

CRA-S-1021-SB-2004
Reserved on: 08.04.2025
Pronounced on:- 06.05.2025

....Appellants

Versus

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. J.S. Hooda, Advocate
for the appellants.

Ms. Aditi Girdhar, AAG, Haryana.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. Appellants/convicts Jagdish, Jal Singh and Smt. Rajan have filed aforesaid appeal against judgment of conviction dated 24.03.2004 and order of sentence dated 26.03.2004 passed by learned Sessions Judge, Faridabad in Sessions Case bearing No. 6 dated 04.04.2003, titled as “State of Haryana Vs. Jagdish and others” vide which appellants are sentenced as under :-

Name of Convict(s)	Offence U/s	Sentence	Fine	In default of fine or a part thereof
1. Jagdish 2. Jal Singh 3. Smt. Rajan	304-B of IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for seven years each.	Rs. 1,000/- each	Further rigorous imprisonment for three months each.
	498-A of IPC	Rigorous imprisonment for two years each.	Rs. 500/- each	Further rigorous imprisonment for two months each.



2. As per the facts of case, on 10.11.2002, a VT message was received from Police Station City Palwal that one Jal Singh and Sunita had consumed some poisonous substance and were admitted in Guru Nanak Hospital. On receipt of said information, ASI Hukam Singh alongwith police party reached Guru Nanak Hospital and moved application regarding opinion of doctor, on which doctor opined that Sunita was referred to Escorts, whereas patient Jal Singh was not fit to make statement. Thereafter, ASI Hukam Singh went to tubewell of accused persons, where he met Nawal Singh (complainant) father of deceased Sunita and moved application to police. He stated that he is resident of village Lalpur, Tehsil Chhata, District Mathura (U.P.). He had performed marriage of his daughter Sunita on 21.05.2002 according to Hindu rites and ceremonies with accused Jal Singh son of Jagdish. He performed decent marriage as per his capacity. Whenever his daughter visited parental house she disclosed that her father-in-law Jagdish and mother-in-law Rajan alongwith her husband Jal Singh were not satisfied with dowry articles. Accused persons used to torture her mentally as well as physically for want of more dowry. They used to demand motorcycle, fridge, colour Television in dowry. He (complainant) being poor agriculturist failed to fulfil their illegal demands for dowry. He further alleged that on 10.11.2002, all accused persons murdered his daughter Sunita. He got information from Ajaypal Singh resident of his village Lalpur, who had come to village Chandhat to meet his sister. When complainant reached the house of Jagdish, he found his daughter Sunita lying dead on a cot. He prayed that legal action be taken against accused persons. On the basis of this statement, case was initially registered under Section 304-B of IPC.



3. During investigation, inquest proceedings were conducted and statements of witnesses were recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. Thereafter, DSP Inder Singh reached the spot and conducted enquiry. He sent dead body of Sunita to Civil Hospital, Palwal for postmortem examination. Rough site plan of place of occurrence was prepared. On 13.11.2002, doctor of Guru Nanak Hospital handed over MLR of accused Jal Singh. Accused persons Jal Singh (husband of deceased victim) and Jagdish (father-in-law of deceased victim) were arrested on 20.11.2002, whereas, Rajan (mother-in-law of deceased victim) was arrested on 21.11.2002. Offence under Section 498-A of IPC was added subsequently. After completion of investigation, accused were challaned and final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was prepared and submitted before the learned Illaqa Magistrate.

4. Accused were supplied complete set of copy of challan report as provided under Section 208 of Cr.P.C. Since the offence under Section 304-B of IPC was exclusively triable by the Court of Sessions, therefore, learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Palwal committed the case to the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Faridabad for trial vide commitment order dated 21.03.2003.

5. Learned Sessions Judge, Faridabad after hearing arguments framed charge-sheet against accused Jagdish, Jal Singh and Smt. Rajan under Sections 498-A and 304-B read with Section 34 of IPC, which was read over and explained to them in simple language to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

6. In order to prove the facts of case, prosecution examined Dr. P.S. Sharma, Medical Officer, Palwal as PW-1, Sagar Mal, Patwari Halqa,



Chandhat as PW-2, ASI Bijender Singh, Incharge, Police Post No. 3, Police Station NIT, Faridabad as PW-3, Nawal Singh (complainant) as PW-4, Charan Singh as PW-5, Bedwati wife of Nawal Singh as PW-6, SI Dalip Singh as PW-7, Ajay Pal son of Ghundi Lal as PW-8, Dr. S.K. Bhutani, Private Practitioner, Palwal as PW-9 and SI Hukam Singh (Investigation Officer) as PW-10. Thereafter, learned Public Prosecutor for State closed prosecution evidence on 27.11.2003.

