



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 311 OF 2021

Ajhar Manjoor Shaikh,
Age : 36 Years, Occ. Labour,
R/o. Fakirgalli, Ahmednagar. ..Appellant

V E R S U S

The State of Maharashtra,
Through Police Inspector,
topkhanna Police Station,
Ahmednagar. .. Respondent

....

Advocate for the Appellant : Mr. T.W. Pathan
Advocate Mr. N. B. Narwade for Assist to Public Prosecutor
A.P.P. for the Respondent/State : Mr. A.V. Lavte

...

**WITH
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 361 OF 2021
WITH
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 1722 OF 2021**

Nihal @ Baba Musraf Shaikh,
Age : 20 Years, Occu. Menial Labour,
R/o. Laddha Colony,
Tal. Partur, District Jalna ..Appellant

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra,
Through Police Inspector,
Topkhana Police Station,
Ahmednagar. .. Respondents

....

Advocate for the appellant : Mr. Datta S. Kale h/f
Mr. A.B. Ghule
A.P.P. for Respondent/State : Mr. A.V. Lavte

...

**CORAM : SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE AND
MEHROZ K. PATHAN, JJ.**

**RESERVED ON : SEPTEMBER 30, 2025
PRONOUNCED ON DECEMBER 23, 2025**

JUDGMENT (PER SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, j):-

1. Both these appeals are directed by the appellants/accused namely Ajhar Manjoor Shaikh and Nihal @ Baba Musaraf Shaikh respectively against one and the same judgment and order dated 22.04.2021 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ahmednagar (hereinafter referred to as the learned 'Trial Judge') in Sessions Case No. 41 of 2020, whereby both of them are convicted for the offence punishable under Section 364-A, read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code and sentenced to suffer imprisonment for life and to pay fine of Rs. 10,000/- with default clause. The appellants/accused however are acquitted from the offence punishable under Sections 3/25 of the Indian Arms Act.

2. As per the prosecution story, one Sayyed Abdul Karim i.e. P.W.-2 and also the victim is a reputed businessman from Ahmednagar, (now 'Ahilynagar') was walking to Makka Mosque for offering Morning Prayer. However, near the gate of S.T. Colony, one white Tata Tiago car bearing registration No. MH-20-EJ-3879 stopped near him. The appellant Ajhar, who was known to the victim, was driving the said car and three others

including the appellant Nihal @ Baba Shaikh were inside the car. Appellant Ajhar asked Sayyed Abdul Karim to get in the car, to which he refused. Therefore, the other accused Nihal got down from the car and then scuffle started. In the said scuffle, the shirt of victim was torn and his cap also fell down. Thereafter, the victim Sayyed Abdul Karim i.e. P.W.-2 was forcibly made to sit in the car and thus abducted. When the victim shouted for help, P.W. No.4 Shaikh Tanveer witnessed that and saw the said car speeding away.

3. Appellant Ajhar took the said car in high speed towards Aurangabad and then to Jalna. He pointed a revolver at the victim and threatened him to remain silent. Thereafter, around at 6:45 a.m. and 7.30 a.m. appellant Ajhar gave missed call from his Mobile No. 9823718904 to the cell phone of victim's wife. When she called back, the victim, who was under threat, told her that he would return home within two hours. The appellants/accused then took the victim approximately 25 Km beyond Jalna towards Nanded, to one Darga beside the Highway. There the appellant Ajhar demanded a ransom of Rs. 25,00,000/- from the victim and on failure threatened to kill him. Due to fear, P.W.-2-victim negotiated the amount and agreed to pay Rs. 10,00,000/-

immediately and the rest later on. Believing the promise made by the victim, the appellants/accused decided to set him free for getting the money. They also took the victim to ready-made cloth shop namely 'Golden Collection' in Jalna where appellant Ajhar purchased a new shirt for him, as the shirt which the victim was wearing, was torn. Then the appellants/accused dropped the victim at Jalna Bus Stand, and Ajhar also gave him amount of Rs. 600/- for bus ticket and instructed him to arrange the money by evening, mentioning that his associate would follow him. The victim has noted the car details on the rear wind shield of which, words "Nawaz" and "Ya Ali" were inscribed.

