IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 730 of 2009

[Against the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 25.07.2009 & 28.07.2009, respectively passed by learned Additional District & Sessions Judge-I-cum-Special Judge, (S.C.S.T.), Dhanbad in G.R. Case No. 2933 of 1997]

---

1. Ashok Kumar Singh, S/o Sri Banke Bihari Singh
2. Surendra Yadav, S/o Late Ram Prasad Yadav

Both residents of Gandhi Nagar, Dhansar, P.S.-Dhansar and District-Dhanbad ... ... **Appellants**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand … … **Respondent**

P R E S E N T

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP KUMAR SRIVASTAVA

For the Appellants : Mr. Yogesh Modi, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Bishwambhar Shastri, A.P.P.

JUDGMENT

C.A.V. on 12.08.2026 **Pronounced on 10/09/2026**

1. Heard Mr. Yogesh Modi, learned counsel for the appellants and Mr. Bishwambhar Shastri, learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. Originally, this appeal was filed by three appellants out of them one Labdu Yadav had died during the pendency of this appeal and his appeal was abated vide order dated 12.08.2026. The rest of the surviving appellants have been renumbered.

3. The instant criminal appeal is directed against the judgment and order of conviction and sentence dated 25.07.2009 & 28.07.2009 respectively passed by learned Additional District & Sessions Judge-I-cum-Special Judge, (S.C.S.T.), Dhanbad in G.R. Case No. 2933 of 1997 whereby and whereunder the appellants have been held guilty for the offences under Sections 341, 323, 506, 354, 448/34 of the I.P.C. and Sections 3 (1)(x) & 3 (1)(xi) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 and

sentenced to undergo S.I. for one month along with fine of Rs.500/- for the offence under Section 341 of I.P.C.; R.I. for one year for the offence under Section 323 of the I.P.C.; R.I. for one year for the offence under Section 506 of the I.P.C.; R.I. for one year for the offence under Section 354 of the I.P.C.; R.I. for one year for the offence under Section 448 of the I.P.C. and R.I. for three years six months along with fine of Rs.3000/- each with default stipulation for the offence under Sections 3 (1)(x) and 3 (1)(xi) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989. All the sentences were directed to run concurrently.

Factual Matrix

4. Factual matrix giving rise to this appeal as per *fardbeyan* (Exhibit-1) of the informant Panpati Devi is that on 19.10.1997 (Sunday) at about 05:00 A.M., when she was returning to her house after answering nature's call, Ashok Singh, Surendra Yadav and Labdu Yadav (since deceased) after uttering abusive languages at her, chased her. Somehow, the informant, while running, entered in her house but all the aforesaid three persons also trespassed into her house. Thereafter, Surendra Yadav and Ashok Kumar Singh pulled her out from her house and started assaulting her by means of *lathi* and *danda.* When the informant raised alarm, her daughter, namely Sunita Kumari and son, namely Bipin Bihari Kumar reached there and saved her. Thereafter, the aforesaid assailants left the informant and went away. It is further stated by the informant that while she was proceeding to the police station to report the alleged occurrence, on

the way, near Chandmari Kanta, all the aforesaid three persons surrounded her and after uttering abusive languages “SALI HARIJAN CHAMAR HUMLOGO SAY TAKKAR LETI HAI BARBAD KAR DENGEY”. After uttering the aforesaid abusive languages, addressing the informant by her caste name, all three persons again assaulted her, as a result of which she sustained injuries. Thereafter, out of fear, the informant returned to her home. When the accused persons had left, the informant, concealing herself along with her husband, reached the police station, where she gave her *fardbeyan,* as stated above. According to the informant, the cause of occurrence as stated in the *fardbeyan,* was that Ashok Singh had got her evicted from her house and since then, he had been troubling the informant.

On the basis of above information, Dhanbad (Dhansar) P.S. Case No. 670 of 1997, dated 19.10.1997 was registered under Sections 341, 323, 506, 354, 448/34 of the I.P.C. and Section 3/4 Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989.