7. Statements of all accused persons were recorded under Section 313 Cr.P.C. by the trial Court to which they pleaded innocence and false implication. Accused in defence examined one witness namely Baljit Singh son of Ram Phul as DW-1.

8. After hearing arguments advanced by learned Public Prosecutor for the State and learned counsel representing accused persons, all accused were held guilty and convicted under Sections 304-B and 498-A read with Section 34 of IPC vide judgment of conviction dated 24.03.2004 and sentenced as referred above vide order of sentence dated 26.03.2004 passed by learned Sessions Judge, Faridabad. Feeling aggrieved of this judgment of conviction and order of sentence, abovenamed appellants filed present appeal.

9. Learned counsel representing appellants argued that judgment of conviction dated 24.03.2004 and order on quantum of sentence dated 26.03.2004 passed by learned Sessions Judge, Faridabad, convicting all appellants/accused under Section 304-B, 498-A read with Section 34 of IPC is not on sound footing. Learned trial Court has failed to consider material facts and evidence on record. Evidence led by the prosecution is not trustworthy. All witnesses examined in this case are family members of



deceased victim. Therefore, they are interested witnesses. There is no independent corroboration to the allegations levelled against appellants.

10. Allegation regarding harassment on account of demand of dowry is falsified from the statements of witnesses recorded in this case. Learned counsel for appellants referred to the testimonies of Nawal Singh PW-4 father of deceased victim, Bedwati PW-6 mother of deceased victim who during their cross-examination conceded that engagement ceremony had taken place two months prior to the marriage by giving one rupee. It is further admitted that at the time of engagement, there was no demand for dowry. Therefore, it cannot be believed that the deceased victim was being harassed in the matrimonial home by appellants/convicts on account of their demand of dowry. It is further case of prosecution that when deceased victim had visited her parental house for the third time she disclosed to her parents that she was being harassed on account of demand of a motorcycle, colour Television and a fridge. Nawal Singh PW-4 admitted that in-laws family of his daughter was already having a motorcycle. Therefore, there was no question of raising demand for motorcycle. There is nothing on record to show that regarding alleged maltreatment to the deceased victim for raising demand for dowry no complaint was filed to the police nor the matter was raised before any Panchayat. Version put forward by prosecution for first time at the time of lodging FIR cannot be believed. Learned counsel for appellants referred to the statement of Charan Singh PW-5 brother of deceased victim who did not state anything regarding maltreatment given to his sister by appellants/convicts on account of any demand for dowry. Therefore, prosecution has miserably failed to establish one of the most important ingredient to constitute the



offence that soon before the death of victim she was subjected to maltreatment on account of their demand for dowry. In the absence of this material fact, prosecution cannot take benefit of the provisions of Section 113-B of Indian Evidence Act.

11. Learned counsel for appellants further raised the issue that defence version has been totally ignored by learned trial Court by holding the appellants guilty for the offence under Section 498-A, 304-B read with Section 34 of IPC. Prosecution examined Dr. S.K. Bhutani PW-9 who proved MLR of Jal Singh Ex.PH. It is duly established on record that Jal Singh was also admitted in hospital with alleged history of poisoning and epileptic fits. He remained admitted in hospital for three days. In fact, Jal Singh and his mother Rajan had altercation on account of giving clothes etc. to sister of Jal Singh. Out of anger, Jal Singh had consumed poison. On seeing this, his wife Sunita also consumed poison. Both Jal Singh and his wife Sunita were admitted in hospital. Deceased victim was further referred to Escorts Hospital, whereas, Jal Singh remained admitted at Guru Nanak Hospital, Palwal. Therefore, said unfortunate incident did not take place on account of any kind of harassment to the deceased victim on account of demand of dowry. Appellants examined Baljit Singh, paternal uncle of Jal Singh as DW-1 and confirmed the aforesaid incident. Learned trial Court while deciding the present case has totally ignored the defence version of appellants/convicts.

