



* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

Reserved on: 05.03.2024

Decided on: 01.04.2024

+ **BAIL APPLN. 481/2024 & CRL.M.A. 4108/2024**

RAJEEV JHAWAR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sidharth Luthra, Mr.
Pramod Kumar Dubey, Sr.
Advocates with Mr. Rajiv
Bhatnagar, Mr. Ayush
Kaushik, Mr. Anshuman
Mohit Chaturvedi, Mr.
Uddeshya Singh, Mr. Satyam
Sharma, Ms. Aditi, Ms.
Ritivika Poswal, Mr. Kaul
Rustom Khan, Mr. Sangat Pati
and Mr. Suhail Ahmed,
Advocates.

versus

DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Special
Counsel for ED with Mr.
Vivek Gurnani, Mr. Kartik
Sabharwal and Mr. Pranjali
Tripathi, Advocates and Mr.
Devendra Kumar Gupta, AEO

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

JUDGMENT

SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J.



1. The present application has been preferred on behalf of the applicant Rajeev Jhawar under Section 438 and 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (*'Cr.P.C.'*) and Section 45 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (*'PMLA'*) seeking pre-arrest bail in ECIR/DLZO-I/24/2022, Complaint Case No. 08/2023, registered at DLZO-I, Directorate of Enforcement, New Delhi.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

2. On 02.10.2020, the Central Bureau of Investigation (*'CBI'*) had registered RC AC-1/2020/A0004, at CBI/AC-I, New Delhi under Sections 7-A/8/9/10/12 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (*'PC Act'*). This was registered pursuant to receipt of an information that Sh. N.M.P. Sinha i.e. Ex. SP, CBI, New Delhi, in conspira

3. cy with Sh. Vinay Jalan, Sh. Parth Jalan, Sh. Rajiv Jhawar (present applicant) i.e. M.D. of M/s. Usha Martin Ltd., Sh. Raj Kumar Kapoor i.e. Authorized Signatory of M/s. Usha Martin Ltd., and other unknown persons, was trying to influence the investigation of the case of CBI registered *vide* RC17(E)/2016 dated 20.09.2016 under Section 13(2) read with Section 13(1)(d) of PC Act and Section 420/120B of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (*'IPC'*), by EO-II Branch, New Delhi against I.D. Paswan, the then Director (Mines), Govt. of Jharkhand, M/s. Usha Martin Ltd. and other unknown persons. The allegations were that Sh. N.M.P. Sinha was the Supervisory Officer of the aforesaid case before his retirement on 31.08.2020, and Sh. Raj Kumar Kapoor was representing M/s. Usha Martin Ltd. on behalf of Sh. Rajiv Jhawar. As alleged, they were actively pursuing the case



through Sh. Vinay Jalan who had assured them that he will get the investigation moulded in their favour through his contacts in CBI. On 23.09.2020, Sh. N.M.P. Sinha had met Sh. Vinay Jalan at hotel ITC Maurya, New Delhi for three-four hours and in his presence, Sh. Vinay Jalan had asked his son Parth Jalan to prepare a reply to the summons issued by CBI to M/s. Usha Martin Ltd. and asked him to meet Sh. N.M.P. Sinha on his next visit to New Delhi. Sh. N.M.P. Sinha also had a conversation with Sh. Parth Jalan. It was informed to CBI that Sh. Vinay Jalan will deliver a bribe of Rs. 20 lakhs to Sh. N.M.P. Sinha to get the work done.

4. During investigation, a trap was laid and the accused persons namely Sh. N.M.P. Sinha and Sh. Vinay Kumar Jalan were arrested and an amount of Rs. 25,00,000/- and Rs.5,12,000/- was recovered respectively from their possession. After completion of investigation, chargesheet was filed on 01.12.2020 against the accused persons namely (1) Nripendra Mohan Prasad Sinha @ N.M. P. Sinha, (2) Vinay Kumar Jalan, (3) Rajiv Jhavar, (4) Raj Kumar Kapoor, (5) M/s. Usha Martin Ltd. and (6) Hemant Joshi, under Sections 120B of IPC read with Sections 7/7A/8/9/10/12 of PC Act and substantive offences under Section 9 and 12 of PC Act.

