

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (DB) No.106 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-58 Year-2020 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Rohtas

=====

Sandeep Kumar @ Raja @ Vicky S/o Nand Kishore Verma Resident of
Village- New Area Near Lucky House Station Road, Ward No.- 18, Dehri-on-
Sone, P.S.- Dehri, District- Rohtas.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. X

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr. B.N. Mishra, Advocate
		Mr. Umeshanand Pandit, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Manish Kumar No. 2, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Manoj Kumar Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY

CAV JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY)

Date : 12-12-2025

Heard Mr. B.N. Mishra assisted by Mr. Umeshanand
Pandit, learned counsel for the appellant, Mr. Abhimanyu
Sharma, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State and
Mr. Manoj Kumar Sinha, learned counsel for the informant.



2. The present appeal arises out of the judgment of conviction dated 21.11.2022 (hereinafter referred to as the '*impugned judgment*') and the order of sentence dated 23.11.2022 (in short referred to as the '*impugned order*') passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, 6th -cum-Special Judge, POCSO, Rohtas at Sasaram in connection with POCSO Case No. 14 of 2021, arising out of Dehri Mahila P.S. Case No. 58 of 2020.

3. By the impugned judgment, the appellant namely Sandeep Kumar @ Raja @ Vicky has been convicted for the offences under Sections 376(D.A.) and 342 of the Indian Penal Code (in short referred to as the 'IPC') and has been sentenced to undergo imprisonment for life, to pay a fine of Rs. 50,000/- (Fifty Thousand) and in default of payment of fine to further undergo Simple imprisonment for a period of three months for the offence under Section 376(D.A.) of the IPC and to undergo Simple imprisonment for one year for the offence under Section 342 of the IPC. Both the sentences were directed to run concurrently.

Prosecution Case:

4. The prosecution case is based on the written application dated 26.12.2020 submitted by the informant (P.W.



1). In her report, she has stated that on 23.12.2020 at about 7:00 P.M., she and her sister had gone to the shop of Om Prakash @ Tuna to purchase domestic goods. The accused persons—Sahib, Vicky (the appellant), and Sonu—who were residing in a rented house at Station Road, Ward No. 17, Durga Gali, Bhayankar More, P.S. Dehri, allegedly intercepted them at a lonely place, chased them, caught hold of the informant's sister and forcibly confined both sisters in the house of Tuna, where they committed rape upon the victim/informant. When she became senseless, the accused left her on the street. It is further alleged that when the victim developed severe abdominal and vaginal pain and began vomiting blood, her sister disclosed the incident to their father. The accused persons had also threatened her sister, warning that if the matter was disclosed, they would kill both sisters and ruin their father financially.

5. On the basis of the aforesaid written application, Dehri (Mahila) P.S. Case No. 58 of 2020 dated 26.12.2020 under Sections 506/376(D.A.) of the IPC and Sections 4(2)/6 of the POCSO Act was registered.

6. After completion of investigation, the Investigating Officer (I.O.) (P.W. 6) submitted charge-sheet being Charge-Sheet No. 08 of 2021 dated 26.02.2021 under Sections 342, 376



(D.A.) and 506 of the IPC and Sections 4(2)/6 of the POCSO Act.

7. On the basis of the police report, cognizance was taken vide order dated 03.03.2021 under Sections 342, 376 (D.A.) and 506 of the IPC and Sections 4(2)/6 of the POCSO Act against the accused/appellant Sandeep Kumar @ Raja @ Vicky.

8. Charges were read over and explained to the appellant Sandeep Kumar @ Raja @ Vicky in Hindi to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

9. In course of trial, the prosecution has examined as many as seven witnesses and exhibited several documents to prove the prosecution case.

