearing No. CRR-1051-2008 titled as 'Jagdish Chand versus State of Haryana and others' and CRR No.1537-2017 titled as 'Jagdish Chand versus State of Haryana' as they arise out of the same FIR No.93 dated 26.04.2003 under Sections 364 read with Section 120-B IPC, Police Station Missing.



2. The present revision petitions have been filed against the judgment of acquittal dated 21.11.2007 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal and the judgment of acquittal dated 02.08.2010 passed by the Juvenile Justice Board, Karnal.

3. The FIR in the present case came to be registered on 26.04.2003. The judgment of acquittal was passed on 21.11.2007 and 02.08.2010 . These revision petitions dated 19.02.2008 and 14.03.2017 have come up for final hearing now i.e. after a period of almost 21 years having elapsed from the date of the registration of the FIR.

4. For the sake of convenience, the facts are being taken from the petition bearing CRR-1051-2008.

5. The facts of the prosecution case are that Ravinder Kumar aged 15 years son of the complainant Jagdish Chander (PW2) who was studying in 9th standard in a school had gone out of his house of his own on 17/3/2003. He did not return home. The complainant did not suspect any one and on 19/3/2003 he lodged a Daily Diary Report a copy of which is Ex. DA. The complainant searched for his son amongst the relatives but could not trace him. On 26/4/2003 complainant Jagdish again made a statement to the police that his son Ravinder was missing since 17/3/2003. He lodged the report regarding the missing of his son on 19.3.2003 in the police post and thereafter he searched for his son of his own. In their village Ror Majra, one Sansi family was living which indulged in black magic (Jadu Tona). In the said family Sultan accused, Bhira accused and their wives and children were the family members. One other lady, Gurdayalo



accused was also residing in the same family who was a resident of Kaithal. She also indulged in black magic (Jadu Tona). Ravinder Kumar and Satish Kumar son of Bhira Ram accused were friends and they used to play with each other. On 16/3/2003 Satish Kumar took his son Ravinder Kumar on his motor cycle to Nigdu petrol pump. There both were seen by Surinder Kumar son of Sadhu Ram at the petrol pump. Ravinder Kumar at that time was pillion rider on the motor cycle. On 17/3/2003 it was a day of the Holi Festival. Ravinder Kumar was seen standing near the house of the said Sansi family. Later on his whereabouts could not be known. Since 17/3/2003 Gurdayalo was also missing from the village and was not seen with the said Sansi family. The complainant suspected that since the said family was indulging in black magic, so his son Ravinder Kumar was abducted by Sultan Singh, Bhira, Satish Kumar, Gurdayalo and other members of the Sansi family for Jadu Tona in order to commit murder. On the statement of Jagdish Chander Ex.P1 the First Information report Ex.P2 was registered. The spot was inspected by the police. Subhash Chand SI, Incharge, Police Post Sitamai conducted the investigation and recorded the statements of the witnesses. On 30.4.2003, Sh. K.V. Ramana, IPS also investigated the case. Thereafter, the investigation was handed over to Surinder Singh Inspector CIA-11, Karnal. Efforts were made to trace out the said Ravinder Kumar alias Pola but he could not be traced. The accused were also joined in the investigation. Lie Detector Tests were conducted. On 10/6/2003, the photos of Ravinder Kumar were also circulated on Television through the Missing Persons Squad Kotwali Dariya Ganj, New Delhi. Thereafter, the investigation was conducted by Rajinder Singh



S.I. CIA-II but Ravinder Kumar could not be traced. Later, Jagdish complainant filed a petition No. 31578-M of 2003 before the High Court and the investigation was marked to DIG/CID Crime (H). Firstly, the investigation was conducted by Sh. Amar Singh Inspector CID/Crime. Madhuban. Thereafter, the investigation was conducted by Pardeep Singh HPS, DSP/CID/Crime, Madhuban. The accused were joined again in the investigation and efforts were made to trace Ravinder Kumar but without any result. On 30.11.2003, the investigation of this case was marked to Raj Singh, DSP, CID Crime and then the accused were arrested in this case. Their police custody was sought but the whereabouts of Ravinder Kumar could not be ascertained. After completion of the investigation, the accused were challaned in this case and a report under section 173 of the Code of Criminal Procedure was prepared by Raj Singh, DSP. The same was forwarded to the court for trial.