Learned trial Court has failed to give any finding regarding specific role played by each of the appellant/convict. Evidence led by prosecution was not considered in its right perspective. There is material irregularity in impugned judgment of conviction and order on quantum of



sentence since material facts and evidence on record has been ignored. Prosecution has failed to lead convincing evidence on record to prove the charge-sheet framed against them. Appellants are facing mentally agony due to prolonged pendency of criminal case. Therefore, judgment of conviction and order on quantum of sentence passed by the trial Court may be set aside by accepting present appeal and they may be acquitted of the charge framed against them.

12. On the other hand, learned counsel representing State argued that facts of case and evidence on record were rightly appreciated by learned trial Court and all appellants were rightly convicted and sentenced for the offence under Section 498-A, 304-B read with Section 34 of IPC. In the case in hand, marriage of Sunita took place with Jal Singh one of the convict/appellant on 21.05.2002 and this unfortunate occurrence took place on 10.11.2002 i.e. within six months of marriage. FIR was lodged on the complaint of father of deceased victim Nawal Singh who has stepped into the witness box as PW-4 and fully corroborated prosecution version. Mother of deceased victim Bedwati also stepped into the witness box as PW-6 and fully supported the version of her husband. Prosecution examined Charan Singh PW-5 brother of deceased victim who had identified dead body of his sister during inquest proceedings. Prosecution examined Ajaypal PW-8 who had informed father of deceased victim about unfortunate death of his daughter. Apart from this, medical record pertaining to deceased victim Sunita is proved on file by examining Dr. B.S. Sharma as PW-1. The Postmortem Report is Ex.PA and report of Forensic Science Laboratory is Ex.PB. There is specific opinion of doctor that the deceased victim died due to consumption of organo



phosphorus pesticide. It is pointed out that victim died unnatural death within six months of her marriage in matrimonial home. It has come in testimonies of Nawal Singh PW-4 and Bedwati PW-6 that she was maltreated in matrimonial home by appellants/convicts on account of their demand for motorcycle, colour Television and a fridge. Investigation carried out by police is proved on record by SI Hukam Singh PW-10. After completion of investigation, challan was presented by SI Dalip Singh examined as PW-7. The defence raised by appellants is falsified from the testimony of Dr. S.K. Bhutani examined as PW-9. Therefore, judgment of conviction and order on quantum of sentence passed by learned Sessions Judge, Faridabad is fully justified and appeal preferred by appellants deserves dismissal.

13. I have considered the arguments advanced before me and have gone through the trial Court record with able assistance of learned counsel for appellants and learned counsel representing State of Haryana. In the case in hand, FIR Ex.PG/3 has been lodged on the written complaint of Nawal Singh addressed to SHO, Police Station Chandhat which is Ex.PG. Occurrence took place on 10.11.2002. On the complaint of Nawal Singh, there is police endorsement Ex.PG/1 prepared at 12:10 AM on 11.11.2002 and thereafter, FIR is lodged which is Ex.PG/3. Therefore, in the case in hand, there is prompt registration of FIR.

14. Complainant categorically stated that his daughter Sunita got married with Jal Singh on 21.05.2002. He had performed marriage of his daughter beyond his capacity. When his daughter visited the parental house, she disclosed that her father-in-law Jagdish, mother-in-law Rajan and her husband Jal Singh were unhappy with dowry articles and for this reason she



was being physically and mentally harassed. She further disclosed that they were raising demand for a motorcycle, fridge and a colour Television. Complainant could not satisfy their demand, he being poor farmer. He was informed by Ajaypal that his daughter has been killed. He immediately reached the matrimonial house of his daughter and saw body of his daughter lying on a cot in courtyard. With these allegations, present FIR was registered. Appellants/convicts were chargesheeted for the offence under Section 498-A, 304-B read with Section 34 of IPC. In order to prove aforesaid charges, prosecution has examined complainant Nawal Singh PW-4 and his wife Bedwati PW-6 who have fully corroborated prosecution version regarding harassment to their daughter on account of demand of dowry by all the accused which resulted into her unnatural death.

Gainful reference can be made to the judgment of **Supreme Court of India** cited in **2013(2) RCR(Criminal) 75**, case titled “**Kashmir Kaur and another Versus State of Punjab**”, where in order to constitute the offence under Section 304-B of IPC, following principles were culled out, which are as under :-

“16. From the above decisions the following principles can be culled out :

- a) To attract the provisions of Section 304B Indian Penal Code the main ingredient of the offence to be established is that soon before the death of the deceased she was subjected to cruelty and harassment in connection with the demand of dowry.
- b) The death of the deceased woman was caused by any burn or bodily injury or some other circumstance which was not normal.
- c) Such death occurs within seven years from the date of her marriage.



- d) That the victim was subjected to cruelty or harassment by her husband or any relative of her husband.
- e) Such cruelty or harassment should be for or in connection with demand of dowry.
- f) It should be established that such cruelty and harassment was made soon before her death.
- g) The expression (soon before) is a relative term and it would depend upon circumstances of each case and no straightjacket formula can be laid down as to what would constitute a period of soon before the occurrence.
- h) It would be hazardous to indicate any fixed period and that brings in the importance of a proximity test both for the proof of an offence of dowry death as well as for raising a presumption under Section 113B of the Evidence Act.
- i) Therefore, the expression "soon before" would normally imply that the interval should not be much between the concerned cruelty or harassment and the death in question. There must be existence of a proximate or life link between the effect of cruelty based on dowry demand and the concerned death. In other words, it should not be remote in point of time and thereby make it a stale one.
- j) However, the expression "soon before" should not be given a narrow meaning which would otherwise defeat the very purpose of the provisions of the Act and should not lead to absurd results.
- k) Section 304B is an exception to the cardinal principles of criminal jurisprudence that a suspect in the Indian Law is entitled to the protection of Article 20 of the Constitution, as well as, a presumption of innocence in his favour. The concept of deeming fiction is hardly applicable to criminal jurisprudence but in contradistinction to this aspect of criminal law, the legislature applied the concept of deeming fiction to the provisions of Section 304B.



l) Such deeming fiction resulting in a presumption is, however, a rebuttable presumption and the husband and his relatives, can, by leading their defence prove that the ingredients of Section 304B were not satisfied.

m) The specific significance to be attached is to the time of the alleged cruelty and harassment to which the victim was subjected to, the time of her death and whether the alleged demand of dowry was in connection with the marriage. Once the said ingredients were satisfied it will be called dowry death and by deemed fiction of law the husband or the relatives will be deemed to have committed that offence”.

15. Learned counsel for appellants raised the issue that there was no demand of dowry nor matter was ever complained to police or to Panchayat. I have considered the point raised by learned counsel for appellants and have carefully examined the testimonies of Nawal Singh father PW-4 and Bedwati mother PW-6. Both witnesses conceded that at the time of engagement there was no demand for dowry. It has come in their statements that initially when victim came to the parental house after marriage, on two occasions she did not raise any issue and on her third visit she disclosed that her husband and both in-laws were unhappy with dowry articles and there was demand for motorcycle, colour Television and fridge. It has come in cross-examination of Nawal Singh PW-4 that at the time of *bidai* of his daughter, mediator had told him that instead of giving gold chain, he should have given a fridge. Nawal Singh PW-4 conceded that he is a farmer and sole bread-winner in family. Other children were studying, therefore, he had no means to satisfy their demand. Even if it is considered that appellants/convicts did not raise any demand for dowry initially that does not mean that they did not have



expectations. In fact due to their unfulfilled expectations, occurrence has taken place. Statements of Nawal Singh father PW-4 and Bedwati mother PW-6 remained consistent on all material points and there is no valid reason to disbelieve their testimonies. Charan Singh brother of deceased victim also stepped into the witness box as PW-5. His testimony was limited to the identification of dead body of his sister. Even this witness was not cross-examined by learned counsel for appellants/convicts regarding allegations of maltreatment on account of demand of dowry. The occurrence took place in matrimonial home. Therefore, Nawal Singh father PW-4, Bedwati mother PW-6 and Charan Singh brother PW-5 do not know how the said occurrence took place. In fact, they were informed by Ajaypal PW-8 who had visited village Chandhat to meet his sister married in same village and there he came to know about the death of victim Sunita. On his return to village he disclosed about this fact to family of deceased victim, who thereafter reached the matrimonial home of their daughter.