5. Since, Section 120B of IPC and Sections 7, 7A, 8, 9, 10 and 12 of PC Act are Scheduled offences under the PMLA, enquiries were initiated under PMLA against the accused persons.

6. On the basis of the RC registered by the CBI, an ECIR No. RNSZO/17/2020 dated 29.10.2020 was recorded by Ranchi Sub-Zonal Office (now Zonal office), and the investigation in this case



was initiated by Ranchi office. However, the ECIR was transferred to Delhi Zonal Office-1 and new ECIR No. DLZO-I/24/2022 was assigned on 18.05.2022. Thereafter, the investigation was carried out by the Delhi team of Directorate of Enforcement.

7. The case of Directorate of Enforcement, in brief, is that the applicant Rajeev Jhawar, Managing Director, M/s Usha Martin Ltd., on behalf of the accused company, had agreed to give a bribe of Rs. 50 lakhs to Sh. N.M.P Sinha and as a first installment, Rs. 30 lakhs was delivered to Vinay Kumar Jalan in Delhi for further handing over to N.M.P Sinha. However Rs. 25 lakhs was given to N.M.P Sinha and rest Rs. 5 lakhs was retained by Vinay Kumar Jalan on request of N.M.P Sinha and the said amount totalling to Rs. 30 lakhs were seized by CBI. The aforesaid money totalling to Rs. 30 lakhs, which were acquired by N.M.P Sinha and Vinay Kumar Jalan, from Rajeev Jhawar, as a result of criminal activities related to schedule offences is proceeds of crime as defined under Section 2(1)(u) of PMLA. As alleged, the accused persons namely N.M.P Sinha, Rajeev Jhawar, Vinay Kumar Jalan, M/s. Usha Martin Ltd have committed the offence of money laundering as defined under Section 3 and they are liable to be prosecuted and punished under Section 4, and the bribe money Rs. 30 lakhs which is involved in the offence of money laundering is proceeds of crime in terms of Section 3 of PMLA and is liable to be confiscated in terms of section 8(5) of PMLA, 2002.

8. On 30.03.2023, prosecution complaint in the present case was filed against the aforesaid accused persons. Proceedings under Section 174 of the IPC were also initiated against the applicant. On



03.04.2023, cognizance of the prosecution complaint was taken by the learned Special Judge, CBI-19 (PC Act), Rouse Avenue Courts, New Delhi and process was issued against all four accused persons.

9. The anticipatory bail application instituted by the applicant herein was dismissed by the learned Special Judge *vide* impugned order dated 19.01.2024. Non-Bailable Warrants ('NBW') were also issued against the applicant on 02.02.2024 by the learned Special Judge.

SUBMISSIONS BY THE PARTIES

On Behalf of the Applicant

10. Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant Rajeev Jhavar argues that in the present ECIR, no accused person was arrested by the Directorate of Enforcement during investigation, and two remaining accused have been granted bail on appearance by the learned Special Judge. It is further stated that at the time of cognizance, Directorate of Enforcement had neither sought issuance of NBW against the applicant nor the learned Special Judge had issued NBW instead of summons. It is further pointed out that in the proceedings before the learned Special Judge in this case, the applicant had entered appearance on 31.05.2023 (via counsel), and in person (through Video-Conferencing) on four dates of hearing i.e. 11.08.2023, 19.09.2023, 07.11.2023 and 02.02.2024. It is vehemently argued that once cognizance has already been taken by the learned Special Judge, the power of arrest under Section 19 PMLA cannot be



exercised by Directorate of Enforcement, and thus, it has no right to arrest the applicant for alleged further investigations and also has no right to oppose the present anticipatory bail application. It is further submitted that even otherwise, no further scope of investigation *qua* purported offence under PMLA is left to be investigated by Directorate of Enforcement, since the alleged proceeds of crime were seized by the CBI within minutes of the alleged commission of the offence, and the Directorate of Enforcement cannot investigate the predicate offence as per settled law.

