

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (DB) No.21 of 2023**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-104 Year-2018 Thana- RAMGARHWA District- East
Champaran

=====

Nek Mohammad @ Raj Mohammad, Son of Md. Muslim Mian @ Muslim
Miyan, Resident of Village- Auraiya, P.S.- Adapur, Dist- East champaran

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Rajesh Pandey, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sujit Kumar Singh, APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAILENDRA SINGH
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAILENDRA SINGH)**

Date : 25-07-2025

1. We have heard Mr. Rajesh Pandey, learned counsel for the appellant and Mr. Sujit Kumar Singh, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The present criminal appeal has been filed by the appellant, namely, Nek Mohammad @ Raj Mohammad against the judgment dated 14.10.2022 (hereinafter referred to as the ‘impugned judgment’) and order dated 18.10.2022 (hereinafter referred to as the ‘impugned order’) passed by the court of learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Special Judge, East Champaran, Motihari (hereinafter referred to as the ‘learned trial court’), in NDPS Case No. 32 of 2018 (CIS No. 32 of 2018)



arising out of Ramgarhwa P.S. Case No. 104 of 2018, whereby and whereunder the appellant has been convicted for the offences under section 20(b)(ii)(C) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act (in short 'NDPS Act') and sections 25(1-b)(a) and 26 of the Arms Act and has been awarded the following punishments :

(i) Under section 20(b)(ii)(C) of the NDPS Act – rigorous imprisonment of twelve years with a fine of Rs. 1,25,000/- and in default of payment of fine, further imprisonment for one and a half years;

(ii) Under section 25(1-b)(a) of the Arms Act – rigorous imprisonment of two years with a fine of Rs. 1,000/- and in default of payment of fine, further imprisonment for one month;

(iii) Under section 26 of the Arms Act – rigorous imprisonment of five years with a fine of Rs. 2,000/- and in default of payment of fine, further imprisonment for two months.

All the above-mentioned sentences have been directed to run concurrently.

Prosecution story :-

3. The substance of the prosecution story is as follows:-



On 29.05.2018 at 10:00 A.M., the informant, Rajesh Kumar, Sub-Inspector, posted as the Station House Officer (SHO) at Ramgarhwa police station, proceeded along with armed police personnel, namely, Assistant Sub-Inspector (ASI) Rambaboo Chaudhari, Hawaldar Raes Khan, constable 01 Jitendra Prasad, constable 830 Umesh Ram and constable 603 Hari Narain Prasad, for patrolling duty. During course of patrolling at about 12:30 P.M., he got the secret information that one notorious criminal, namely, Nek Mohammad @ Raj Mohammad (appellant), who was accused in several cases of extortion and wanting in the said cases, would come at Piparpati chowk on an Apache motorcycle. The said secret information was informed to the senior police officials and thereafter, the informant reached at Piparpati chowk with police force and started waiting for the said accused Nek Mohammad. At about 13:20 hours, an informer informed him that one person similar to Nek Mohammad was going on an Apache motorcycle from Manjhaulia side. At about 13:20 hours, one person having same appearance and figure like the accused Nek Mohammad, came on a grey (slaty) colour Apache motorcycle from Manjhaulia side and as he reached at Piparpati chowk, he was signalled to stop but upon seeing the police party, he tried to flee towards the



eastern side from Piparpati chowk but the police personnel surrounded him and he was caught. As per the informant, a white colour plastic bag was hanging on the handle of the motorcycle and the person, who was riding on the said motorcycle disclosed his name as Nek Mohammad @ Raj Mohammad after some pretext on this or that way. Thereafter, he and other police personnel suspected narcotic material being kept in small packets in the recovered bag and then asked the accused Nek Mohammad whether he wanted to get his person searched in the presence of a Magistrate or before the police. Upon that, the accused Nek Mohammad stated that he wanted to be searched before the Magistrate and thereafter, the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Raxual, was contacted on his mobile phone and he was informed about the incident and requested to appoint an Executive Magistrate for the purpose of search of the apprehended accused. At about 14:50 hours, an Executive Magistrate, namely, Sri Shambhu Pandey reached there, before whom, the apprehended accused was searched. Upon search, a total of eight plastic packets containing charas kept in a bag, hanging on the handle of the motorcycle, were recovered and from the left side of waist of Nek Mohammad, a country made pistol and from the jeans pocket of the accused, two 315 bore