4. The victim boarded a bus from Jalna and by using the cell phone of co-passenger, he called home, but due to apprehension in the mind, only conveyed that he would return soon. He even changed the bus at Pandhari Pool being in frightened condition. Thereafter, at 2.30 p.m. his bus was checked by police at Jeur Toll Plaza and the Police took the victim to the Superintendent of Police Office, Ahilyanagar and from there to Topkhana Police Station, where his statement was recorded. By that time, the victim's son i.e. P.W.1/ informant had already lodged an F.I.R. Exh.21 with Topkhana

Police Station, after receiving the distressed calls and being informed by the local people including P.W.-4 about the abduction of his father. Then the investigation was started and the Investigating Officer A.P.I Pingle i.e. P.W.-5 collected CCTV footage's from the places where the appellants had taken the victim. He also arrested both the appellants and after completion of investigation, charge sheeted the appellants/accused as aforesaid.

5. The learned Trial Judge, after conducting the trial, found the appellants guilty as aforesaid, and therefore, convicted them as mentioned above.

6. The learned counsels for the respective appellants/accused vehemently submitted that the prosecution has examined only five witnesses and the learned Trial Judge relied too much on the evidence of victim Sayyed Karim and wrongly convicted the appellants/accused. According to them, there is no evidence of actual abduction and the prosecution did not care to prove the C.D.R by calling necessary witnesses. They pointed out that though the test identification parade was held, but the Special Executive Magistrate, who conducted the same, is not at all examined and there is no supporting evidence to the evidence of victim.

According to them, it is highly unbelievable that though the victim stated that he was threatened at the point of revolver, but the said revolver is not seized by the Investigating Officer. On the contrary, they pointed out that there was land dealing between the victim and accused No.1 and perhaps for that purpose, the victim on his own must have gone with him. Moreover, no bus ticket from the victim was seized by the Investigating Officer to substantiate the story of the victim. Even no statement of co-passenger was recorded by the Investigating Officer, whose mobile hand set, the victim had used. According to them, the entire behavior of victim was abnormal and it is highly impossible that the appellants/accused would set free the victim for bringing ransom amount. Finally, they concluded that, the necessary ingredients to establish the offence of kidnapping and abduction are not at all established by the prosecution beyond the reasonable doubt. Even the statement of eye witness Arun Zende was not recorded. As such, they prayed for acquittal of the appellants/ accused.

In support of their respective contentions they relied on the following citations :

- (i) ***Thulia Kali vs. State of Tamil Nadu (Manu/SC/0276/1972)***
- (ii) ***Marudanal Augusti vs. State of Kerala***

(MANU/SUPREME COURT/0170/1972)

- (iii) **State of Andhra Pradesh Vs. Punati Ramulu and others MANU/SC/0417/1993**
- (iv) **Rupes Vs. State of Maharashtra (MANU/MH/0056/2019)**
- (v) **Takhaji Hiraji Vs. Thakore Kubersing Chamansing and others (MANU/SC/0345/2001)**
- (vi) **State of Uttar Pradesh Vs. Punni and others (MANU/SC/7085/2008)**
- (vii) **Gaurv Maini Vs. The State of Haryana (MANU/SC/0584/2024)**
- (viii) **Krishan Kumar Malik Vs. State of Hararyana (MANU/SC/0718/2011)**
- (ix) **Mehatar Vs. The State of Maharashtra (MANU/SC/0221/2025)**
- (x) **Umeh Chandra and others vs. State of Uttarakhan (MANU/SC/1412/2021)**
- (xi) **Ram Singh Vs. The State of Uttar Pradesh (MANU/SC/0125/2024)**
- (xii) **Kailash Gour and Others Vs. State of Assam (MANU/SC/1505/2011)**

7. On the contrary, the learned A.P.P. as well as learned counsel for respondent No.2/victim supported the impugned judgment and pointed out that the prosecution has definitely established the case of abduction and in absence of any probable defence, the appellants are not entitled for acquittal as prayed. Finally, they prayed for dismissal of both the appeals. In support of their contentions learned A.P.P. relied

on the following citations.