5. After completion of investigation, charge-sheet was submitted against the accused persons for the aforesaid offences. Accordingly, cognizance was taken by learned C.J.M., Dhanbad and subsequently, the case was committed to the Court of Special Judge, S.C. S.T., Dhanbad on 24.07.2000. After framing of charges it was read over and explained to the accused persons to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

6. In the course of trial altogether seven witnesses were examined

by the prosecution:-

(i) P.W.-1-Panpati Devi (Informant)

(ii) P.W.-2-Rameshwar Ram

(iii) P.W.-3-Sunita Kumari

(iv) P.W.-4-Bipin Kumar

(v) P.W.-5-Bikhari Yadav

(vi) P.W.-6-Sunil Kumar

(vii) P.W.-7-Dharnidhar Mondal

7. Apart from oral testimony following documentary evidence have also been adduced by prosecution.

(i) Exhibit-1-Fardbeyan

(ii) Exhibit-2-Endorsement on fardbeyan

(iii) Exhibit-3-Carbon copy of injury report

8. On the other hand, defence has also examined three witness, namely D.W.-1, Ram Das Ravidas, D.W.-2, Ashok Kumar Singh and D.W.-3, Chandra Bhusan Srivastava and several documentary evidences have also been adduced by defence.

9. After conclusion of trial, the appellants were held guilty for the offences under Sections 341, 323, 506, 354, 448/34 of the I.P.C. and Sections 3 (1)(x) & 3 (1)(xi) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 and sentenced as stated above which has been assailed in this appeal.

Submissions on behalf of appellants: -

10. Learned counsel for the appellants has submitted that the impugned judgment of conviction and order of sentence is not

sustainable either in law or on facts, as the learned Trial Court has failed to properly appreciate the evidences and materials available on record. It has further been contended that the present prosecution is a result of misuse of the process of law and is actuated by *mala fide* intention and false allegations, which were made by the informant with a view to take revenge upon the appellants. Learned counsel has also submitted that the learned Trial Court has failed to consider the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court and other judicial orders, which were brought on record by way of defence exhibits, and passed the impugned judgment without properly considering the said documents. It has also been argued that the investigation was biased, as the Investigating Officer failed to properly consider the relevant facts, including the proceedings under Section 145 Cr.P.C. and the orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court against the local administration. Learned counsel has further contended that while discussing the evidence of the prosecution witnesses, the learned Trial Court failed to take into consideration their statements made during cross-examination and thereby failed to appreciate the evidence as a whole. It has further been submitted that the husband of the informant was merely a hearsay witness and had not deposed about the alleged occurrence, whereas P.Ws. 3 and 4, being the son and daughter of the informant, did not support the allegation relating to any offence under the S.C./S.T. (Prevention of Atrocities) Act. Even the independent witness, P.W.5, did not support the prosecution case in respect of the alleged offence. It has also been submitted that the evidence on record

does not establish the allegations against the appellants beyond reasonable doubt and the prosecution case is false and malicious. Therefore, impugned judgment and order of conviction and sentence of appellants is absolutely based beyond the evidence available on record and suffers from serious error of law which is liable to be set aside, allowing this appeal.

Submissions on behalf of State: -

11. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. has opposed the aforesaid contentions raised on behalf of appellants and submitted that the learned Trial Court has rightly convicted the appellants on the basis of material available on record, therefore, there is no illegality or infirmity in the impugned judgment of conviction and sentence of the appellants and no merits in this appeal which is fit to be dismissed.

12. I have gone through the record of the case along with the impugned judgment in the light of contentions raised on behalf of both side.

13. The only point for determination in this appeal is **"as to whether the impugned judgment and order of conviction and sentence of the appellants suffers from any serious error of law calling for any interference in this appeal?"**

Analysis, discussions and reasons:-

14. Before imparting my verdict on above point, it is desirable to take brief resume of ocular testimony of witnesses examined in this case.

P.W.-1-Panpati Devi is the informant of this case. She has stated that on 19.10.1997, at about 05:00 A.M., she went out of her house to answer nature's call. While she was returning to her house after answering nature's call, on the way Ashok Kumar Singh, Surendra Yadav, Labdu Yadav surrounded her and started abusing her in filthy language. She somehow managed to flee from there and entered her house. When she entered her house, all the aforesaid three accused persons trespassed into her house. Thereafter, they caught hold of the informant by her hair and pulled her out of the house. All three accused persons then started assaulting her with *lathi*, as a result of which, she fell down on the floor. When she fell down, her son, Bipin Bihar and her daughter, Sunita Kumari, raised an alarm, upon which the co-villagers assembled there. Thereafter, all three accused persons fled away from the place of occurrence. She has further stated that after the said occurrence, when she was proceeding to Dhansar Police Station she was again assaulted by all three accused persons with *lathi* when she reached near Chandmari Kanta and they uttered "TUM HAMSAY TAKKAR LEGI HARIJAN CHAMAR HO KAR." All three accused persons thereafter concealed themselves in an ATTA CHAKKI GHAR near Chandmari Kanta. They also threatened the informant that she should return to her home, failing which she and her family members would be killed. This witness has stated that due to the said threat, she returned to her house. Thereafter, she along with her daughter Sunita, went by rickshaw to the office of S.P. Saheb. However, as the