cartridges, were also recovered. From the pocket of the shirt of the accused, one mobile phone was also recovered. Thereafter, a weighing machine was brought from a nearby shop and the seized contraband was weighed and the weight of the seized contraband was found 2 kg. After that, the seizure list with respect to all the seized materials was prepared by the Executive Magistrate, thereof, one copy was given to the accused. The apprehended accused Nek Mohammad accepted the seized contraband as being narcotic material, namely, charas and revealed that he was coming from Nepal at the time of his arresting. The accused did not produce any licence or documents to justify his possession over the seized firearms and the motorcycle upon which he was riding at the time of his arrest.

4. The informant Rajesh Kumar, the then SHO of Ramgarhwa police station, recorded his own statement describing the afore-mentioned prosecution story, upon that basis, the formal FIR bearing registration No. 104 of 2018 was lodged under section 20(b)(ii)(C) of NDPS Act and sections 25(1-b)(a) and 26 of the Arms Act, which set the criminal law in motion.

5. After completion of the investigation, the



appellant, who was the sole accused, was chargesheeted vide chargesheet No. 269/2018 dated 23.11.2018 under section 414 of the Indian Penal Code (in short 'IPC'), under section 20(b)(ii) (C) of NDPS Act and sections 25(1-b)(a) and 26 of the Arms Act. Thereafter, the cognizance of the offences under section 20(b)(ii)(C) of the NDPS Act and sections 25(1-b)(a) and 26 of the Arms Act, was taken by the learned Special Judge vide order dated 30.11.2018.

6. The appellant was charged with the offences under Section 20(b)(ii)(C) of the NDPS Act, and Sections 25(1-b)(a) and 26 of the Arms Act. The charges were read over and explained to him in Hindi, to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

7. During the course of trial, the following witnesses were examined by the prosecution :-

PW-1	Ram Baboo Chaudhari	Police sub-inspector and member of the raiding party
PW-2	Umesh Ram	Police constable, member of the raiding party and witness of the seizure list
PW-3	Jitendra Prasad	Police constable and a raiding member
PW-4	Manoj Kumar	Dy. S.P., the police official who examined the seized firearms as ballistic expert
PW-5	Arun Kumar Singh	Police sub-inspector and the I.O.
PW-6	Hari Narayan Prasad	Police constable and a raiding member and witness of the seizure list
PW-7	Raes Khan	Police head constable and a member of the raiding party
PW-8	Rajesh Kumar	Police inspector and then the SHO of



	Ramgarhwa police station
--	--------------------------

8. In documentary evidence, the prosecution proved and exhibited the following documents :-

Ext. P-1	Signature of the witness Umesh Ram on the seizure list
Ext. P-2	Report dated 08.10.2018
Ext. P-2/1	Signature of Dy.S.P. Manoj Rai on the report dated 08.10.2018
Ext. P-2/2	Signature of Narendra on the report dated 08.10.2018
Ext. P-3	Formal FIR of Ramgarhwa PS Case No. 104/2018
Ext. P-3/1	Signature of SHO Rajesh Kumar on self statement and order of giving charge of investigation
Ext. P-4	Searching and Seizure list
Ext. P-4/1	Signature of executive magistrate on the seizure list
Ext. P-4/2	Signature of the accused on the seizure list
Ext. P-5	Forwarding report to Director FSL, Muzaffarpur and Kolkata
Ext. P-5/1	Receipt of forwarding report
Ext. P-6	Petition for sampling
Ext. P-7	Charge-sheet
Ext. P-8	Self statement of SHO Rajesh Kumar
Ext. P-8/1	Signature and endorsement on petition for giving charge of investigation to Arun Kumar Singh
Ext. P-9	Seizure list
Ext. P-9/1	Signature of Umesh Ram on the seizure list
Ext. P-9/2	Signature of Hari Narayan on the seizure list
Ext. P-9/3	Signature of executive magistrate on the seizure list
Ext. P-10	Confessional statement of accused Nek Mohammad
Ext. P-10/1	Signature of Nek Mohammad on the confessional statement
Ext. P-11	Formal FIR
Ext. P-12	FSL report

9.After the completion of the prosecution evidence, the statement of the appellant was recorded under Section 313 of the Cr.P.C., wherein he denied the material circumstances appearing against him in the prosecution evidence. He claimed



to be innocent and specifically took the plea that, at the alleged time, he was traveling from Raxaul to Adapur in a Commander jeep, he was forcibly apprehended by the police along with the vehicle and taken to the Ramgarhwa Police Station, where he was falsely implicated in connection with the alleged recovery of contraband.