- (i) ***Ramesh Krishna Madhusudan Nayar Vs. State of Maharashtra (AIR 2008 Supreme Court 927)***
- (ii) ***Vinod Kumar Vs. State of Harayana [(2015) CRI. L. J. 1250]***
- (iii) ***Edakkandi Dineshan Alias P. Dineshan and others Vs. State of Kerala (AIR 2025 Supreme Court 444)***
- (iv) ***Suman Sood @ Kamal Jeet Kaur Vs. State of Rajasthan with Daya Singh Lahoriya Vs. State of Rajasthan AIR 2007 Supreme Court 2774)***
- (v) ***Principal Seat of this Court in Prakash @ Buddha Ramchandra Shinde Vs. The State of Maharashtra in Criminal Appeal No. 753 of 2014 dated 5.10.2021***

8. Heard rival submissions. Also perused the documents on record along with the impugned judgment. Also consider the citations relied upon by rival parties.

9. To support the charge against both these appellants, the prosecution has examined in all five witnesses. Out of them, P.W.1 Sayyed Afroz is the informant, who is also son of the victim. In his evidence, it has come on record that he lodged an FIR (Exh.21) and stated about the missed calls and the frightened tone of the victim, during the phone conversations. He also supported the prosecution story for timings and the fact that victim's cap was found on the spot of alleged abduction. Sayyed Abdul Karim, (P.W.2), who is the victim

himself, has stated as to how he was abducted and threatened at gun point. He also described the journey till Darga of Jalna District, where the ransom was demanded and about his subsequent release and how he brought by the police to the police station. This witness has identified both the accused i.e. appellant Ajhar by prior acquaintance and appellant Nihal via Test Identification Parade. Vishal Kumbhar (P.W.3) is the panch witness to the spot *panchnama* and he has also acted as a panch for seizure of C.C.T.V. footages from Toll Plazas and S.T. Bus stand at Jalna. He has deposed accordingly. Shaikh Tanveer (P.W.4) is the alleged independent witness, who was acting as Masjid cleaner at the relevant time. He has deposed that when he was preparing for Namaz, he heard commotion and then saw one white car with black glasses speeding away. He also heard shouts of person from inside the car. The last witness A.P.I. Pinge (P.W.5) is the Investigating Officer and his evidence is mostly on the procedural aspects.

10. On going through the impugned judgment, it appears that the learned Trial Judge has convicted both the accused for the offence punishable under Section 364-A read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, relying mainly on the sole evidence of the victim i.e. abducted person Sayyed Abdul

Karim P.W.2. The learned Trial Judge has found his testimony as natural, probable, trustworthy and reliable. The learned Trial Judge further observed that evidence of P.W.2 is corroborated by the circumstances, such as, lodging the F.I.R promptly. Learned Trial Judge also relied upon supportive evidence of P.W. 4 on the point of initial abduction of the victim, seizure of the vehicle used in the crime, statement of victim under Section 164 of the Code of Criminal Procedure at Exh.25 and the conduction of Test Identification Parade, wherein the victim had identified accused No.2 Nihal. Though the learned Trial Judge observed that there were lapses in the investigation, but they were not sufficient for falsifying the prosecution story. The defence of accused/appellants is that the victim had gone with the appellant-Ajhar voluntarily for land deal. It is also observed that the accused were not found guilty for the offence under Section 3/25 of the Arms Act, due to non-recovery of the alleged fire arm and in absence of mandatory sanction of prosecution. Thus, the conclusion of the Trial Judge about the culpability of accused is based mainly on the evidence of P.W.2. As such, the evidence of prosecution needs to be scrutinized carefully.

11. We would like to reproduce Section 364-A of the Indian

Penal Code for quick reference, which reads as under :-

“ Section 364-A, whoever kidnaps or abducts any person or keeps a person in detention after such kidnapping or abduction and threatens to cause death or hurt to such person, or by his conduct gives rise to a reasonable apprehension that such person maybe put to death or hurt, or causes hurt or death to such person in order to compel the Government or (any foreign State or international inter-government organization or any other person) to do or abstain from doing any act or to pay a ransom, shall be punishable with death, or imprisonment for life, and shall also be liable to fine.)

On going through the aforesaid section of kidnapping for ransom, the prosecution must prove the following ingredients

- (I) The accused must have kidnapped, abduct or detained any person;
- (ii) He must have kept such person under custody or detention.
- (iii) Kidnapping, abduction or detention must have been for ransom. To pay a ransom, in the ordinary sense means to pay the price or demand for ransom. This would show that demand has to be communicated.

12. Let us consider the evidence on initial abduction of the victim for which the evidence of P.W.4 is vital.

Shaikh Tanveer Shaikh Sikandar (P.W.4) appears to be the cleaner of Makka Masjid in J.J. Galli at Ahmednagar, who used to reside in the Masjid itself. This witness has stated that he was preparing for Namaj on the day of incident i.e. on 18.11.2019 at about 5.00 a.m. and at that time he heard commotion from the outside of the Masjid. When he came out, he saw one white coloured car with black glasses moving away towards Mangalgate Chowk. According to him, he heard noise of a person shouting from inside the car. From such type of evidence, it is sufficiently made clear that he had not actually seen the abduction of P.W. 2 victim, but he only saw the car moving away from the spot and only heard shouts of a person. As such, from the evidence of this witness, it is not clear, whether the victim was forcibly made to sit in the car by the appellants/accused. Further, in the cross-examination, he has stated that, he had come in the Court with the son of victim. However, he changed his version and stated that, he came in the Court with the nephew of the victim. As such, the possibility of giving evidence by this witness on the say of victim's family, cannot be ruled out. Further, he clearly admitted that he had not disclosed the incident to any one till police recorded his statement. That means, even on witnessing such important act, he did not find it necessary to

report the incident to the police immediately. Therefore, the evidence of this witnesses is not sufficient in respect of the actual abduction of the victim and cannot be regarded as supportive to the victim himself.

13. Sayyed Afroz Abdul Karim (P.W.1) is the son of the victim, who had lodged complaint with Topkhana Police Station, Ahmednagar, after about almost nine hours after the incident or seven hours after getting the knowledge of the incident of kidnapping. This has created certain doubts about the truthfulness and creditability of the allegations of kidnapping. It is to be noted that alleged incident had occurred at about 5.30 a.m. of which this witness had got knowledge about 7.45 a.m. but still the complaint/F.I.R lodged on 14.39 p.m. on the day of the incident and that too after receiving phone calls by his mother from the victim. As such, there is certainly delay in lodging the F.I.R. It has come in the evidence of this witness that he stated that four persons namely Shaikh Tanveer, Munirbhai, Shahabaj and one Arun Zende had been to his house and gave the cap, allegedly of the victim. Further, the victim had not told any family member that he was actually kidnapped or abducted by the appellants/accused on gun point, but the victim himself had

stated that he was outstation and would return home shortly. As such, at least from victim's side there was no disclosure that he was kidnapped while making phone calls when he was in the alleged custody of the appellants and even after he was asked to go for arranging money. Further, though the C.D.R. of conversation between the victim and others was recovered, but the prosecution did not examine any person, such as Noddal Officers of the respective companies to prove the facts about conversation by the victim. This certainly cannot be considered as laches on the part of Investigating Officer, but can be treated as deliberate and intentional suppression of the true facts.

14. Now by coming to the evidence of victim Sayyed Abdul Karim (P.W.2), it is revealed that according to him, when he was walking towards Makka Masjid for prayers around 5.40 a.m. to 5.45 a.m. one white coloured Tata Tiago car stopped near him at S.T. Colony Gat. Appellant Ajhar, with whom he was acquainted as neighbour, was driving the said car. Three other accused were also in the car and they, on the order of appellant Ajhar, forcibly boarded him into the car after having scuffle. He specifically stated that his cap was fallen on the ground and shirt was also torn in the said scuffle. He also

shouted for help as “अरे कोई मुझे बचाओ” Thereafter, he has stated that Ajhar then took out revolver and on the gun point, threatened him to kill him, if he continues to shout. According to him, at about 6.45 a.m. Ajhar made missed call on the mobile of his wife and when his wife called back, Ajhar made him to speak by pointing gun to him. Accordingly, he told his wife that he would return in two hours. The sequence of missed call and call back from his wife took place on second time during which, he said that he would return within short time. It is significant to note that on both these occasions, the victim did not tell his wife that he was abducted or kidnapped and threatened at gun point.