List of Prosecution Witnesses:

P.W. 1	Informant
P.W. 2	Informant's sister
P.W. 3	Munna Prasad
P.W. 4	Mamta Devi
P.W. 5	Kamini Kuwar
P.W. 6	Ananta Kumari (I.O.)
P.W. 7	Dr. Kanchan Singh

List of Exhibits on behalf of the Prosecution:

Ext. 1	Signature of the victim on 164 Cr.P.C.
Ext. 2	Signature of the victim on the typed copy of the written application



Ext. 3	Signature of the I.O. on the typed copy of the written application
Ext. 4	Signature of the Doctor on the Medico Legal Examination

List of Court Witnesses:

C.W. 1	Kumar Bikarmaditya
C.W. 2	Ashu Kumar Jha

List of Exhibits on behalf of the Court Witnesses:

Ext. C-1	Signature of the Principal on Admission Register
Ext. C-2	Signature of the Clerk on Sl. No. 129 in Page 88 of the Admission Register
Ext. C-3	Signature of the Principal on the final entry of the admission register
Ext. C-4	Letter No. 951 of the Director, Forensic Science Laboratory, Government of Bihar
Ext. C-5	F.S.L. No. 175/2021 dated 30.03.2022 (nine pages)
Ext. C-6	F.S.L. No. 175/2021 dated 09.03.2022 (four pages)
Ext. C-7	F.S.L. No. 175/2021 dated 20.07.2021 (two pages)
Ext. C-8	Memorandum No. 33/2021 dated 21.01.2021 Forwarding of sending the exhibits.

10. The accused/appellant was examined under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure on 27.01.2022, wherein he has stated that all the allegations are false and that he is innocent.



Findings of the Learned Trial Court:

11. The learned Trial Court first of all decided the issue as to whether the victim was a minor or not? It has gone into recording the fact that the age of the victim was entered as 16 years in the F.I.R. and then 15 years during her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C and at the time of her deposition in the trial, she stated her age to be 18 years. Considering the evidence of C.W.-1, namely, Kumar Bikramaditya, who was the clerk at Girls High School, Dalmianagar and who had proved the entries in the admission register, which has been marked as Exhibit- C-1 and wherein the age of the victim was entered as 01.01.2005 and, therefore, it was held that on the date of occurrence the victim was 15 years 11 months 22 days old, which proves the fact that she was a minor. The learned Trial Court has also observed that during the trial the defence had not questioned the fact that the victim was a minor.

12. The learned Trial Court, while discussing the deposition of the prosecution witnesses, has taken note of the fact that P.W.-2, the younger sister of the victim was an eyewitness, as she was accompanying her sister (victim-P.W.-1) during the occurrence. It has also been observed that the victim was also examined as P.W.-1 and she had supported the entire



prosecution case and had reiterated what she had written in the written report given to the police. The learned Trial Court has held the evidence of P.W.-2, the younger sister of the victim to be supporting the prosecution case despite the fact that she was declared hostile as far as the identification of the accused was concerned. The learned Trial Court, thus, after discussing the deposition of all the witnesses, held that all the prosecution witnesses have supported the prosecution case and the Doctor, I.O and the witness from the Forensic Science Laboratory (in short, FSL), Patna, have corroborated their statements. The learned Trial Court has also taken note of the fact that defence has not been able to prove that he was falsely implicated in the present case and even during the cross-examination, nothing could be elicited from the witnesses that could prove to be contrary statements to the prosecution case and therefore, their claim of false implication could not be proved and the evidence of the witnesses was found to be natural and convincing.

13. The learned Trial Court, on the point of non-observance of the procedures in preparing the DNA profile, has categorically held that the samples were collected by the I.O. and were sent to the FSL, Patna and there was no irregularity committed by the prosecution. It has been held that if the



samples were not collected in accordance with the rules, the DNA profile would not have given a positive result and therefore, such contention of the defence was not tenable.

14. The learned Trial Court, taking into account the medico-legal examination (Exhibit-4) and the FSL report, held that the prosecution has been able to prove the case under Section 376 beyond all reasonable doubt. The learned Trial Court has gone on to hold that all three persons had committed rape upon the victim and therefore the charge under Section 376(DA) was proved. The learned Trial Court also held that the victim and her younger sister were kept in wrongful confinement, which can be proved by the evidence of P.W.-1 and 2 and therefore the charge under Section 342 was found to be proved, however, the charge under Section 323 of the I.P.C. was found to be not proved.