6. After supplying the copies of the documents contemplated under section 207 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the case was committed to the Court of Sessions. The accused were charge-sheeted for the commission of offences punishable under section 364 read with Section 120-B of the Indian Penal Code. The accused pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

7. In support of its case the prosecution examined the following witnesses:-

Sr. No.	Prosecution Witness(es)	Name of the Witnesses
1.	PW-1	Raghbir Singh SI
2.	PW-2	Jagdish, complainant



3.	PW-3	Reetu
4.	PW-4	Rajinder Kumar
5.	PW-5	Ram Kumar
6.	PW-6	Amar Singh, Inspector
7.	PW-7	Vir Shakti Singh, Draftsman
8.	PW-8	Surinder Kumar
9.	PW-9	DSP Pardeep Singh
10.	PW-10	Raj Singh, DSP
11.	PW-11	SI Subhash Chander

The prosecution placed reliance on the following documents:-

Sr. No.	Documents	Nature of Documents
1.	Ex.P1	Ruqqa
2.	Ex.P1/A	Endorsement
3.	Ex.P2	FIR
4.	Ex.P3	Endorsement
5.	Ex.P4	Site Plan
6.	Ex.P5	Rough Site Plan

Thereafter, the Public Prosecutor closed the evidence of the prosecution.

8. When examined under section 313 Cr. P.C., the accused refuted all the allegations levelled against them and pleaded that they were innocent and had been involved in a false case in connivance with Ram Dia, brother of the complainant Jagdish Chander with whom they had previous enmity. The accused also produced in their defence Ex.DA copy of rapat roznamcha, Ex.DB statement of Reetu recorded under section 161



Cr.P.C. Ex.DC statement of Rajinder Kumar, Ex.DD statement of Ram Kumar, Ex.DC statement of Surinder Kumar recorded under section 161 Cr.P.C. besides the documents copy of petition under Section 482 Cr. P.C. Mark-D1, copy of affidavit Mark-D2, copy of application moved before Human Rights Commission Mark-D3 and copy of order dated 23.2.2006 Mark-D.

9. The prosecution examined 11 witnesses in all PW-1 SI Raghbir Singh was a formal witness who recorded the first information report Ex.P2 after receiving ruqqa Ex.PI. PW-6 Inspector Amar Singh was also a formal witness who recorded the statement of complainant Jagdish Chander under Section 161 Cr.P.C. on 25.3.2003. PW7 Vir Shakti Singh was also a formal witness who prepared the scaled site plan on 30.8.2004. PW-9 Pardeep Singh DSP was also a formal witness who recorded the statement of Bimla, Surinder Singh and Fakir Chand Chowkidar under Sections 161 Cr.P.C. PW-10 DSP Raj Singh CID was also a formal witness who arrested the accused, recorded the statements of witnesses and prepared the report under Section 173 Cr.P.C.

10. The prosecution case rests on the statements of complainant Jagdish PW-2, Reetu niece of complainant PW-3, Rajinder Kumar brother of Ravinder Kumar PW-4 and PW-8 Surinder Kumar.

11. The complainant Jagdish/PW-2 deposed in his statement on oath that he had two sons, namely, Rajinder Kumar and Ravinder Kumar alias Pola. Ravinder Kumar alias Pola was his younger son. Ravinder



Kumar was studying in 9th Class in Mohri National Public School. On 17/3/2003 his son Ravinder Kumar went missing. When he came back to his house in the evening on 17/3/2003 he enquired about his son from his wife Ram Murti who told him that Ramesh son of Sultan Singh (accused who has been declared as a Juvenile) had taken Ravinder Kumar from the house. He further deposed that accused Sultan Singh, Raghbir Singh and Gurdayalo Devi were Tantriks and accused Ramesh was also from the same Tantrik family. He deposed that all the accused including Ramesh used to deal in black Magic (Jadu Tona). On 17/3/2003 it was the Holi festival and the accused performed Jadu Tona on the festival of the Holi. He went to the house of the accused at Ror Majra but the house was found locked and for many days, the accused were absconding. After 15-20 days all the accused met him and told him to withdraw his complaint from the police and assured that they would produce his son Ravinder Kumar but Ravinder Kumar was not produced. He informed the police but no action was taken by the police. On 26/4/2003 the police recorded his statement Ex.P1 then the case was registered. The police did not record his statement correctly. Ram Dia son of Phagu Ram, Dharam Pal MLA of Nilokheri constituency and Sardar Bakshish Singh were the member of INLD party and then they took the accused to the Chief Minister. Thereafter, the police did not take any action in the matter. He moved many applications to the Chief Minister, to the son of Chief Minister Ajay Chautala, to the Deputy Commissioner and other but no response to those



applications was received. He deposed that the accused had taken his son to sacrifice him and till that day his whereabouts were not known.