S.P. Saheb was not available there, the Reader of the S.P. asked to the informant to go to Dhansar Police Station. Accordingly, she went to Dhansar Police Station and made her statement before Daroga ji, namely Sri Vivekanand Thakur. Her statement was reduced into writing by Daroga ji. This witness has further stated that after recording her statement, Daroga Ji read over and explained to her the contents of the statement. After finding the contents to be true and correct, she put her thumb impression thereon, which is marked as **Exhibit-1**.

In her cross-examination, she has deposed that at the request of the Magistrate, she had vacated the room (Kothari) of Banke Bihari Singh. Further, in para 10, she has deposed that Banke Bihari Singh did not give her the room (Kothari) in which she used to live earlier, but it was broken cottage in which she went and used to live herself. Banke Bihari Singh filed a case against her husband for stealing three tons of coal, which is still ongoing. This case is about the theft of coal from the same room. Banke Bihari Singh had filed a case against her for theft of vegetable which has now been disposed of. However, in para 14 of her deposition, she has denied the suggestion that the accused persons were asking her to vacate the said room and she was not vacating it, hence the accused persons had beaten her. She has further deposed in para 19 of her deposition that the litigation with Banke Bihari Singh has been going on for the last five years. She has deposed before court on 29.11.2000 and the occurrence is of 19.10.1997, while she admit that litigation with

Banke Bihari Singh has been going on for last five years.

P.W.-2-Rameshwar Ram is the husband of the informant. He has stated that on 19.10.1995, at about 5:00 A.M., he went to the field for sowing potatoes and returned at about 12:00 noon. Thereafter, his wife informed him about the occurrence. Subsequently, he along with his wife and others, went to the police station and lodged the case. He has stated that one Naurang Paswan also accompanied them to the police station. He has stated that, as informed to him by his wife, on the alleged date, while she was returning after answering nature's call, the accused persons chased her and after catching hold of her hair, pulled her out of her house and assaulted her. He has further stated that, while his wife was proceeding to the police station after the occurrence, near Chandmari Kanta, the accused persons again surrounded her and assaulted her, as informed to him by his wife. He stated that he and his wife are 'Harijans' and that all three accused persons are non-Harijans.

In his cross-examination, he has stated that a criminal case has been filed by Ashok Singh against him and his wife for an incident of 19.10.1995. The family members of Banke Bihari Singh have filed a case against him for theft of vegetables which is still going on.

P.W.-3-Sunita Kumari is the daughter of the informant. She has deposed that about five years ago, at around 5:00 a.m., Ashok Singh, Surendra Yadav, and Labdu Yadav severely assaulted her mother while her mother was near the fields. At that time she was at home. Thereafter, all three of them dragged her mother to her house

and assaulted her there. At that time, she and her brother, Vipin were present at home. Her father was not at home, as he had gone to the vegetable garden. When she and her brother raised an alarm, other people gathered there whereupon all three accused fled away from the spot. She has further stated that they belong to Harijan caste, whereas the accused persons are Rajputs. This witness, in para 13 of her deposition, admitted that we have a lot of criminal cases going on with Ashok Singh, which were going on before this case, due to which there was tension between both the families.

P.W.-4-Bipin Kumar is the son of the informant. He has deposed that the incident took place in October, 1997 at about 5:00 a.m. His mother had gone to answer the call of nature when Surendra Yadav, Labdu Yadav and Ashok Singh chased her, whereupon she ran back to the house. All three of them then entered the house and assaulted his mother. When she raised an alarm, they fled from the place. This witness has stated that he has been residing in a BCCL quarter ever since he came to his senses. According to him, Ashok Singh and Banke Bihari Singh claim the said house to be their own and on that account, assaulted them with the intention of forcing them to vacate the house. At the time of the assault, apart from this witness, his sister Sunita Kumari was also present in the house. His father had gone to the garden to plant potatoes. This witness has further stated that when his mother was proceeding to Dhansar Police Station, the accused persons again intercepted and assaulted her mother near Chandmari Kanta. Consequently, his mother returned home.