Submissions on behalf of the appellant

15. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant has submitted that the judgment of conviction and order of sentence has been passed more on presumption than on the materials on record. It has been argued that there was an unexplained delay of three days in lodging the First Information Report, which itself casts serious doubt on the veracity of the



prosecution case. The victim's statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C was materially different from her deposition and was admittedly tutored by the Investigating Officer, thereby vitiating its credibility. Thus, in absence of direct, reliable or corroborative evidence, convicting the appellant under Section 376(DA) was wholly unsustainable.

16. The learned counsel for the appellant submits that the charge under Section 376(DA) cannot be sustained because the learned Trial Court itself acquitted the other accused persons while convicting only the appellant, which negates the very foundation of gang rape under the statutory provision. It has further been submitted that there exist vital contradictions and material improvements in the statements of the victim and her younger sister (PW-2), who was projected as an eyewitness. The victim (PW-1) failed to identify the appellant and the co-accused in the dock. Similarly, PW-2 failed to identify any accused person, resiled from her earlier statement, and was declared hostile on the point of identification. Even the place of occurrence stands disputed, as initially it was stated to be the house of Om Prakash @ Tuna, but later shifted to an adjacent house. The mother of the victim (PW-4) also refused to identify the accused, and PW-5, Kamini Kuwar, was declared hostile,



while two additional prosecution witnesses were declared hostile under Section 154 of the Evidence Act at the instance of the prosecution itself.

17. The learned counsel for the appellant has drawn the attention of the Court to the medical report of the victim, wherein no abnormal stains, foreign particles, or injuries were found on any part of her body, including her private part. It has been submitted that this medical evidence completely fails to corroborate the alleged occurrence and strongly suggests that no such incident took place. It is argued that if three persons had indeed committed rape upon the victim, some form of injury, laceration, abrasion or even tenderness would ordinarily be expected, and the total absence of such findings destroys the prosecution case.

18. The learned counsel for the appellant has also submitted that the Investigating Officer did not collect the biological samples properly, that they were sent for chemical examination at a belated stage, and that mandatory procedural safeguards for scientific examination were not followed. The forensic expert failed to establish the unbroken chain of custody of the samples, to explain the delay in their collection and analysis, or to clarify how such delay may affect the reliability



of DNA profiling. It has been submitted that the DNA report, which constitutes opinion evidence under Section 39 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023, cannot form the sole basis of conviction in the absence of corroborative ocular or circumstantial evidence, particularly when the key witnesses have turned hostile or have given materially inconsistent versions. With respect to age determination, it has been submitted that the prosecution failed to prove the victim's age in accordance with Section 94 of the Juvenile Justice Act, 2015, as the admission register relied upon relates only to the years 2020–2021 and is not the register of the first school attended by the victim.

19. Thus, it has been submitted that convicting the appellant in the present facts and circumstances, without assigning any motive and without any cogent, reliable or legally admissible evidence, would be wholly improper. In view of the contradictions, hostile witnesses, lack of medical or ocular corroboration, non-compliance with forensic protocols, and failure to prove age, the impugned judgment and order of conviction are fit to be set aside.

Submissions on behalf of the informant

20. Mr. Manoj Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the



informant submits that the evidences of the prosecution witnesses were consistent on the point of place of occurrence, the time of occurrence and the manner of occurrence. It has been submitted that if the evidence of the victim is found to be convincing and unblemished and of sterling quality, there is no reason to disbelieve her evidence and conviction can be based solely on the evidence of the victim as has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in catena of judgments. Learned counsel has relied upon *Rai Sandeep @ Deepu Vs. State of NCT of Delhi*, reported in *(2012) 8 SCC 21*.

21. The learned counsel for the informant further submitted that the witnesses, though they have refused to identify the accused persons, however, there is enough evidence on record that points towards the guilt of the appellant and it is only because of some influence of the appellant and others that they did not identify them at the relevant time during the course of the trial. It has been pointed out that in the 164 statement of the victim as well as in the F.I.R., the names have been categorically given and therefore non-identification of the appellant or other accused persons will not draw adverse interference against the victim.