10. In defence, the appellant examined the following three witnesses :-

DW-1	Dhirendra Pandit
DW-2	Anant Kumar
DW-3	Md. Arman

Findings of the learned trial court :-

11. Learned trial court after analyzing the materials available on the record observed that the prosecution brought on record FSL report regarding the seized substance which was marked as Ext. P-12. The said FSL report shows that after examination of the seized substance, the blackish brown colour uneven shaped solid resinous substance kept in polythene packet, was found to be ‘charas’. Accordingly, learned trial court finally observed that the prosecution has successfully proved that the seized material was charas coming under the purview of NDPS Act.

Learned trial court further observed that the prosecution



has proved by examining the members of the raiding party and proving the seizure list a copy whereof has been supplied to the accused person who has signed on the seizure list that the seized material was recovered from the bag hanging to the handle of the motorcycle of the accused person and the accused was arrested on the spot. Accordingly, the learned trial court deemed the charges under section 20(b)(ii)(C) of the NDPS Act as being proved against the accused person/appellant beyond the shadow of all reasonable doubts.

For the charge under sections 25(1-b)(a) and 26 of the Arms Act, learned trial court found that all the prosecution witnesses have supported the prosecution's case regarding recovery of the alleged country made pistol and cartridges as well as contraband charas from the possession of the accused. Accordingly, the learned trial court held the accused-appellant guilty for the offences punishable under section 20(b)(ii)(C) of the NDPS Act and under sections 25(1-b)(a) and 26 of the Arms Act.

Submissions made by the Appellant's Counsel:-

12. Mr. Rajesh Pandey, learned counsel appearing for the appellant, submits that in the present case, which involves the alleged recovery of narcotic drugs, namely *charas*, and firearms allegedly from the possession of the appellant, no



independent witness was examined to prove the alleged recovery; only police personnel were involved and examined as prosecution witnesses. It is contended that the police party fabricated a false story to falsely implicate the appellant. He further submits that the mandatory provisions relating to search, seizure, and sampling of which compliance is required under the NDPS Act were not followed by the informant and the investigating officer. The prosecution failed to establish that the sampling from the seized narcotic material was conducted in the presence of a Judicial Magistrate. Additionally, the inventory preparation, photographing, and sealing process of the samples and the remaining contraband were not proved as having been carried out before a Judicial Magistrate, as required under Section 52A of the NDPS Act.

As per the FIR, the informant claimed to have received a secret information about the appellant and he informed senior police officials about the said information before proceeding to the alleged place of interception. But, the prosecution did not produce any evidence to prove that such information was actually conveyed to senior police officials. Most importantly, the prosecution failed to produce the alleged seized materials before the trial court, which significantly undermines the



prosecution case and is fatal to the prosecution.

Submissions made by the Learned APP:-

13. On the other hand, Mr. Sujit Kumar Singh, learned APP appearing for the State, submits that the appellant has criminal antecedents of several cases. Although no independent witness was present during the search and seizure of the alleged articles from the appellant's possession, however, the testimony of the police personnel, including the informant and members of the raiding party, are sufficient to prove the recovery.

He further argues that all the prosecution witnesses remained consistent in their statements regarding the recovery of the alleged contraband from the appellant. Therefore, the learned trial court rightly convicted the appellant for the offences charged, and there is no merit in this appeal.

Consideration and Analysis:-

14. We have heard both sides and have perused the evidences available on the record of the trial court, including the statement of the appellant. The foremost argument advanced by the appellant's counsel is that the mandatory provisions of the NDPS Act, pertaining to search, seizure, sampling, preparation of the inventory, and sealing of the seized materials, were not



complied with by the police in respect of the alleged recovered contraband.