Thereafter, she went to the police station along with his father and lodged the case.

P.W.-5-Bikhari Yadav has stated that the occurrence took place about six years ago. It was in the morning and at that time, he was present at his house. On hearing the hulla, he went to the place of occurrence, where he saw some persons assaulting Panpati Devi. This witness has stated that one of them was the son of Banke Bihari Singh, who was also assaulting Panpati Devi. He has further stated that there were two other persons who were assaulting Panpati Devi. The witness has intervened and separated the persons involved in the quarrel. He has further stated that he could identify the accused persons.

P.W.-6-Sunil Kumar is the Investigating Officer (I.O.) of this case**.** He has stated that on 19.10.1997, he was posted at Dhanbad as Deputy S.P. (Law and Order) and on the direction of the then S.P., Dhanbad, was entrusted with the investigation of Dhanbad (Dhansar) P.S. Case No. 670 of 1997. He stated that a copy of the fardbeyan was made available to him. The fardbeyan was recorded under the signature of Sri Vivekanand Thakur, the then Officer-in-Charge of Dhansar P.S., which he identified and which had already been marked as **Exhibit-1**. He has further stated that the fardbeyan bears the RTI of the informant, Panpati Devi and the LTI of Rameshwar Ram. He identified the endorsement forwarding the fardbeyan to Dhanbad P.S., made under the handwriting and signature of Vivekanand Thakur, which is marked as **Exhibit-2**. He has also stated that the formal FIR

bears the signatures of the Officer-in-Charge at two places. During the investigation, he recorded the re-statement of the informant and the statements of witnesses and inspected the places of occurrence. He has stated that there were two places of occurrence. The **first place of occurrence** was the house of Jagan Sah, son of Bhagirath Sah, at East Bastacolla. It was a soil-built tiled house facing north, where the informant resided with her family. According to the informant, she was pulled out of the house into the verandah and assaulted there. The I.O. inspected the place in the presence of the informant. To the north was the soil-built tiled house of Mangru Ram; to the south, the brick-built tiled house of Jattu Manghi; to the east, the house of Mangru Ram and to the west, the soil-built house of Prayag Ram. The **second place of occurrence** was the pitch road at Sri Ram Nagar, Chandmari, leading towards East Bastacolla. It was a public road where, according to the informant, the accused persons abused her by using the terms “Harijan” and “Chamar” and also assaulted her. The I.O. described the surrounding houses and roads, including the houses of Dina Nath Singh and Sharda Singh, the road towards East Bastacolla, the road from Joraphatak to Beda Colliery, and the adjacent Chandmari Colliery belt. He has further stated that the investigation was supervised by the then S.P. and after completing the investigation on all relevant points, he submitted the charge-sheet. He has further stated that none of the accused persons belonged to the Harijan or Adivasi community, whereas the informant belonged to a Scheduled Caste.

P.W.-7-Dharnidhar Mondal has stated that he has brought the injury register from the Superintendent, P.M.C.H., pursuant to the order of the Court. On page no. 36 of this register, there is the injury report of Panpati Devi, wife of Rameshwar Ram, which is a carbon copy. This carbon copy was prepared along with the original copy. The said injury report is in the handwriting and bears the signature of Dr. Binay, P.M.C.H., Dhanbad. He identify the same. (Objection was raised.) The carbon copy of the injury report of Panpati Devi is marked as **Exhibit-3** (with objection).