16. Learned counsel for appellants further raised the issue that prosecution case is not proved by examining any independent witness. All witnesses referred above are family members of deceased victim, therefore, they are interested in conviction of appellants/convicts. Said objection raised by learned counsel for appellants/convicts does not hold any ground. Even appellants/convicts could not examine anybody from neighbourhood to prove their version regarding occurrence in which deceased victim Sunita lost her life. Appellants examined Baljit Singh DW-1 who is also paternal uncle of Jal Singh. It has come during cross-examination that he was not present on the spot when said unfortunate occurrence took place. It is further revealed in



cross-examination that Baljit Singh DW-1 had constructed their house in fields. Usually, it is seen that such like occurrence takes place within the four walls of a house. Initially newly married girl resists to tell anything unpleasant to her family about her in-laws. There is always a hope that better sense would prevail and attitude of her husband and in-laws will change. The controversy comes into light only when girl finds that there is no ray of hope. In a similar case, aforesaid proposition was raised that there was no independent corroboration to prosecution story. It was observed by **Supreme Court of India** in case titled “**Mustafa Shahadal Shaikh Versus State of Maharashtra**” cited in **2012 CriLJ 4763**, where in para No. 13, it was observed as under :-

“13. Though learned counsel for the appellant contended that all the witnesses relied on by the prosecution are close relatives and no outsider has been examined to prove their case, we are of the view that in a case of this nature i.e. matrimonial death, we cannot expect outsiders to come and depose what had happened in the family of the deceased. We have already highlighted that the death occurred within a period of 7 months from the date of the marriage and she died at her matrimonial home. It has also come in evidence from the prosecution witnesses that on the date of the death, the appellant and his parents alone were in the house. In such circumstances, we reject the contention raised by the counsel for the appellant”.

Therefore, stand taken by learned counsel for appellants cannot be looked into.

17. It is duly established on record that it was a case of unnatural death. Dr. B.S. Sharma, Medical Officer, Palwal examined as PW-1 has



proved Postmortem Report on the dead body of Sunita wife of Jal Singh, age 18 years. It was observed that *“it was a dead-body of a young female, moderately built and nourished, rigor mortis was present on all four limbs, post-mortem staining was present on dependent parts, mouth and eyes were closed, face was suffused, lips were blue, nail cyanosed, frothing was present from both the nostrils. Wearing blue printed shirt, blue salwar, white Dupatta and white glass bangles. I found typically unpleasant smell present. No external injury was found on the body. I sent portions of brain matter, right and left lungs, liver, spleen, kidney, stomach and its contents, small and large intestines and its contents and sample of blood from heart for chemical analysis. Rest of the organs were pale and healthy. Uterus was non-pregnant and healthy and normal”*. Cause of death was given on receipt of Forensic Science Laboratory report and doctor gave his opinion that cause of death in that case was organo phosphorus pesticide consumption by deceased. Probable duration between death and injury was within few minutes to few hours and between death and postmortem examination was within 24 hours. Postmortem is Ex. PA and FSL report is Ex.PB.

18. Facts of the case indicate that victim Sunita lived in matrimonial home for a short duration of six months. She got married on 21.05.2002 and the occurrence took place on 10.11.2002. During this short duration in matrimonial home, she was ill-treated by her husband and both in-laws on account of their demand of motorcycle, colour Television and fridge. Complainant categorically stated that he being a poor farmer was unable to satisfy this demand. His daughter disclosed about the harassment caused to her on account of their aforesaid demand. He along with Charan Singh son



and Bijender had visited in-laws house to make them understand. Father of deceased victim conceded that no complaint was lodged with police. Conduct of Nawal Singh PW-4 is fully justified from the facts of present case. His daughter was married with Jal Singh about six months ago and in this short duration there was no point in lodging the report with police. Complainant had hope that husband and in-laws family of his daughter would understand and would refrain from ill-treating his daughter. Considering the date of marriage and date when the said occurrence took place, it is evident that soon before her death victim was maltreated in matrimonial home on account of their demand for dowry. Even otherwise, as per Section 113B of The Indian Evidence Act, 1872, there is a presumption as to dowry death. Section 113B of The Indian Evidence Act, 1872 runs as under :-

“113B. Presumption as to dowry death - When the question is whether a person has committed the dowry death of a woman and it is shown that soon before her death such woman has been subjected by such person to cruelty or harassment for, or in connection with, any demand for dowry, the Court shall presume that such person had caused the dowry death.