PW-3 Reetu daughter of Ram Kumar, brother of the complainant deposed that she was studying in 6th Class. Her father and her uncle Jagdish resided in the same boundary but separately. On 17/3/2003 she, Ravinder Kumar alias Pola, Ram Kumar, Sheela and Murti were present at the house. Ramesh Kumar called Ravinder Kumar. Then he came out of the house. She also came out of the house and found that Ramesh accused was present there. She asked Ravinder Kumar to take tea but he stated that he would come for tea later on and was going to play. Then Ravinder Kumar did not return. Then she went to the house of Sultan Singh, Raghbir, Ramesh, Satish and Gurdialo. They all were present there. Ravinder Kumar alias Pola was also sitting with them. She asked Ravinder Kumar to come for the tea but the accused stated that he would come on his own. Thereafter, Ravinder Kumar did not return.

Rajinder Kumar (PW-4) son of Jagdish also deposed that on 17/3/2003 he was present at his house. Ramesh came and took Ravinder Kumar with him and thereafter, Ravinder Kumar did not return home. On 27.4.2003, after registration of the case on 26/4/2003, Ramesh, Satish, Bhira, Gurdialo came to their house and they sought pardon from them and asked to withdraw the case and assured that they would return Ravinder Kumar. However, Ravinder Kumar was not returned by the accused.



Ram Kumar (PW-5), brother of the complainant Jagdish deposed that on 17/3/2003, he was present at his house. At about 3.30/4 PM his wife Sheela Devi, Murti Devi, Ravinder alias Pola, Rajinder and Reetu were present. He was putting fodder to the cattle and then he heard a call and asked his daughter Reetu to go outside and see who was there. Reetu told that there was Ramesh son of Sultan. Pola went alongwith Ramesh. Then he went to his fields. At 7.00 PM he was present at the bus stand. Satish Kumar was driving the motor cycle. Ravinder alias Pola was sitting in the middle whereas Bhira accused was pillion rider on the motor cycle and he saw them going and thereafter, Ravinder Kumar did not return. His statement was not recorded by the police correctly.

Surinder Kumar PW-8 deposed that he was running a Restaurant in Nigdu in the name of Rohil Restaurant. In front of his restaurant there was a petrol pump. On 17/3/2003 at 6.30 PM, he was standing in front of his Restaurant Ravinder Kumar was sitting on the motor cycle in between Satish Kumar and Bhira and were going. Thereafter, Ravinder Kumar did not meet him.

12. Based on the evidence led, the respondents No.2 to 5/accused, Sultan Singh, Raghbir Singh, Satish and Gurdayalo Devi (in CRR-1051-2008) came to be acquitted vide judgment dated 21.11.2007 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal. In a separate Trial, respondent No.2, namely, Ramesh (in CRR-1537-2017) came to be



acquitted vide judgment dated 02.08.2010 passed by the Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Karnal.

13. The aforementioned judgments are under challenge before this Court.

14. So far as the revision petition CRR-1051-2008 is concerned, the learned counsel for the petitioner and the State contend that the judgment of acquittal dated 21.11.2007 was recorded on the basis of conjectures and surmises. The prosecution evidence had not been appreciated in its proper perspective. Minor discrepancies/improvements in the statement of prosecution witnesses had been given undue weightage. The judgments of acquittal had been passed only on account of the supposedly defective investigation. They, therefore, contend that the impugned judgment be set aside and the matter be re-investigated.

15. The learned counsel for the private respondents No.2 to 5/accused, on the other contends that the prosecution witnesses were discrepant in material particulars. Substantial improvements were made in their statements from stage to stage. No reliable motive or 'last seen' evidence of the accused for kidnapping was available on record. There was absolutely no evidence connecting the accused/respondents No.2 to 5 to the commission of the alleged offence in question. Therefore, the present petition was liable to be dismissed.

16. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.



17. It is pertinent to mention that since 17/3/2003 Ravinder Kumar alias Pola son of the complainant was missing and the complainant lodged the report with the police regarding missing of Ravinder Kumar on 19/3/2003. Ex.DA is the copy of the said daily dairy report. A close perusal of the daily dairy Ex.DA reveals that at that time, the complainant had disclosed that on 17/3/2003 at 3.40/4 PM his son had gone outside of his own and even till 19/3/2003 he did not suspect any one. So, it is established that the son of the complainant had gone of his own from the house. He was not called by Ramesh accused as deposed by the complainant in his statement on oath. Ex.P1 is the statement of the complainant made to the police on 26/4/2003 and in the said statement also the complainant did not disclose that Ramesh called Ravinder Kumar from his house and took him along. So, the statement of complainant Jagdish Chander that he was told by his wife Ram Murti that Ramesh son of Sultan Singh had taken Ravinder Kumar from the house is just a concocted one. His statement that the police did not record this fact in his statement Ex.P-1 can not be believed. There was no reason for the police not to record the statement of the complainant Ex.P-1 on 26/4/2003 correctly. Had in fact, Ramesh taken the son of the complainant Ravinder Kumar on 17/3/2003, the complainant would have mentioned this fact in his statement made on 19/3/2003 on the basis of which the Daily Dairy Report was recorded and even in his statement recorded on 26/4/2003 on the basis of which the first information report was recorded. So,