On the other hand, **D.W.-2-Ashok Kumar Singh** is himself one of the accused. He has stated that on 19.10.1997, he was present at his house situated at Gandhi Nagar. At that time, his father and one Surendra Yadav, a neighbour, were also present in the house. Ramdas Ravidas came to his house and informed him that in the house situated at his farm, Panpati Devi, her husband Rameshwar Ram and their children were assaulting Singhashan Yadav @ Laddu Yadav. The children of Panpati Devi and Rameshwar Ram are Bipin Bihari (son) and Sunita Kumari (daughter). He has further stated that the said persons were also removing the household articles belonging to Singhashan Yadav. After receiving this information, he and Surendra Yadav proceeded to the place of occurrence and Ramdas also followed them. He has further stated that upon reaching the place of occurrence, he saw that the hands and feet of Laddu Yadav had been tied with rope. When he attempted to untie the rope, Panpati Devi attacked him with a bhala (spear). Surendra Yadav caught hold of bhala and after

snatching it threw away. Thereafter, Rameshwar Ram, his wife and their children assaulted him, Surendra Yadav and Laddu Yadav, as a result of which all of them sustained injuries. He has further stated that he reported the incident to Dhansar Police Station and lodged an FIR. He explained that the occurrence was connected with a dispute over possession of the house. According to him, Panpati Devi and her family members had earlier obtained possession of the said house through the District Administration. His father thereafter approached the Hon'ble High Court against the said possession. Subsequently, pursuant to an order passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer, Dhanbad, possession of the house was restored on 20.09.1997. He has further stated that possession was restored on the basis of a letter typed by Sri Chandra Bhusan Srivastava, the then Stenographer and signed by the S.D.O., Sri Arbind Kumar Choudhary. The said document was marked with objection as **Exhibit-D**. He alleged that, because he had obtained possession of the house, the police became biased against him and falsely implicated him in the present case. He has further stated that although the police arrested him, they did not arrest the accused persons in the counter-case. According to him, the police again illegally delivered possession of the house to the opposite party, against which he approached the Hon'ble High Court. He has stated that the Hon'ble High Court made adverse observations against the S.D.O. and D.C., following which possession of the house was again restored to him. Since then, he has remained in peaceful possession of the house. He has also stated that the case against him was initially

lodged and thereafter, at the instance of the Administration and with the assistance of the police, a false case was instituted against him in order to protect the informant and to save her from the case lodged by him.

In his cross-examination, he has stated that, apart from the present case, four to five other cases were pending against him in Dhanbad Court. He has further admitted that he had previously been convicted by the then Special Judge, S.C./S.T. Court and had been sentenced to pay a fine of Rs.700/-. He has stated that the said conviction and fine were imposed under the S.C./S.T. (Prevention of Atrocities) Act. The said case had been instituted by Sunita Kumari, who is the daughter of Panpati Devi. He has identified the case as G.R. Case No. 3009/95 and Dhansar P.S. Case No. 656/95. He has further stated that the present case had been instituted by the informant, Panpati Devi. According to him, the occurrence in the present case took place between 7:00 and 8:00 a.m. and not at 5:00 a.m. He has also stated that on 19.10.1997, Surendra Yadav and Laddu Yadav had neither assaulted Panpati Devi nor committed any act of "chher-chhar" (molestation) against her, nor had they humiliated her by referring to her as a member of the Harijan community.

D.W.-1-Ram Das Ravidas has stated that on 13.06.2008, between 6:30 a.m. and 8:00 a.m., while he was going to his field, he saw Rameshwar Ram, Panpati Devi, Sunita Devi, and Bipin Bihari committing Marpit with Singhasan Yadav and throwing his articles out of the room. According to this witness, after witnessing the

aforesaid occurrence, he went to Ashok Singh and informed him about the assault and the incident. Thereafter, Ashok Singh and Surendra Yadav reached the place of occurrence. Ashok Singh attempted to untie the rope with which Singhasan Yadav had been tied. At that point, Panpati Devi attempted to assault Ashok Singh with a Bhala, which was caught by Surendra Yadav. Thereafter, Ashok Singh and Surendra Yadav were assaulted with *danda*, following which they went to the police station. He has stated that Singhasan Yadav is also known as Labdu Yadav and that he had also sustained injuries. He has further stated that the house in which Singhasan Yadav resides belongs to Banke Bihari Singh and Ashok Singh. He has also stated that the informant had filed a false case with a view to saving her from the case lodged by Ashok Singh. He has further stated that the present case had been lodged on account of a land dispute.

D.W.-3-Chandra Bhusan Srivastava has deposed that in the year 1997, he was posted as a Stenographer in the office of the S.D.O., Dhanbad. He has stated that Letter No. 1876 dated 15.09.1997 was issued from the office of the S.D.O. and that the document produced is the carbon copy of the original. The said letter bears the signature of the then S.D.O., