

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.793 of 2004

=====

BHARATH SINGH S/O Ram Swaroop Singh R/O Vill.- Gobarchh, P.S.-
Bhagwanpur, Dist.- Kaimur.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Prabhojot Singh, *Amicus Curiae*
For the Respondent/s : Mrs. Anita Kumari Singh, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 06-12-2025

Heard learned counsel for the appellant and
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The present appeal has been directed against
the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated
05.10.2004 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, F.T.C
No. 5, Kaimur at Bhabua in S.T. No. 65 of 2004, Tr. No. 56 of
2004, arising out of Bhabua P.S. Case No. 74 of 2003 whereby
and whereunder the appellant has been convicted for the
offences punishable under Section 364(A)/395 of IPC and has
been sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for seven
years along with fine of Rs. 2,000/- each under Section
364(A)/395 of IPC and in case of default of payment of fine,
appellant has to undergo further simple imprisonment for two
months each.



3. According to fardbeyan of informant/Satya Nararaian Sah (PW 7), he was cooking food for his owner (Ram Bali Sah) and two other staffs. It is alleged that his owner and Mintu Sah (PW 1) were sleeping and Chunnu Bind (PW 3) was operating Mill. It is further alleged that at about 11:00 PM in the night, suddenly nine miscreants entered into the Mill out of which six miscreants were armed with one barrel gun and three miscreants were empty handed. It is further alleged that two armed miscreants pointed weapon on informant and armed persons pointed weapon on informant's owner and Chunnu Sah and asked about the money. Upon which, informant's owner said that there was no money, then, miscreants continued to surround the informant and others by pointing weapon on them. It is further alleged that two armed persons checked the box and scattered the documents. It is alleged that one of the miscreants snatched informant's Kohinoor watch and he started to take away the informant and his owner by catching their hands. At the same time, two miscreants out of nine miscreants, who were dressed in dhoti-kurta and was holding plane muffler, were aged about 50-52 years and at the behest of one of the miscreants, informant was being left out by the miscreants and informant's owner was taken away by them and three



miscreants closed the gates and stood outside and threatened of dire consequences in case they raised *hulla*. After some time, at the corner from north side when the informant peeped, then, he saw that there was no one at the gate, thereafter, he informed the Police. Thereafter, informant disclosed that two miscreants were short, mid color, aged about 20-25 years persons and four armed miscreants were of normal height and aged about 30-32 years. Four armed miscreants were wearing full pant(white) and shirt and other armed persons were wearing lungi and shirt. One miscreants who was empty handed, was wearing lungi and shirt, aged about 30 years, remain stood at the gate and keep saying from there to make it fast. Informant further disclosed that all miscreants were speaking local language. The informant further disclosed that about 20 days ago, a meeting (Panchayati) was held between informant's owner and Bharat Koyeri of Govarach at the brick kiln of Adeshwar Singh in which many people had participated and Bharat Koyeri and his associates had threatened the informant's owner stating that they would not allow the informant's owner mill to operate and they would not let them live.

4. On the basis of fardbeyan of informant, Bhabua P.S. Case No. No. 74 of 2003 was registered under



Sections 364/379 of the IPC against 9 unknown persons. Routine investigation followed. Statement of witnesses came to be recorded and charge sheet has been submitted against the appellant under Sections 364(A)/379 of the IPC whereas investigation in respect of other co-accused, continued. Thereafter, the learned trial court took cognizance. The case was committed to the court of sessions after following due procedure. The learned trial court framed charges against the appellant under Section 364 (A) and 395 of the IPC. Charges were read over and explained to the appellant to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

5. In order to bring home guilt of accused persons, prosecution has examined altogether eleven witnesses. PW-1 Mantu @ Mintu Sah, PW-2 Bachau Sah, PW-3 Chunnu Bind, PW-4 Mahesh Sah, PW-5 Ganesh Sah, PW-6 Ram Bali Sah (victim), PW-7 Satyanarain Sah (informant), PW-8 Malti Devi, PW-9 Ramdayal Singh, PW-10 Sudama Sah, PW-11 Upendra Kumar.