apparently the complainant concocted the version that he was told that Ramesh had taken Ravinder Kumar from his house. The complainant was duly confronted with the DDR and statement Ex.P-1 but his explanation that the police did not record his statement correctly can not be believed. If the statement of the complainant had not been recorded correctly then the complainant could have moved applications to the higher authorities. The statement of the complainant that he moved applications to the Chief Minister and other authorities can not be believed as no evidence regarding giving those applications to the Chief Minister or others has been produced on the record. The mere statement of the complainant that the police did not record his statement correctly can not be believed as the police was not inimical to the complainant nor had any relations with the accused. The accused are also not influential persons so as to influence the police. The statement of the complainant that he went to the house of the accused and the house was found locked also can not be believed as no such fact was disclosed by him to the police. His statement that 15-20 days thereafter, the accused told him to withdraw the complaint and they would produce his son can not be believed as no complaint was made by him to the police, thereafter in this regard nor any such statement was made by him to the police. On 26/4/2003, the statement of the complainant was recorded on the basis of which the first information report was registered. Even at the that time, the complainant did not disclose these facts to the police. The improvements made by the complainant in his statement later



on can not be believed being an after thought. The witness was duly confronted with the Improvements made by him in his statement by the defence counsel and there is no satisfactory explanation given by the complainant to believe his statement.

18. The statement of Reetu (PW-3) that on 17/3/2003 accused Ramesh called Ravinder Kumar alias Pola from his house also can not be believed because Reetu disclosed in her statement that on 17/3/2003 she had told all the persons present, namely, Ram Kumar, Sheela and Murti that Ramesh had taken Ravinder Kumar with him. Had, In fact, Reetu disclosed this fact to all other family members then the complainant would have got this fact mentioned in his report when he lodged the DDR and also when he made statement Ex.P-1 on the basis of which the first information report was recorded. The statement of Reetu that she went to the house of the accused and there Ravinder Kumar was found present sitting with them also can not be believed as this fact does not find mention in the DDR and the first information report. No statement was made by Reetu to the police before 25/8/2003. The statement made by Reetu on 25/8/2003 after five months of the incident is nothing but a concocted version. Her statement that the police did not record her statement properly can not be believed. Even in her statement to the police, Reetu did not disclose that she had gone to the house of the accused and found Ravinder Kumar and this part of her statement is also an improvement. So, the statement of Reetu that Ramesh called Ravinder



Kumar and took with him as well as her statement that she saw Ravinder Kumar at the house of the accused is not believable.

19. The statement of Rajinder Kumar (PW-4) son of Jagdish Chander who is the brother of Ravinder Kumar that Ramesh came to their house and took Ravinder Kumar with him also can not be believed as had Ramesh come to the house of the complainant, the complainant would have got this fact mentioned in the DDR or at least at the time of lodging of the FIR. The statement of Rajinder Kumar Ex.DC which was recorded on 26/4/2003 by the police only proves that they heard the call of some child outside the house after which Ravinder Kumar alias Pola went away. In his statement to the police even Rajinder Kumar did disclose that Ramesh took Ravinder Kumar with him or that they saw Ramesh calling Ravinder Kumar alias Pola. So, his statement in the Court is nothing but an improvement just to bolster the prosecution case. The statement of Rajinder Kumar that the accused sought pardon and asked them to withdraw the case also can not be believed as it is an improvement from the statement Ex.DC to the police. His version that his statement was not recorded by the police correctly can not be believed. Rather this witness made a statement to the police that, at that time they did not come out to find out as to who was the boy who called Ravinder Kumar.