In support of above contention, learned counsel for the appellant has drawn our attention to the evidences adduced by the prosecution before the trial court. The instant case pertains to the recovery of 2 kilograms of charas, kept in eight plastic packets, along with firearms from the possession of the appellant.

As per the prosecution story, the informant, who was then SHO of Ramgarhwa P.S., received a secret information that the appellant, a wanted accused in several extortion cases, was coming to Piparpati Chowk on an Apache motorcycle. After informing his senior officials, a police team was constituted and the appellant was apprehended. A bag hanging from the handle of the motorcycle was recovered, containing the alleged contraband, i.e., charas kept in eight plastic packets. A loaded country-made pistol and two live cartridges (315 bore) were also recovered from the packets of the clothes which the appellant wore at that time.

A perusal of the FIR, which is based on the informant's self-statement, reveals that although a seizure list was prepared, but there is no mention of the sealing process of the seized



materials being conducted at the spot by the police party. As per the FIR, the appellant was given the option to be searched either before a police officer or a Magistrate. Upon his opting for the latter, an Executive Magistrate Shambhu Pandey was deputed by the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Raxaul. However, during the investigation his statements were not recorded, the said Executive Magistrate was not examined by the prosecution in course of trial.

According to the FIR, the seizure list was prepared by the Executive Magistrate, which was also supported by the informant in his deposition (Paragraph 3). But, the informant further stated in Paragraph 6 of his evidence that the seizure list was prepared by him, and it merely bore the signature of the Executive Magistrate. Moreover, the FIR in itself is silent on whether the seized articles were sealed at the place of recovery or not. In his cross-examination (Paragraph 21), the informant stated that the seized materials were sealed at the spot, and the accused also signed on the sealed packets. However, the prosecution failed to produce the seized materials, including the specimen seal, the bag containing eight packets, and the document (slip) showing case details and witness names that were affixed to the sealed contraband before the trial court. The



seized firearms were also not produced before the trial court.

Further, although the informant claimed to have informed his senior police officers about the secret information received, but no evidence was submitted to prove that such information was actually conveyed.

As per the prosecution story, the alleged recovery took place in broad daylight near Piparpati Chowk, yet no independent person was made a witness to the search and seizure. The FIR does not indicate any attempt being made by the SHO to include an independent witness, despite the police party having waited for nearly half an hour for the Executive Magistrate after apprehending the appellant. This raises a serious doubt about the prosecution's version of events as well as in the bonafide action of the police party.

Prosecution witness Ram Baboo Chaudhari (PW-1) stated that the seizure list was prepared before the Executive Magistrate, and Umesh Ram and Hari Narayan Prasad signed it as witnesses. In the cross-examination (Paragraph 11), he said that the motorcycle was black in color, whereas the FIR describes it as grey (slaty). He also claimed that the informant made photography of the seized materials, but no such photographs were produced in evidence. In Paragraph 12 of his



cross-examination, PW-1 further stated that the seized packets were put back into the same bag from which they were recovered, and the bag was then taken to the police station by the SHO, Rajesh Kumar. This confirms that no sealing process was carried out at the place of recovery.

15. The prosecution witness Umesh Ram (PW-2) stated in paragraph 11 of his cross-examination that no mark of identification was made on the bag or packets. He further stated that, after reaching the police station, he remained there for 10 to 15 minutes and during that period, he did not witness any reading and writing. This statement clearly indicates that no sealing proceeding in respect of the seized materials was conducted in his presence.

16. The prosecution witness Jitendra Prasad (PW-3) stated in his cross-examination that he did not sign any document, and SHO Rajesh Kumar did not inform him about any recovery. This statement contradicts the prosecution's case, as this witness was claimed to be present at the place of recovery as a member of the raiding party.

17. The prosecution witness Arun Kumar Singh (PW-5), the Investigating Officer, deposed in his examination-in-chief that the search-cum-seizure list was prepared by the



SHO Rajesh Kumar, whereas, according to the FIR, the seizure list was prepared by the Executive Magistrate. In paragraph 13 of his cross-examination, he stated that he received the seized articles along with the seizure list from SHO Rajesh Kumar, who was also the in-charge of the Malkhana at that time. He further stated in the same paragraph that he did not remember whether any mark of identification was present on the seized articles or not. Thus, the evidence of this witness fails to establish that the seized articles were deposited in the police Malkhana in a sealed condition, and that the articles were received by him in the same sealed condition after he was deputed as the Investigating Officer. Furthermore, to substantiate this aspect, the most crucial evidences, i.e., the seized articles and the materials containing them, were not produced before the trial court.