11. Learned Senior Counsel also argues that the investigation in the present ECIR is complete and the Directorate of Enforcement has already filed a complaint, the evidence is documentary in nature and the statements of all the witnesses have been recorded. Therefore, there is no scope of tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses and there arises no occasion for custodial interrogation of the applicant. It is further contended that the applicant has always been desirous of returning to India and has taken genuine and affirmative steps. However, due to the frequent impediments created by CBI & Directorate of Enforcement, the applicant, despite all bona fide attempts, has been unable to return to India. However, it is argued that the applicant has cooperated by responding to all the summons and submitting all the documents requisitioned, and considering the same, the Directorate of Enforcement had never exercised its powers under Section 19 of PMLA and no request for issuance of NBW against the applicant was made by the Directorate of Enforcement, during the course of investigation or while filing the prosecution



Complaint. Although all summons were replied to by the applicant, he was unable to appear in person due to circumstances beyond his control, including the COVID-19 restrictions, medical condition of his parents and roadblocks created by prosecuting agencies. It is also contended that summons issued by the Court were not served as per law and were neither served at the residence of the applicant in Singapore nor as per MLAT yet the applicant had entered appearance (through counsel) on 31.05.2023 and later through video-conferencing himself.

12. It is further argued that as per law, where the accused is not arrested during investigation, he shall be treated on a separate footing from an accused who was arrested during investigation and while applying for bail, twin conditions under Section 45 PMLA are not applicable. Furthermore, the alleged proceeds of crime are Rs. 30 lakhs i.e. less than Rs. 1 crore and the present case falls within the *proviso* of Section 45 of PMLA. It is also stated that applicant is suffering from hyperlipidemia, ischemic heart disease and hypertension since the year 2014 and had also undergone cardiac catheterization in November 2020, and therefore, he falls under the category of 'sick' as per *proviso* of Section 45 of PMLA.

13. Further, it is submitted on behalf of the applicant that no case is made out under PC Act, since the alleged meeting had taken place on 23.09.2020 i.e. post-retirement of the alleged public servant. It is stated that *prima facie*, the ingredients of predicate offence are not made out in the present case, and concomitantly, there cannot be



proceeds of crime having been generated as there is no criminal activity *qua* scheduled offence.

14. Therefore, it is prayed that the applicant be granted pre-arrest bail in the present ECIR.

On Behalf of the Respondent

15. While opposing the present application, learned Special Counsel appearing on behalf of the Directorate of Enforcement argues that the present bail application should be dismissed on the sole ground that the applicant has been non-cooperative and has failed to join investigation, and further has also disobeyed Court orders asking him to appear before the Court. It is argued that the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that non-cooperation is a ground of rejection of bail application even when a complaint stands filed, and anticipatory bail cannot be granted to a person not joining investigation. It is submitted that the applicant has failed to join the proceedings pending before the learned Special Judge in case titled as 'Directorate of Enforcement vs. N.M.P Sinha & Ors' where the learned Special Judge had issued Non-Bailable Warrants against the applicant for 22.02.2024 and again on his failure to appear before the Court, fresh NBW were issued against the applicant for 21.03.2024.

16. It is also stated that during the course of investigation, statements of several persons were recorded under Section 50 of PMLA but the statement of applicant Rajeev Jhavar could not be recorded due to his non-appearance on multiple occasions. It is also pointed out that a complaint under Section 174 of Cr.P.C. has also



been filed against him for his non-appearance before the I.O., on 24.03.2023, before the learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Patiala House Court, New Delhi. It is argued that though the role of applicant in offence of money laundering has categorically emerged during the investigation, but due to his non-appearance, investigation *qua* him could not be completed, and there is every possibility that further evidences may be gathered after recording of his statement and interrogation. It was further argued that as per explanation to Section 44 of PMLA, the prosecuting agency is within its right to make any subsequent complaint in respect of further investigation that may be conducted to bring any further evidence, oral or documentary, against any accused persons involved in respect of the offence, for which complaint has already been filed, whether named in the complaint or not.

17. It is also argued that the fact that the applicant was granted anticipatory bail in the predicate offence is of no avail in the present case since the proceedings under PMLA are independent from the proceedings initiated by the predicate agency and the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that any protection from arrest granted in the predicate offence will not extend to the offence of money laundering. It is further contended that the applicant had tried to influence the investigation in the main case by bribing the Supervisory Officer i.e. accused N.M.P. Sinha, resulting in registration of predicate offence and the present ECIR. Therefore, it is submitted that if the applicant is released on bail, he may again try to tamper with evidence and influence the witnesses of the present case.



18. On these grounds, it is prayed that the present bail application be dismissed.

19. This Court has heard arguments addressed by learned Senior Counsel for the applicant/accused as well as learned Special Counsel for the Directorate of Enforcement, and has gone through the records of the case.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

20. Before considering the arguments raised before this Court, it will be appropriate to take note of the relevant factors which are to be considered while adjudicating an application seeking pre-arrest bail. In this regard, a reference can be made to the relevant observations of the Hon'ble Apex Court in case of *Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra (2011) 1 SCC 694*, which are extracted hereunder:

“112. ... (i) the nature and gravity of the accusation and the exact role of the accused must be properly comprehended before arrest is made;

(ii) the antecedents of the applicant including the fact as to whether the accused has previously undergone imprisonment on conviction by a court in respect of any cognizable offence;

(iii) the possibility of the applicant fleeing from justice;

(iv) the likelihood of the accused repeating similar or other offences;

(v) whether the accusations have been made only with the object of injuring or humiliating the applicant by arresting them;

(vi) the impact of the grant of anticipatory bail particularly in cases of large magnitude affecting a very large number of people;



(vii) the courts must carefully evaluate the entire material against the accused. The court must also clearly comprehend the exact role of the accused in the case. The cases in which the accused is implicated with the help of Sections 34 and 149 of the Penal Code, 1860 the court should consider with even greater care and caution because over implication in such cases is a matter of common knowledge and concern;

(viii) while considering the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail, a balance has to be struck between two factors, namely, no prejudice should be caused to the free, fair and full investigation and there should be prevention of harassment, humiliation and unjustified detention of the accused;

(ix) the reasonable apprehension of tampering of the witnesses or apprehension of threat to the complainant;

(x) frivolity in prosecution should always be considered and it is only the element of genuineness that shall have to be considered in the matter of grant of bail and in the event of there being some doubt as to the genuineness of the prosecution, in the normal course of events, the accused is entitled to an order of bail.”

21. Recently, in case of *Srikant Upadhyay v. State of Bihar SLP (Crl.) 7940/2023*, Hon’ble Apex Court has held that grant of interim protection or protection from arrest to an accused in a serious case may lead to miscarriage of justice and may hamper the investigation to a great extent as it may sometimes lead to tampering or distraction of the evidence. It was also held that in the absence of any interim order, pendency of an application for anticipatory bail would not bar the Trial Court in issuing coercive steps against an accused due to his continued defiance. It was also observed that filing of an Anticipatory Bail application by an accused through his advocate cannot be said to be an appearance of the accused in a competent Court, so far as proceeding initiated under Section 82/83 of Cr.P.C. is concerned. The relevant portion of the judgment reads as under:



“9. When a Court grants anticipatory bail what it actually does is only to make an order that in the event of arrest, the arrestee shall be released on bail, subject to the terms and conditions. Taking note of the fact the said power is to be exercised in exceptional circumstances and that it may cause some hinderance to the normal flow of investigation method when called upon to exercise the power under Section 438, Cr.PC, courts must keep reminded of the position that law aides only the abiding and certainly not its resistant. By saying so, we mean that a person, having subjected to investigation on a serious offence and upon making out a case, is included in a charge sheet or even after filing of a refer report, later, in accordance with law, the Court issues a summons to a person, he is bound to submit himself to the authority of law. It only means that though he will still be at liberty, rather, in his right, to take recourse to the legal remedies available only in accordance with law, but not in its defiance.

20. We are in full agreement with the view taken by the Gujarat High Court that filing of an anticipatory bail through an advocate would not and could not be treated as appearance before a court by a person against whom such proceedings, as mentioned above are instituted.

24. We have already held that the power to grant anticipatory bail is an extraordinary power. Though in many cases it was held that bail is said to be a rule, it cannot, by any stretch of imagination, be said that anticipatory bail is the rule. It cannot be the rule and the question of its grant should be left to the cautious and judicious discretion by the Court depending on the facts and circumstances of each case. While called upon to exercise the said power, the Court concerned has to be very cautious as the grant of interim protection or protection to the accused in serious cases may lead to miscarriage of justice and may hamper the investigation to a great extent as it may sometimes lead to tampering or distraction of the evidence.”

22. As regards the argument raised on behalf of the present applicant that no offence under PC Act as well as the provisions of PMLA is made out, it has been rightly observed by the learned Trial Court in the impugned order that the present applicant already stands



summoned by way of order dated 03.04.2023 in the present complaint case arising out of ECIR, and the said summoning order has not been assailed by the accused, and similarly, the accused persons have also been summoned in the CBI case pertaining to the predicate offence and the summoning order therein has also not been challenged till date. Further, this Court's attention was drawn towards the order dated 28.09.2022 passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in case of *Usha Martin Limited Through Its Authorised Signatory v. Union of India SLP (Crl.) No. 9352/2021* wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court had upheld the order of High Court of Jharkhand, dismissing the petition filed by Usha Martin Limited seeking quashing of the present ECIR and thereby expressing that the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner were all the defences which were required to be considered and dealt with at the time of trial. Therefore, when the cognizance of the offence has already been taken by the learned Trial Court and the petition seeking quashing of ECIR stands dismissed by the Hon'ble Apex Court on earlier occasion, the submissions regarding absence of ingredients of alleged offence in the present case is without any merit.

23. Further, both the parties during the course of arguments had placed their reliance upon the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court in case of *Satender Kumar Antil v. CBI (2022) 10 SCC 51*. While it was argued on behalf of the applicant that since he was not arrested during the course of investigation by the Directorate of Enforcement, his case shall be treated on a separate footing, from an accused who was arrested during investigation, at the time when cognizance has



been taken by the learned Trial Court, the Directorate of Enforcement on the other hand had argued on the strength of same judgment that it has been clearly held by the Hon'ble Apex Court that non-cooperation during the course of investigation is a ground of rejection of bail application even when the complaint or chargesheet stands filed.

24. In this regard, this Court has gone through the findings of the learned Trial Court as well as the ratio of judgment in case of ***Satender Kumar Antil*** (*supra*) and this Court notes that in the said case, it was held that by the Hon'ble Apex Court that in case of offences which are punishable with imprisonment for a period of 7 years or less than that (i.e. Category 'A'), the accused would be entitled to be released on bail when he appears before the Trial Court provided that he was not arrested during the course of investigation and he had cooperated throughout the investigation including appearing before the investigating officer.

25. In the case at hand, with respect to the argument that the applicant was never arrested during the course of investigation, it is important to note that the applicant had already left the country when the case was being investigated and pursuant to being summoned by the investigating agency, the applicant had failed to appear even once before the investigating officer and had not traveled to India from abroad. Therefore, the aspect of him getting arrested or not does not hold much significance since he was not even present in the country at the relevant point of time. Further, as regards the second condition laid down in case of ***Satender Kumar Antil*** (*supra*), it is clear that



the applicant had not appeared during the course of investigation before the investigating officer and had not cooperated in the investigation. Thus, the ratio of *Satender Kumar Antil* (*supra*) can be of no help to the present applicant.

26. As far as the conduct of present applicant during the course of investigation is concerned, it is important to take note of the fact that during the course of investigation, several persons were examined by the Directorate of Enforcement and their statements under Section 50 of PMLA were recorded, however, the statement of applicant could not be recorded since he had failed to appear before the investigating officer despite issuance of summons for his personal appearance on five occasions i.e. 15.09.2021, 01.10.2021, 26.10.2021, 05.09.2022 and 02.11.2022. Though he had responded to every summon, however, he had failed to appear before the agency on one pretext or the other. Due to his non-appearance before the investigating officer, a complaint has also been filed under Section 174 of IPC by the Directorate of Enforcement on 24.03.2023.

27. Also significant to note is the fact that the learned Trial Court in the present case had taken cognizance of the complaint on 03.04.2023 and had issued process against all the accused persons, including the present applicant. However, till date, the applicant has not appeared physically before the learned Trial Court. Though initially, his applications seeking exemption from personal appearance or physical appearance were allowed by the Trial Court, it was clarified on several occasions by the Trial Court that applicant's failure to appear before the Court physically will lead to



issuance of NBW, more so since he had yet not been granted bail by the learned Trial Court in the present case. The learned Trial Court has also observed that the appearance through video-conferencing cannot be deemed to be sufficient compliance of the summons issued by the Court as the applicant was yet to seek bail from the Court.

28. In the case registered by the CBI also, this Court had granted several opportunities to the applicant herein to join the investigation. However, despite the same, the applicant had failed to come back to India and join the investigation. In this regard, it will be relevant to take note of the following observations of this Court in order dated 24.01.2024 passed in case of **Rajeev Jhawar v. CBI, Crl.M.A. 1214/2024 in Bail Appln. 1683/2022**:

“10. In the present case, this Court, vide order dated 02.06.2022 (corrected vide order dated 03.06.2022), had disposed of the bail application filed by the petitioner with the following directions, inter alia, to join investigation on 09.06.2022:

11. Thereafter, the petitioner had filed an application, seeking extension of time to join the investigation, and this Court vide order dated 08.06.2022 had directed the applicant to join investigation on 01.07.2022, and disposed of the said application vide following order:

12. The applicant herein had again sought extension of time, to appear before the CBI, and vide order dated 03.11.2023, this Court in CRL.M.A. 13598/2022, had directed as under:

“18. In these circumstances, as discussed above, this Court is inclined to direct that the present applicant will join investigation within ten days. In case of event of arrest, the applicant herein will be given seven days time to seek his legal remedies.

19. It is also made clear to the applicant that in case on this occasion, he fails to join investigation within the stipulated time, he will not be entitled to seek pre-arrest bail and in



case he moves an application again for extension of time before this Court, the application will be deemed to be barred by his previous conduct”

17. Thus, if the applicant required any clarification with respect to the directions contained in order dated 03.11.2023, he could have immediately approached this Court after the order was passed, or after the learned Special Judge had passed the order 07.11.2023, and before 13.11.2023 i.e. when the ten days granted to the applicant to join investigation were to expire. However, very conveniently, the applicant chose to remain indifferent to the orders passed by this Court and the learned Special Judge, and failed to join investigation by 13.11.2023, and now after a period of more than two months, the applicant has approached this Court for seeking clarifications and extension of time to join investigation.

18. In this Court opinion, for the reasons stated hereinabove, no clarification is required in the order dated 03.11.2023, and no ground is made out for granting any further extension to the applicant for joining investigation since despite repeated directions...”

29. As far as the role of present applicant in the instant ECIR/prosecution complaint is concerned, it alleged that he was the Managing Director of M/s. Usha Martin Limited and was trying to influence the investigation of a case registered against the said company by the CBI, and he through his company officials had arranged Rs. 30 lakhs and out of this amount, Rs. 25 lakhs were delivered to accused N.P.M. Sinha through accused Vinay Kumar Jalan and remaining Rs. 5 lakhs were kept by Vinay Kumar Jalan as per the request of N.P.M. Sinha. These were subsequently recovered and seized by CBI from the residence of N.P.M. Sinha and from a hotel room where Vinay Kumar Jalan was staying, respectively. The statement of present applicant Rajeev Jhawar in this regard could not



be recorded either by the CBI or by the Directorate of Enforcement since he was out of India at that point of time, and till date, he has not opted to return to India.

30. Therefore, considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the seriousness of the allegations against the applicant, his conduct of non-cooperation during the course of investigation as well as after taking of cognizance by the learned Trial Court in the present case, his previous conduct before this Court in the case registered by CBI wherein despite repeated opportunities, he had not joined investigation, and also considering the fact that non-bailable warrants have already been issued against him in the present case, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

31. Accordingly, the present bail application alongwith pending application stands dismissed.

32. It is however clarified that nothing expressed hereinabove shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

33. The judgment be uploaded on the website forthwith.

SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

APRIL 1, 2024/ns