20. The statement of Ram Kumar (PW-5), brother of the complainant-Jagdish Chander that Ramesh called Ravinder Kumar and took him along also can not be believed as this fact does not find mention



in the DDR or in the first information report. His statement that on 17/3/2003, he saw Ravinder Kumar alias Pola sitting on the motor cycle of Satish Kumar also can not be believed as had he seen Satish Kumar and Bhira carrying Ravinder Kumar then he would have disclosed this fact to his brother Jagdish and would have got mentioned this fact in his statement. No such statement was made by him to the police that on 17/3/2003 Ravinder Kumar alias Pola was seen on the motor cycle of Satish Kumar accused. On the other hand, in his statement Ex.DD which was recorded on 26/4/2003 he had deposed that on 16/3/2003 he saw Ravinder Kumar alias Pola on the motor cycle of Satish Kumar. Admittedly, on 16/3/2003 Ravinder Kumar alias Pola had returned to the house, so in case on 16/3/2003 Ravinder Kumar was seen with Satish Kumar then it can not be said that Ravinder Kumar was abducted. The statement of Ram Kumar that he saw Ravinder Kumar on 17/3/2003 on the motor cycle of Satish Kumar is just an after thought and an improvement to his previous statement to the police.

21. The statement of Surinder Kumar (PW-8) that on 17/3/2003 Ravinder Kumar was seen sitting on the motor cycle of Satish Kumar alongwith Bhira also can not be believed as in his statement to the police Ex.DE he had disclosed that on 16/3/2003 he saw Ravinder Kumar on the motor cycle of Satish Kumar. Since on 16/3/2003, Ravinder Kumar had returned to his house so this evidence that on 16/3/2003 Ravinder Kumar was with Satish Kumar has no connection with the kidnapping of



Ravinder Kumar. The statement of Surinder Kumar that on 17/3/2003 Ravinder Kumar was seen with Satish Kumar and Bhira is not believable as this is an improvement by the witness in his previous statement to the police. His version that the police did not record his statement correctly can not be believed.

22. The prosecution has failed to prove the motive of the accused to kidnap Ravinder Kumar. The prosecution version that the accused indulged in black magic (Jadu Tona) is not proved on the record as the prosecution witnesses examined are interested witnesses. No neighbour or independent witness from the village has come forward to depose that the accused were indulging in any Jadu Tona. Previously no complaint was made against the accused in this regard. Some respectables could have been produced to prove that the accused were indulging in Jadu Tona. The prosecution failed to prove that the accused were indulging in Jadu Tona and also failed to prove miserably the motive of the accused to kidnap Ravinder Kumar.

23. The statements of the prosecution witnesses that Ramesh accused called Ravinder Kumar from his house can not be believed being contradictory to their earlier statements. The statements of the prosecution witnesses Reetu that Ravinder Kumar was seen at the house of the accused is also not believable as discussed above. The statement of other prosecution witnesses Jagdish Chander, Rajinder Kumar and Ram Kumar that Ravinder Kumar was taken by Ramesh from his house are also not



believable. The statements of Surinder Kumar and Ram Kumar that Ravinder Kumar was seen on the motor cycle of accused Satish Kumar on 17/3/2003 are also not believable.

24. The prosecution has failed to produce cogent evidence that Ravinder Kumar was lastly seen in the company of the accused. The sole witness Bimla has not been examined by the prosecution. No Independent witness or respectable from the village has come forward to depose that Ravinder Kumar was seen near the house of the accused before disappearance or he was seen lastly in the company of the accused. The witnesses produced by the prosecution are interested witnesses being related to each other and their statements can not be believed as they made a number of improvements in their statements on Oath. Many officers conducted the investigation. It can not be said that all the officials were inimical towards the complainant and that they did not conduct the Investigation properly or record the statements of witnesses correctly.

25. In view of the aforementioned discussion, I find no reason to interfere with the well reasoned judgment dated 21.11.2007 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal whereby the respondents No.2 to 5, namely, Sultan Singh, Raghbir Singh, Satish and Gurdayalo Devi (in CRR-1051-2008) have been acquitted. Therefore, the present revision petition stands dismissed.

26. So far as the connected petition (CRR-1537-2017) is concerned, while Sultan Singh, Raghibir Singh, Satish and Gurdayalo



Devi faced Trial before the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal, accused-respondent No.2/Ramesh (in CRR-1537-2017) was tried by the Juvenile Justice Board headed by the Principal Juvenile Justice Board, Karnal.

The evidence lead in the said case before the Juvenile Justice Board, Karnal is a truncated version of the evidence lead in the main Trial which took place before the Court of the Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal.

27. In view of the fact that the afore-mentioned revision petition challenging the order dated 21.11.2007 passed by the Court of the Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal, whereby the four co-accused, namely, Sultan Singh, Raghbir Singh, Satish and Gurdayalo Devi stand acquitted, has been dismissed, the instant revision petition challenging the acquittal of the juvenile accused/respondent, namely, Ramesh based on similar evidence also stands dismissed.

28. Since the main revisions petitions stand dismissed, no order needs to be passed in the pending applications, if any.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

November 12, 2024
sukhpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No