18. The prosecution witness Hari Narayan Prasad (PW-6) is claimed to be a witness to the seizure list. In his examination-in-chief, he deposed that the packets containing charas were seized in the presence of the Executive Magistrate, and the seizure list concerning the seized materials was prepared and brought to the police station. According to the FIR, this witness was a member of the raiding party. However, during his



cross-examination, he stated that he was not a member of the raiding party. He also gave contradictory statements regarding his signature, first stating that his signature was taken, and later stating that it was not taken. This inconsistency severely undermines the prosecution's claim that he is a reliable seizure witness, especially when he himself denied as he being part of the raiding team, despite being presented as a witness of seizure by the prosecution.

19. We now come to the evidence of the informant (PW-8). In his examination-in-chief, he deposed that the secret information received by him was communicated to his senior police officials. However, the prosecution failed to produce any documentary evidence to substantiate this, relying solely on the bare statement of the informant. In paragraph 3 of his examination-in-chief, he stated that the seizure list of all the seized articles was prepared by the Executive Magistrate. Contradictorily, in paragraph 6, he stated that the seizure list was in his own handwriting and bore his signature. Furthermore, in paragraphs 13 and 16 of his cross-examination, he admitted that he did not mention any fact relating to the sealing of the seized materials in his self-recorded statement, nor did he record that any independent person declined to be a witness to the



seizure. When the search on one's person or on other object such as vehicle etc. is to be made at or near a public place then before conducting the search, the police officer, if has sufficient time, is required to call upon some independent and respectable people of the locality to witness the search and in this regard, there must be some reasonable attempt on the part of the police. If it is found that no attempt was made by the police officer concerned to join with him some persons of the locality who are admittedly available to witness the recovery, it would affect the weight of evidence of the police officer. In this regard, the observation made in paragraph No. 6 of the judgement passed by the Hon'ble Apex court in the case of **Sahib Singh vs. State of Punjab** reported in **(1996) 11 SCC 685**, is relevant, which is reproduced as under : -

“6. Having gone through the record we find much substance in each of the above contentions. Before conducting a search the police officer concerned is required to call upon some independent and respectable people of the locality to witness the search. In a given case it may so happen that no such person is available or, even if available, is not willing to be a party to such search. It may also be that after joining the search, such persons later on turn hostile. In any of these eventualities the evidence of the police officers who conducted the search cannot be disbelieved solely on the ground that no independent and respectable witness was examined to prove the search but if it is found — as in the present case — that no attempt was made even by the police officer concerned to join with him some persons of the locality who were admittedly available to witness the recovery, it would affect the weight of evidence of the police



officer, though not its admissibility. We next find from the record that the arms and ammunition allegedly recovered from the appellant and seized were not packeted and sealed. In Amarjit Singh v. State of Punjab [1995 Supp (3) SCC 217 : 1995 SCC (Cri) 828] this Court has observed that non-sealing of the revolver at the spot is a serious infirmity because the possibility of tampering with the weapon cannot be ruled out. From the record we further find that there is no evidence to indicate with whom the revolver was after its seizure by PW 3 till it was sent to the Arms Expert for testing through Head Constable Baita Singh. This missing link also weakens the prosecution case. For all these infirmities we are of the view, that the appellant is entitled to the benefit of reasonable doubt.”

In paragraph 21 of his cross-examination, he stated that the seized materials were sealed at the spot and the accused signed on the sealed packets but most of the prosecution witnesses, who were also present at the spot as per prosecution story, did not say such thing in their evidence and there are serious contradictions among their testimony and informant's testimony with regard to sealing of seized articles. In the same paragraph, he admitted that the seized articles were not available before him in the court. These contradictory statements cast a serious doubt on whether the sealing process was ever properly conducted, either at the spot or at the police station.