6. Prosecution has relied upon following documentary evidence on record:-

Ext. 1 – Signature on statement of 164 of Cr.PC.

Ext. 1/1 – Signature of statement of Satyanarain



Sah under Section 164 of Cr.P.C.

Ext. 2 – Signature of fardbeyan

Ext. 3 – FIR

Ext. 4 – Fardebeyan

Ext. 5 – Signature of Judicial Magistrate.

Ext. 5/1 :- Signature of Judicial Magistrate.

7. The defence has not adduced any oral or documentary evidence.

8. However, defence of the appellant as gathered from the line of cross examination of prosecution witnesses as well as from the statement under Section 313 of the Cr.P.C. is that of total denial.

9. After hearing the parties, the learned trial court convicted the appellant and sentenced him as indicated in the opening paragraph of the judgment.

10. Following submissions have been made on behalf of learned counsel for the appellant:-

11. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that though prosecution has produced eleven witnesses but Mantu Sah @ Mintu Sah (PW-1) and Chuunu Bind (PW-3) who were present with the informant at the time of occurrence



and they have been examined of the prosecution witnesses and have not supported the case of prosecution. Other witness have also not supported the case of prosecution but the learned trial court has taken into account the material which are merely a corroboratory piece of evidence to convict the appellant and the concerned court has not evaluated the material available on record as victim is the star witness of the present case who has clearly stated that he has not identified any persons while he was in forest and he has taken U-turn what is stated in statement recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C.. If the version of victim is quite divergent on two occasions, it is really difficult to face the conviction on the said statement. Though, statement recorded under Section 164 is not a substantive piece of evidence and has merely a corroboratory value and the concerned court has taken into account such a statement where victim has divergent view while stating before the Court and while stating before Magistrate. He further submits that the informant (PW-7), Chunnu Bind (PW-3) and Mintu Sah (PW-1) are present at the time of commission of occurrence but none of the witness has supported the story of prosecution and even other witness have not supported the case of prosecution. In this way, prosecution has totally failed to prove the case



beyond reasonable doubt and the judgment of conviction and order of sentence passed by the learned trial court is without assessing the material available on record and the jumped to the wrong conclusion and passed the judgment of conviction and order of sentence which is not justified and legal and the judgment of conviction and order of sentence is fit to be set aside.

12. Learned counsel for the State has submitted that PW 6 has already recorded the statement that the person who is wearing Dhoti and Kurta was just like Bharat Singh who is villager. The statement of PW 11 who is Judicial Magistrate – Ist Class, Bhahua before whom the Statement has been recorded, has supported the story of prosecution and there are sufficient material to say that prosecution has proved the case and the concerned court while passing the judgment of conviction and order of sentence has appreciated the evidence material available on record and the judgment of conviction and order of sentence passed by the learned trial court is justified and legal and there is no reason to differ from the finding of the concerned court.

13. The question which arises for consideration is:-



*"Whether offence under Sections 364
(A) and 395 of IPC is made out in the light of given
facts and circumstances of the case or not ?"*

14. I have perused the impugned judgment, order of trial court and trial court records. I have given my thoughtful consideration to the rival contention made on behalf of the parties as noted above.

15. It is necessary to evaluate, analyze and screen out the evidences of witnesses adduced before the trial court.

16. PW 1 (Mintu Sah @ Mantu Sah) :- He has stated that the occurrence of kidnapping took place one year ago. He further stated that 2-3 miscreants came and Ram Bali Sah was being taken away. He has stated that he did not identify anyone. From the perusal of FIR, it is clear that he was the person who was present with victim at the time of occurrence and he did not identify anyone.

17. PW 2 (Bachhua Sah) :- He has been declared hostile as he did not point as to who had kidnapped Ram Bali Sah (PW-6). He further stated that his statements was not recorded before the Police.

18. PW 3 (Chunnu Bind):- He has also stated



that he did not point out as to who had kidnapped Ram Bali Sah (PW-6). From the perusal of FIR, it is clear that he was the person who was present with victim at the time of occurrence and he did not identify anyone.