15. He has further deposed that they went to Jalna from Ahmednagar and thereafter to one Darga situated at the distance of 20 to 25 km from Jalna on Nanded Highway, where the appellant -Ajhar stopped the car. According to this witness, appellant -Ajhar demanded ransom of Rs. 25,00,000/- and threatened to kill him in failure of arranging the same. This witness negotiated the terms with Ajhar and thereafter promised to pay Rs. 10,00,000/- immediately and the rest in subsequent two-three days. Further, according to him, accused told him to call one Hazi Nazir to make

arrangement of money, but he requested them to leave him for bringing the said amount. He also disclosed to them that if anything about his abduction was told his son, then the situation would be spoiled, because his son would lodge complaint with the police. Thereafter, they stopped at one cloth shop and Ajhar purchased one Shirt for him and replaced the torn shirt. Not only this, but the appellant Ajhar, according to the victim, had dropped him at Jalna S.T. Stand and also gave an amount of Rs. 600/- for bus fair. According to this witness, appellants/accused had told him that his persons will follow in the bus and thereafter instructed the victim to arrange the money by evening. Further he has stated that after boarding the bus, he used mobile handset of co-passenger for calling his wife, but even after setting free, he did not tell anything to his wife about his alleged abduction, but only told that he would return in two hours. Then he changed the bus due to fear and eventually found by the police at Jehur Toll Plaza, who took him to S.P. Office and then to Topkhanna Police Station, where his statement was recorded.

16. On the basis of the evidence of this witness, i.e. P.W.2 Sayyed Abdul Karim, the learned Trial Judge has convicted both the appellants/accused. However, it is extremely

important to note that the Trial Judge has acquitted the accused persons from the charge under Section 3/25 of Arms Act, mainly when the fire arm was not recovered during the investigation. Therefore, the use of fire arm in this kidnapping, appears highly doubtful. Further, the conduct of victim himself also appears unnatural. It is highly doubtful that after being abducted from Ahmednagar and when the victim was threatened at the gun point, the accused did not demand any ransom amount especially till reaching Darga situated at 20 to 25 km away from Jalna on Nanded Highway. If the accused had kidnapped P.W.2 for ransom, then there was no reason for them to travel so far for demanding such ransom. There is nothing on record in the evidence of P.W. No.2 that before reaching to said Darga, the accused had made any demand of ransom. It is surprising that even after receiving call from his wife, P.W. 2 did not tell her that he was kidnapped. Further, the accused persons, while allowing him to talk with his wife, did not demand anything in return. Under such circumstances, the conduct of P.W.2 definitely appears surprising and against the story of the prosecution about kidnapping for ransom. Further, it is very strange that the accused persons, believing on the words of abductee, that he would arrange for the ransom amount by paying

immediately Rs. 10,00,000/- and rest into three days, set him free. Such type of case that the abductee in fact released for bringing the money of ransom is not only unbelievable, but ridiculous one. Not only this, the accused even purchased one new shirt for the abductee and gave amount of Rs. 600/- for his bus fair. This act on the part of accused cannot be digested, since in the cases of kidnapping for ransom, the abductee is never released, till receiving the ransom amount. Therefore, the conduct of P.W.2 victim is highly suspicious on the point of his kidnapping for ransom.

17. Further, conduct of P.W.2 even after his release by the appellants/accused is highly suspicious. It is to be noted that after he boarded the bus, he was not under threat and still when he made phone call to his wife by using mobile hand set of co-passenger, he did not utter single word about the alleged kidnapping at the hands of accused. On the contrary, he continued to tell that he would return within two hours. This type of evidence cannot establish the ingredients of kidnapping for ransom. In the cross-examination, he has stated that he was knowing the appellant Ajhar as a neighbour for five to seven years. Though this witness has refused that he had any business dealing or conversation with Ajhar, but from such

unnatural conduct about not disclosing the act of kidnapping, it appears that this witness is suppressing something about his relationship between himself and Ajhar. Even he has admitted that he embraced accused Ajhar, when he was asked to go to Ahmednagar at Jalna Bus Stand. If he had really kidnapped then, certainly the accused Ajhar would not have set him free and even embraced him for saying good bye. It is to be noted that though there are CCTV footages, on record, showing that how the victim traveled with the accused in the car from Ahmednagar to Drarga near Jalna, but it is very much surprising that even at Toll Plaza, he did not raise any alarm or asked for help. Even if it is presumed that he was frightened due to fire arm with the appellant Ajhar, but no existence of such fire arm has been established by the prosecution by making its recovery. On the contrary, the learned Trial Judge has acquitted the appellants/ accused from the charge under Section 3/25 of the Arms Act. This witness has specifically admitted that no demand of money was made during the journey till Darga. This aspect is also suspicious and indicates the concocted story prepared by P.W.2 victim.