22. The learned counsel for the informant has also



pointed out that the FSL team, which had visited the place of occurrence, had collected evidence, which were marked as A, B, and C, respectively and were sent for chemical examination at the FSL, Patna, wherein the DNA of the appellant had matched with that of the semen, which was found on the clothes recovered from the place of occurrence. Thus, it has been submitted that there is enough evidence on record to hold the appellant guilty of the charges and therefore there is no illegality in the judgment and order impugned and the appeal is fit to be dismissed.

Submissions on behalf of the State

23. Mr Manish Kumar No. 2, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State has supported the arguments forwarded by the learned counsel for the informant and has further added that the statement of the victim has stood the test during the cross-examination and if her statements in the written report, 164 Cr.P.C statement and thereafter during trial is taken in totality it would be evident that the same is unimpeachable and therefore conviction can be sustained on her evidence alone. It has further been submitted by the learned Addl. P.P. that P.W.-2, the younger sister of the victim (P.W.-1) was all along present with the victim and she had initially during investigation



identified all the three accused persons, however, on account of threat she has not identified the accused persons during trial and was therefore declared hostile on the point of identification. It has further been submitted that all the charge-sheet witnesses have been examined during trial and they have all supported the factum of the prosecution case and therefore the evidence of the prosecution witnesses coupled with the fact that the FSL report has found the blood samples of the appellant matching with the semen found on the clothes collected from the place of occurrence, there is no iota of doubt that the appellant was one of the persons who had committed rape with the victim, however, as the medical evidence did not support the fact that the other two persons had also been involved they have been acquitted by the learned Trial Court.

Consideration

24. We have heard the learned counsel for the appellant, learned counsel for the informant and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State and also perused the Trial Court's records.

25. In this case, the victim has been examined as P.W.-1, who was initially tested by the Court with regard to her capability to depose being a child, she was present along with



her mother and it has been noted that the victim was not able to reveal the name of her school or the present address of her house.

26. P.W.-1, the victim in her deposition has stated that three boys caught hold of her by her hand and took her to a dark house and committed wrong with her. She further stated that they left her behind and thereafter, she went back along with her sister, who was kept in the courtyard. To a question as to whose house was it, she has stated that the house belonged to one Om Prakash @ Tunna and there was one boy who was there prior to her arrival. The victim has denied the suggestion that she had stated before the Magistrate that she had gone to the market along with her sister on 22.03.2020 where she was initially teased by one of the boys upon which she started running and then the three boys namely Sandeep Kumar @ Raja @ Vicky (appellant), Sahil and Raju caught hold of her and took her into a house and removed her clothes, committed wrong with her and left her outside her house. The victim was shown the three accused persons through video conferencing, however, she did not recognize them. During her cross-examination the victim has accepted that the statement which she gave before the Magistrate, what was tutored to her by the I.O (darogaji). In



comparison to her deposition, we take note of the statement made by the victim in the written report submitted to the Mahila Police Station, Dehri, wherein she has stated that while she was going to the shop of Om Prakash @ Tunna on 22.03.2020 at around 7:00 P.M., three named accused persons started chasing her with wrong intention at an isolated place and caught hold of her sister's hand and kept her confined in the shop of Om Prakash @ Tunna while all the three accused persons took her to the house of Om Prakash @ Tunna where the three accused persons took turn in committing rape upon her after which she fell unconscious and was reeling in pain. She has further stated that around 09:00 P.M., the accused persons brought her to the by-lane of her house and left her there in an unconscious position and she anyhow managed to reach her home, however, she did not disclose about the incident to her parents and when she was having pain in her stomach and around her private parts it was then that her sister has disclosed the entire incident to her father. She has further stated that the three accused persons have criminal background and they had threatened her sister that she would be done to death if they would disclose the incident to their parents.

27. The statement of the victim was recorded under



Section 164 Cr.P.C by a learned Magistrate on 27.12.2020, wherein she had disclosed about the incident stating therein that she had gone to the market alongwith her sister and there three accused persons chased her and they took her to a house and closed the doors and all the three accused persons took turn to commit wrong with her and left her later. She has further stated that she came back to her house and disclosed about the incident to her mother and father.