19. PW4 (Mahesh Sah) :- He has been declared hostile as he did not know anything about the occurrence.

20. PW5 (Ganesh Sah) :- He has been declared hostile as he did not know as to who had kidnapped Ram Bali Sah (PW6).

21. PW6 (Ram Bali Sah) :- He has stated that he was being kidnapped. He further stated that on the night of occurrence, he was at his Polisher Mill situated at Ward No. 10. He further stated Satyanarain Sah, Chunnu Bind and Mantu Sah were also present with him. He stated that at the time of occurrence, he was sleeping. He further stated that 8-9 persons came and 4-5 persons came inside and surrounded him and they were armed with gun. He further stated that he alongwith Stayanarain Sah was caught hold and they were being taken outside of the Mill and at the behest of one of the persons, who was wearing dhoti kurta, Stayanarain Sah was left out and he was taken away. He further stated that miscreants took him to canal and kept him in forest for 11-12 days. In para 2, he has



stated that Bharat Singh met in the way when he was returning from forest and Bharat Singh assisted him to reach at the village. He has stated that he was kept in the forest but he did not identify any of the accused persons. The statement of PW 6 has been recorded before the police as well as before the magistrate and he has been declared hostile. In para 6, he has stated that he has identified Bharat Singh prior to the occurrence as Bharat Singh belongs to his village. He further stated that there was no light of electricity on the day of occurrence and miscreants made intrusion into the room and he did not identify anyone. There was no light at the canal and there was darkness. He further stated that miscreants took him away and he did not identify anyone.

22. In the statement of Ram Bali Sah (PW 6) recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C., in para 3 he has stated that he identified accused as Bharat Singh who had worn Dhoti kurta and he was taken to canal and accused Bharat Singh was demanding Rs. 2 lakh. He has admitted that he was released on the basis of payment of Rs. 1,20,000/- as ransom from his house. From the statement recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C., PW 6 has supported and corroborated the story of prosecution and it is quite evident that victim is said to have



been taken away and lastly he was set free/left out on the basis of payment but the statement of victim recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. has no meaning at all in the light of the fact that PW 6/ Ram Bali Sah has improvised his statement as he has not identified anyone during his confinement in forest and in the way, he met Bharat Singh.

23. From the perusal of evidence of PW 6 as well as his statement recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C., it appears that he is the victim of the present case and he has denied the identification of any of the accused persons, even appellant. Though, he has stated in the statement recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. that the appellant is the kingpin and on the basis of payment of Rs. 1,20,000/- he was released from confinement but the said statement is quite divergent on the point of identification of appellant when he has stated before the court at the time of adducing his evidence that he did not identify anyone during the confinement in forest and he did not identify anyone at the time of occurrence. He has stated the reason for not identifying anyone as there was darkness.

24. PW7 (Satyanarain Sah) :- He is the informant of the present case. He was present with the Ram Bali Sah/victim in the mill at the time of occurrence. He further



stated that 9 persons armed with weapon came and caught him. He further stated that Chunnu Bind (PW 3), Mintu Sah (PW 1) and Ram Bali Sah (PW 6) were also present at the time of occurrence. He further stated that miscreants caught hold him and Chunnu Bind and asked them about the whereabouts of money and the informant and other replied that they were labour and did not know anything. He further stated that miscreants caught him and Ram Bali Sah and they were taken outside. He further stated that at the behest of the one of the miscreants, he was left out as he was considered as a labourer and Ram Bali Sah was taken away. He further stated that he along with others was confined in the house and threatened of dire consequences in case they raised hulla. In para 2, he has stated that he heard that there was dispute between Ram Bali Sah and Bharat Singh regarding the monetary transaction and Panchayati took place between them. In para 3, he has stated that he had given his statement before the Police. In para 5, he has stated that Ram Bali Sah returned home after 10-12 days. He further stated that while Ram Bali Sah was returning after confinement, he met him but did not identify any of the accused person. He further stated that Bharat Singh is well wisher of Ram Bali Sah. He has stated that he and Bharat Singh



went to search for Ram Bali Sah and all of a sudden, they met Ram Bali Sah and they took him back.