18. Further, despite having conversation with the wife, the

prosecution has not proved the C.D.R collected for that. No person from the shop from where the accused Ajhar had purchased a new shirt for the victim, is examined. Even the person from whose mobile the accused called his wife from S.T. Bus is not examined. Even if after setting free at Jalna Bus Stand P.W. 2 did not make any effort to seek help from anybody. It is strange that he did not disclose the incident of alleged kidnapping to any one, until he was taking to the Superintendent of Police office Ahmednagar. He has also admitted in his cross-examination that the accused persons did not dictate him what to talk with his wife. Therefore, from these facts, which are on record, the evidence of P.W.2 certainly appears doubtful and leads to the inference that he is hiding something about the real transaction between himself and Ajhar and prepared a false and concocted story about his kidnapping by the accused persons. The learned Trial Judge appears to have carried away by the evidence of this witness, by ignoring vital admissions given by him, which make his story doubtful. Therefore, the evidence of this witness is not satisfactory to establish the aforesaid ingredients of the offence of kidnapping for ransom.

19. The rest of the evidence i.e. the evidence of Vishal

Kumbhar (P.W.3), who is acted as panch witness, is on the procedure adopted by the Investigating Officer for recording spot *panchnama* and seizure of cap. However, it is not helpful in establishing the actual fact of kidnapping. Moreover, this witness appears to have traveled at the places from the CCTV footages and alleged demand of ransom was made. Further, the evidence of A.P.I. Pingale P.W. 5, who is the Investigating Officer, is mostly on the procedural aspect, but in cross-examination he has given vital admissions that the spot from which the victim was abducted, was in crowded locality. It is significant to note that the abduction was near *Makka Masjid*, where people from Muslim community use to visit for *Namaz* and therefore, it cannot be believed that there was no one on the place of initial abduction. He also admitted that he did not record statements from Toll Plaza employees, S.T. Stand or the passenger, whose phone was used by the victim, to support the story of victim of being taken forcibly. He also admitted that he did not seize the shirt purchased from the Jalna shop and also admitted that the car in which the victim was allegedly abducted was not registered in the name of appellant Ajhar. He also did not investigate in respect of mobile numbers from which ransom calls were made. He further admitted that in the CCTV footages from toll Plazas, the accused persons

were not visible and only the vehicle was seen. Therefore, it appears that the Investigating Officer has also not investigated the crime to fully establish the act of the alleged kidnapping.

20. Thus, by considering over all evidence on record, it is transpired that prosecution has failed to establish the guilt of appellants/accused beyond reasonable doubt. On the contrary, it appears that the learned Trial Judge wrongly appreciated the evidence and gave too much credit to the testimony of P.W.2 i.e. the victim by ignoring various suspicious circumstances leading to the inference that the story of victim is concocted one. Thus, the appellants/accused are definitely entitled for benefit of doubt as the prosecution has not established their guilt beyond reasonable doubt. As such, we pass the following order :

ORDER

- (i) Criminal Appeal No. 311 of 2021 and Criminal Appeal No. 361 of 2021 are hereby allowed and the conviction of both the appellants/accused for the offence punishable under Section 364-A read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal code recorded by the learned Trial Judge against them in impugned judgment and order dated 22.04.2021 in Sessions Case No. 41 of 2020, is

hereby quashed and set aside.

- (ii) Appellants/Accused, shall be released forthwith, if they are not required in connection with any others case.
- (iii) The fine amount, if any, paid by the appellants, be refunded to them.
- (iv) Both the appeals are accordingly disposed of.
Pending Criminal Applications, if any, also stand disposed of.
- (v) Record and Proceedings be remitted back to the Trial Court.

(MEHROZ K. PATHAN)
JUDGE

(SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE)
JUDGE

Ysk/