20. To verify whether the seized narcotic materials and firearms were produced before the Chief Judicial Magistrate (CJM) along with the accused on 30.05.2018, we have perused



the ordersheet dated 30.05.2018. It appears that the order sheet is in a pre-printed format and does not record the production of the seized articles before the learned CJM on that date. A perusal of the trial court record further reveals that though the Investigating Officer filed a petition after 2 months i.e. on 06.08.2018 for sampling and certifying the seized contraband in the presence of a Judicial Magistrate, pursuant to which a Judicial Magistrate B.K. Tripathi was also deputed but the prosecution did not produce any evidence to prove that sampling was done in presence of a Magistrate. No certification of inventory has taken place. For more than 2½ months where were the seized articles kept is not known.

21. Neither the said Judicial Magistrate was examined nor any documentary evidence was produced to establish that the seal was broken and the seized articles were opened before the Judicial Magistrate. There is also no evidence to show that samples were taken from each packet, measured, mixed and then sealed, along with the sealing of the remaining contraband and other seized articles, in the presence of the deputed Judicial Magistrate. Accordingly, there is a clear violation of the provisions of Section 52A of the NDPS Act, which severely vitiates the prosecution's case.



The FSL report (Exhibit-12) regarding the examination of the samples taken from the seized narcotic material indicates that the parcel containing the samples was handed over to Special Messenger Devendra Kumar on 25.08.2018, but the same was received in the FSL office only on 20.09.2018. This reflects again a delay of approximately 25 days in depositing the said samples at the FSL, which raises a serious doubt about the authenticity and integrity of the samples. To clarify this issue, the best witness would have been the said Special Messenger Devendra Kumar, but he was not examined by the prosecution.

22. Turning to the recovery of firearms, the FIR states that one loaded country-made pistol and two live cartridges of 315 bore were recovered from the clothes of the appellant during his personal search. Although the seizure list (Exhibit-4) mentions these firearms, but the firearms were not produced before the trial court. In the cases involving the recovery of firearms under the Arms Act, non-production of the seized firearms before the trial court can be fatal to the prosecution's case and weakens the prosecution's case, potentially leading to an acquittal. Further, Umesh Ram (PW-2) and Hari Narayan Prasad (PW-6), who are police personnel named in the seizure list as witnesses to the recovery, did not



depose anything regarding the sealing of the recovered firearms in their presence. Dy. S.P. Manoj Kumar (PW-4), who examined the alleged firearms as a ballistics expert, stated that a sealed small plastic box was produced before him. However, during his cross-examination, he stated that he did not remember whether any identification mark was present on the seized materials or not.

Most significantly, the recovered firearms were not produced before the trial court at any stage, which is considered a vital piece of evidence in an offence punishable under the Arms Act. In such cases, the firearm itself is the most material evidence, but in the present matter, the prosecution failed to produce the same during trial.

Conclusion:

23. For the aforementioned reasons, we find serious multiple infirmities and procedural lapses in the matter of seizure, sealing, sampling, handling, and production of the alleged seized narcotic material and firearms. Specifically, the failure to seal the seized materials properly, the non-production of those materials before the trial court, and the lack of credible and consistent evidence to prove the seizure and compliance with the mandatory provisions of Section 52A of the NDPS Act,



severely compromise the integrity of the prosecution’s case.

Accordingly, the findings of the trial court in the impugned judgment holding the appellant guilty of the charged offences do not inspire judicial confidence. Therefore, we hold that the judgment dated 14.10.2022 and the order of sentence dated 18.10.2022 passed by the learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Special Judge, East Champaran, Motihari, in NDPS Case No. 32 of 2018 (CIS No. 32 of 2018), arising out of Ramgarhwa P.S. Case No. 104 of 2018, are not sustainable in the eye of law as well as on facts, so, both are hereby set aside. In result, this appeal is allowed.

24. The appellant, Nek Mohammad @ Raj Mohammad, is currently in judicial custody. He is directed to be released forthwith, if not required in connection with any other case.

25. Let a copy of this judgment be sent to the trial court along with the lower court records (LCR) forthwith for necessary information and compliance.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

(Shailendra Singh, J)

annu/-

AFR/NAFR	AFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	29.07.2025
Transmission Date	29.07.2025