25. In the statement of Satya Narayan Sah (PW 7) recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C., in para 1 he has stated that he has also supported the version of prosecution story regarding the manner of occurrence but during the course of statement recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. he has stated that he met appellant after two days and appellant was asked for some kind of means of assistance for searching the victim/ Ram Bali Sah. Akshaywar Singh gave his motorcycle to Bharat Singh. At 9:00 AM, Bharat Singh came after searching. Bharat Singh stated that he would be released from confinement after payment of Rs. 1,50,000/- and at Rs. 1,20,000/- the matter was settled before four persons, namely, PW 7, Sudama Sah – Gobraksh, Sudama Sah – Kirihiri and Akshaywar Singh and Rs. 1,20,000/- in cash was given to Bharat Singh at PCO and after payment of Rs. 1,20,000/-, Bharat Singh came with victim / Ram Bali Sah. He has stated that he did not identify Bharat Singh at the time of occurrence. He has reason to believe that said occurrence was being committed by the appellant and he assisted in releasing the victim from the confinement.



26. From the perusal of evidence of informant as well as his statement recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C., it appears that he is the person who set the prosecution story into motion but he has clearly stated that he did not identify the accused person and appellant rather accused persons/appellant is the well wisher and Bharat Singh assisted the informant in the search of victim/Ram Bali Sah and all of a sudden they met Ram Bali Sah and took him back. PW7 has improvised his version during the course of adducing his evidence before the court that no money was given to Bharat Singh in PCO. In this way, the statement of informant (PW 7) recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. is statement is quite divergent on the issue of payment of Rs. 1,20,000/- and release of victim from confinement. He has stated that Bharat Singh had not taken money for releasing Ram Bali Sah from confinement. He has stated that no panchayati was held before him.

27. PW8 (Malti Devi) :- She is the wife of victim/Ram Bali Sah (PW 6). In para 2 of her examination of chief, she has stated that she had not stated before police that rupees one lakh twenty thousand (Rs. 1,20,000/-) was paid to Bharat Singh for releasing her husband. She further stated that she had only stated that husband got released after paying



rupees one lakh twenty thousand (Rs. 1,20,000/-) and thereafter, she has been declared hostile.

28. PW 9 (Ram Dayal Singh) :- He is a formal witness and his evidence is of no use for proving the case of prosecution.

29. PW 10 (Sudama Sah) :- He is not the person who has seen the occurrence and he is hearsay witness.

30. PW 11 (Sri Upendra Kumar) :- On 08.04.2003, he was posted at Bhabua Civil Court as Judicial Magistrate and he recorded the statement of Ram Bali Sah (PW 6) and informant (PW 7).

31. In the present case, it is necessary to cite a decision rendered by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Rai Sandeep @ Deepu*** reported in ***2012 (8) SCC 21*** in which the Hon'ble Supreme Court said that before relying on the sole testimony of the prosecutrix, the court must be satisfied that the prosecutrix is a "sterling witness". Para 22 of the judgment is being reproduced below:-

"22. In our considered opinion, the 'sterling witness' should be of a very high quality and calibre whose version should,



therefore, be unassailable. The court considering the version of such witness should be in a position to accept it for its face value without any hesitation. To test the quality of such a witness, the status of the witness would be immaterial and what would be relevant is the truthfulness of the statement made by such a witness. What would be more relevant would be the consistency of the statement right from the starting point till the end, namely, at the time when the witness makes the initial statement and ultimately before the court. It should be natural and consistent with the case of the prosecution qua the accused. There should not be any prevarication in the version of such a witness. The witness should be in a position to withstand the cross-examination of any length and howsoever strenuous it may be and under no circumstance