28. On perusal of the three statements of the victim, one thing which is common is the fact that she had gone to the market along with her sister on the fateful day i.e. 23.12.2020 at 07:00 P.M and she has categorically named the three persons to be there at the place of occurrence and having committed gangrape upon her and therefore leaving her near her house at around 09:00 P.M. There might have been some minor discrepancies in her statements, within a span of nine months from the date of incident. We have already seen that the victim has been stated to be a minor and she had answered the questions put to her in a very competent manner, however, the only issue was with regard to the identification of the accused persons, including the appellant. This sudden change in non-identification of the accused persons coupled with the fact that



her younger sister, who had accompanied her on the fateful day being declared hostile on the point of identification goes to show that the witnesses were under some influence, which has made them to say that they did not identify the accused.

29. Though, the younger sister of the victim, who was examined as P.W.-2, was declared hostile on the point of identification, however, if her said statements are taken into account, the factum of the incident happening with them could not be denied as she has very categorically, during her examination-in-chief, has stated that she had gone to the market along with her sister to buy chart-paper wherein the three accused persons had forcefully taken away her sister (P.W.-2) and while she was confined in the courtyard, her sister was taken into room. She has further stated that her sister was kept in the room for one hour and thereafter, they had gone to their home. She has also stated that she had disclosed about the incident to her mother and her sister had also disclosed that wrong act was committed with her sister/victim.

30. The fact that the victim was hesitant in disclosing the occurrence is evident from the statement of the father of the victim, who was examined as P.W.-3, he has stated that his daughter came back at 09:00 P.M and she was very scared and



she had the apprehension that her father would beat her. He has stated that the victim disclosed to her mother that wrong was committed to her by three boys in a room near a grocery (*kirana*) shop. During cross-examination, the P.W.-3 (father of the victim) in paragraph no. 7 has stated that he does not know who were the boys who had committed wrong with her daughter.

31. The change in the stand of the prosecution side to that extent on the point of identification is further evident from the deposition of P.W.-4, the mother of the victim, who during her examination-in-chief has stated that her daughter had disclosed that three boys had committed wrong with her and the F.I.R. was lodged as per her version. However, her mother has stated that she does not recognize the boys whose name her daughter had taken. During her cross-examination she has stated that till date she does not know as to who were the boys who had committed wrong with her daughter.

32. From perusal of the statement of the mother of the victim, it would be evident that she was told about the names of the boys who had committed wrong with the victim. Her statement in paragraph No. 6 of her deposition is reproduced hereunder:

‘लड़की ने जिन लोगों का नाम बताया था उनलोगों



को नहीं पहचानती हूँ।’

33. From perusal of such statements, it is very much clear that the prosecution side was in some kind of pressure, where they have not identified the accused persons, however, one could not turn a blind eye towards the statements made by the victim not only in the written report but also in her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C as well as in her deposition during trial.

34. P.W.-6, the I.O of the case has proved the place of occurrence and he was shown the house of one Vishnu Prasad where the said incident is said to have taken place in one of the rooms of the said house. He has stated that the said room was sealed by the order of the superior authority in order to enable the FSL team to examine the same.

35. P.W.-7, Kanchan Singh, the doctor who had examined the victim on 25.12.2020 and has opined as under:-

Details of Examination

On Examination- On clinical examination there was no any abnormal stain, foreign particle or any injury on any of her body parts including her private part. Hymen ruptured. Old clotted blood seen around the vaginal in introitus.

(emphasis supplied)



36. During her cross-examination, the doctor (P.W.-7) has stated that there was no sign of vaginal part and according to the medical examination sexual intercourse was there.

37. From the deposition of the doctor, it would be evident that the medical examination proved the fact of sexual intercourse with the victim and from perusal of the medico-legal examination of sexual violence, which was part of the record, we have observed that the Doctor has opined that the hymen was ruptured and there was afresh tear and old clotted blood were present near introitus.

38. In addition to the aforesaid findings of the Doctor (P.W.-7), the FSL report and the DNA report was brought on record and was made exhibits. Exhibit-C-5 was the DNA test report and in the conclusion part it has been observed thus:

“The DNA test performed of the exhibits noted above it is sufficient to conclude that :

1. The genetic profile generated from the source of exhibit marked-G/2 (Source-Semen stained cloth cuttings) **matches** with the genetic profile generated from the source of exhibit marked-D (Source-Blood sample of Sandeep Kumar).