Explanation.- For the purposes of this section, “dowry death” shall have the same meaning as in section 304B of the Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860).”

Said presumption is rebuttable. However, learned counsel for appellants failed to lead convincing evidence on record to rebut said presumption.

19. In the case in hand appellants/convicts raised defence that said occurrence took place on account of altercation which took place between Jal Singh and his mother Rajan on account of giving customary gifts, clothes etc.



to the sister of Jal Singh on the occasion of *Bhaiya Dooj*. Because of this reason, Jal Singh consumed poison and on seeing this Sunita deceased victim also consumed poison and both were admitted in the hospital. Aforesaid stand taken by appellants/convicts is falsified from the testimony of their own witness Baljit Singh paternal uncle of Jal Singh examined as DW-1 who in his examination-in-chief categorically stated that Jal Singh had not taken any poisonous substance. This fact is further falsified from the testimony of Dr. S.K. Bhutani PW-9 who medically examined Jal Singh. It has come in his examination-in-chief that Jal Singh was admitted with alleged history of poisoning and history of epileptic fits. Poison was unknown. There was no history of vomiting. Patient (Jal Singh) was anxious, irritated with pulse rate 110 per minute, B.P. 100/60 mm, respiratory rate 30 per minute, chest bilaterally clear, heart S1/S2 normal. R/T with gastric lavage was done. There was no obvious smell of any known poison. There was no obvious soilage of clothes. There was no obvious staining of oral cavity. From his appearance and other circumstances, it cannot be said that he had taken poison or not. It is further observed by doctor that during the period of observation of three days, there was no symptom that patient had taken poison. Copy of MLR is Ex.PH. Therefore, from the testimony of doctor, it is crystal clear that Jal Singh appellant/convict did not consume any poison.

20. Learned trial Court while deciding present case had rightly considered all facts and evidence on record. From the evidence led by prosecution, it is duly established that deceased victim was maltreated in matrimonial home on account of demand of dowry soon before her death, as a result of which she died unnatural death i.e. by consuming poison. Therefore,



judgment of conviction under Section 498-A, 304-B read with Section 34 of IPC is fully justified and same do not require any interference.

21. I have also considered the order on quantum of sentence passed by learned trial Court. In the case in hand, occurrence took place on 10.11.2002 and appellants were convicted on 24.03.2004 and sentenced on 26.03.2004. As per custody certificates, appellants Jagdish and Jal Singh have undergone custody of more than two years, whereas, appellant Smt. Rajan has undergone custody of slightly less than two years. Present criminal appeal is being taken up for hearing after a long gap of about 20 years. Present case relates to maltreatment of a young bride of 18 years of age in matrimonial home on account of demand of dowry resulting into her unnatural death within six months of marriage falling under Section 498-A and 304-B of IPC. Therefore, conviction pertains to a heinous crime which is against the individual dignity and social consciousness. Suspension of sentence or delay in disposal of present case cannot dilute the gravity of offence committed by appellants/convicts. In the light of this, order of sentence dated 26.03.2004 passed by learned Sessions Judge, Faridabad does not require any interference and same is accordingly upheld, except the fine imposed under Section 304-B of IPC and the same is set aside, as Section 304-B of IPC does not explicitly state a fine.

Present appeal preferred by the appellants is, accordingly, dismissed with aforesaid modification. Sentence of appellants Jagdish, Jal Singh and Smt. Rajan was suspended by the Coordinate Bench of this Court, they are directed to surrender before learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Faridabad, within one month from today, failing which learned Chief Judicial



Magistrate, Faridabad would issue warrants of arrest to secure their presence and send them to jail to undergo the remaining sentence. Necessary intimation be sent to the concerned Court for information and compliance.

22. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand(s) disposed of accordingly.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

06.05.2025

lalit

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No