should give room for any doubt as to the factum of the occurrence, the persons involved, as well as the sequence of it. Such a version should have co-relation with each and every one of other supporting material such as the recoveries made, the weapons used, the manner of offence committed, the scientific evidence and the expert opinion. The said version should consistently match with the version of every other witness. It can even be stated that it should be akin to the test applied in the case of circumstantial evidence where there should not be any missing link in the chain of circumstances to hold the accused guilty of the offence alleged against him. Only if the version of such a witness qualifies the above test as well as all other such similar tests to be applied, can it be held that such a witness can be called as



a 'sterling witness' whose version can be accepted by the court without any corroboration and based on which the guilty can be punished. To be more precise, the version of the said witness on the core spectrum of the crime should remain intact while all other attendant materials, namely, oral, documentary and material objects should match the said version in material particulars in order to enable the court trying the offence to rely on the core version to sieve the other supporting materials for holding the offender guilty of the charge alleged."

32. It is the prosecution case that 8-9 persons entered the mill, forcibly took the informant (PW 7) and the mill-owner (PW 6) outside, and threatened to kill others if they raised any alarm. PW 6 was then taken towards the canal, thereafter to a forest area, and wrongfully confined. In his statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C., the victim—who is the subject of the occurrence—categorically stated that he was



kidnapped by the appellant Bharat Singh, kept confined in the forest, and that a sum of ₹1,20,000 was paid for his release.

33. In the present case, while adducing evidence, the victim did not identify any of the accused, including the appellant. On the contrary, he resiled from his earlier statement recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. and deposed at the time of adducing evidence before Court that the appellant merely met him on the way while he was returning from the forest and assisted him in reaching home. His testimony before the Court is wholly inconsistent with his statement recorded under Section 164 CrPC. How the statement of PW 6 has been recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. which clearly and categorically denotes that he was kidnapped by the appellant Bharat Singh, kept confined in the forest, and that a sum of ₹1,20,000 was paid for his release. Given these material contradictions and the complete volte-face, the witness cannot be regarded as a “sterling witness,” particularly when he has shifted from alleging that the appellant was the principal offender in a kidnapping-for-ransom to asserting that the appellant only helped him.

34. In the present case, the statement of victim / PW 6 and informant have already been discussed in foregoing



paragraphs. The statement of PW 6 recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. is totally divergent from the statement adduced before the Court. So, his statements is not reliable as his statement suffers from several infirmities and inconsistencies as he has not identified any of the accused persons. The statement of PW 7 recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. regarding the payment of money to appellant has been denied, the reference of Panchayati has been denied during the course of adducing evidence before the Court. In this way, he cannot be put in the category of sterling witness as his statement is totally divergent on the issue of payment of ransom money and he did not identify any of the accused persons. Victim/ PW6 and informant (PW 7) are star witness of the case and both have not identified any of the accused persons and the whole prosecution story has been shattered.

35. From perusal of statement of P.W. 6, it is crystal clear that his testimony during adducing evidence before the trial court is totally inconsistent with the statement recorded under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C. The statement of victim/PW 6 before the trial court has not supported story of prosecution and she has been declared hostile.



36. It is well settled law that evidence given in court on oath coupled with opportunity of cross-examination to the accused has great sanctity and that is why same is called substantive evidence. It is well settled by catena of judicial pronouncements that statement under Section 154 Cr.P.C. or under 161 Cr.P.C. or under 164 Cr.P.C. can be used for corroboration and contradiction only. In ***R. Shaji vs. State of Kerala*** reported in ***(2013) 14 SCC 266***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court said that a proposition to the effect that if statement of a witness is recorded under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C., his evidence in court should be discarded, is not at all warranted. As the defence had no opportunity to cross-examine the witness whose statement was recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. or under Section 161 Cr.P.C., such statements cannot be treated as substantive evidence.

37. The statements of informant (PW 7) as well as the victim (PW 6) recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. cannot be taken as substantive piece of evidence as defence has no opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses whose statements are recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. and their statements can be taken into account for corroboration and contradiction purpose only. In the present case, the statements



of PW 6 and PW 7 recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. are quite divergent while adducing evidence before the Court. In this way, sanctity of statements of PW 6 and PW 7 have lost the credibility and do not inspire confidence.