2. The genetic profile generated from the source of exhibit marked-G/2 (Source-Semen stained cloth cuttings) **does not match** with the genetic profile generated from the source of exhibit marked-F (Source-Blood sample of Anurodh Kumar) and exhibit marked-E (Source-Blood sample of Saheb mishra).”



39. We have noted that the collection of semen stained cloth, which is said to have been collected from the place of occurrence, was made by the FSL team and was marked as 'A'. We verified the records and found that the same was forwarded by the S.H.O of Mahila Police Station, Dehri, Rohtas vide memo no.33121 dated 21.01.2021 (Exhibit-C-8).

40. We have perused the FSL, Patna's examination of crime scene document, wherein the said sample is said to have been collected from the house where the occurrence had taken place i.e. the house at ward no. 15 near Durga Mandir gali, which is shown to be next to the house of Om Prakash @ Tunna.

41. In view of such unimpeachable evidence of the semen on the stained clothes recovered from the house i.e., the place of occurrence matching with the blood group of the appellant, it leaves no doubt about the factum of occurrence and the appellant being the perpetrator of the crime.

42. As far as the age of the victim is concerned, we have observed that nothing has been elicited by the defence from the cross-examination with respect to the age of the victim and no question were put, challenging her age and therefore, we have no hesitation in accepting the age which has been disclosed



in the F.I.R by the victim herself and also recorded during her 164 Cr.P.C statement before the Magistrate.

43. We have noticed from the impugned judgment that the learned trial court in paragraph 24, while considering the charge under Section 342 IPC (wrongful confinement) has gone on to hold that from the evidences on record, the accused persons had wrongfully confined the victim from fleeing. The learned trial court further held that the charge under Section 342 IPC is proved against the accused persons. Since other accused persons are not before us, we are not going into this issue in the present appeal.

44. The learned counsel for the appellant has relied upon a few judgments rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in support of his arguments with regard to the DNA matching. The judgments are as under:

(i) Manoj v. State of M.P., (2023) 2 SCC 353;

(ii) Pattu Rajan v. State of T.N., (2019) 4 SCC 771;

(iii) Ranjitsing Brahmajeetsing Sharma v. State of Maharashtra, (2005) 5 SCC 294.

45. We have perused the said judgments and have found that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has contended that DNA may be useful for purpose of investigation but not for reasoning



in presumption of identify in a Court of law. The said judgments have come to a finding that the DNA tests cannot be the sole criteria for coming to a conclusion with the identity of the accused. The said legal proposition is well settled, however, in the present case, we have already observed hereinabove that the statement of the victim has been consistent as far as the place of occurrence to the date and time of occurrence and with regard to the names of the accused persons, however, only when it was a case of identifying the said accused she failed to do so. We have also observed that it was on account of some undue influence that the entire family including the victim had not identified the accused persons, which was strange especially when the victim had named the accused persons not only in the F.I.R but also in her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C and then during her examination-in-chief in course of the trial.

46. Therefore, the DNA sampling and the matching of the report by which the semen on the stained cloth had matched with that of the blood of the appellant is not the only evidence pointing towards the guilt of the appellant but the initial version of the prosecution case points towards the involvement of the appellant.

47. In view of the discussions made hereinabove, we



are of the considered opinion that the prosecution has been able to prove the factum of the occurrence and there is no major contradictions in the version of the victim. The victim is a wholly reliable witness, her evidence is of sterling quality. We are convinced that there is no illegality in the findings arrived at by the learned trial court in convicting the appellant for the offences under Sections 376 (DA), 342 of the I.P.C and under Section 6, 5(a) of the POCSO Act.

48. We find no reason to interfere with the judgment of the learned Trial Court and dismiss the same.

49. Let the Trial Court records along with a copy of this judgment be sent down to the concerned Trial Court.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

I agree.
Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J:

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

aditya/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	01.12.2025
Uploading Date	12.12.2025
Transmission Date	12.12.2025