38. In the present case, the very story of prosecution has been narrated by informant (PW 7) who has stated that he himself along with Mantu Sah (PW1) and Chunnu Bind (PW 3) was present at the place of occurrence. Informant (PW 7) has narrated the manner of occurrence and place of occurrence and at the end of the narration of prosecution story, he disclosed that how he has been left out by the miscreants and the victim (PW 6) has been taken away. While narrating the story of prosecution, informant (PW 7) has also disclosed the reason behind the occurrence which is the monetary transaction between victim (PW 6) and Bharat Singh of village Gobraksh. The informant has disclosed the motive behind the occurrence and on the said aspect investigation of Investigating Officer is needed but here the Investigating Officer has not been examined, then, the motive behind the occurrence has also not been investigated and FIR has been lodged against unknown. On the point of place of occurrence, there was no credible evidence to prove the place of



occurrence. PW 6, who is the victim as well as subject matter of occurrence, though, in statement recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C., he has stated that the person who is wearing Dhoti and Kurta is Bharat Singh but during adducing evidence deposition before the Court, he has stated that he did not identify any person in forest and while returning from forest PW 6 (victim) met Bharat Singh and he has been declared hostile. The very star witnesses (PW 6/victim and informant) of the case have not supported the case of prosecution clearly and the very base of prosecution story has been shattered where the victim who is the subject matter of occurrence, has not identified accused in forest. Even the persons, PW 1 and PW 3 who were present at the time of occurrence, have also not supported the case while adducing their evidences before the Court and informant (PW 7) who set the prosecution story into motion, has not stated that he has identified any of the accused persons. Informant (PW 7) in para 8 of his deposition he has deposed that no ransom money was given to Bharat Singh to release the victim in front of him and he has totally taken U-turn from earlier statement recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. and he has also stated that in para 5 that he did not identify any of the accused persons. In this way, the statement



of PW-7 who is initiator of the prosecution story has given statement under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. is totally inconsistent with the deposition made before the Court. In this way, his evidence does not carries authenticity and same can be disbelieved in the light of the facts and circumstances of the case. PW-8 who is the wife of the victim, has also denied that she has given any money to Bharat Singh. In this way, her statement does not support the story of prosecution and she has been declared hostile. PW – 9 is the formal witness and his evidence is of no use. PW – 10 is not the person who has seen the occurrence and he is hear say witness. Hence, his witness is of no significance. PW – 11 who is the Judicial Magistrate, has recorded the statement of Ram Bali Sah (PW 6) and informant (PW 7). These statements are merely corroborative in nature and there is no substantive piece of evidence and their evidentiary value has got no significance when the witnesses whose statements have been recorded, have taken a totally divergent view before the court while adducing evidence before the Court.

39. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, it is crystal clear that none of the witnesses have supported the case of prosecution and the concerned court fell



in error of law while appreciating said material. In this way, the judgment of conviction of order of sentence passed by the concerned court is hereby set aside and the appeal stands allowed and the appellant is discharged from the liability of bail bond.

40. In the result, in my view, prosecution case suffers from several infirmities, as noticed above, and it was not a fit case where conviction could have been recorded. The learned trial court fell in error of law as well as appreciation of facts of the case in view of settled criminal jurisprudence. Hence, impugned judgment of conviction and order of sentence are hereby set aside and this appeal stands allowed. The appellant is on bail, he is discharged from the liabilities of his bail bonds.

41. The interlocutory application, if any, also stands disposed of.

42. Let a copy of this judgment be transmitted to the Superintendent of the concerned jail for compliance and for record.

43. The records of this case be also returned to the concerned trial court forthwith.

44. Before parting with the judgment, I



appreciate the legal assistance rendered by Mr. Prabhojit Singh, learned Amicus Curiae. Patna High Court Legal Service Committee is directed to pay a sum of Rs. 5,000/- (five thousand) to Mr. Prabhojit Singh, learned Amicus Curiae, as consolidated fee for the legal assistance rendered by him within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of this judgment.

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

alok/-

AFR/NAFR	AFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	12.12.2025
Transmission Date	12.12.2025

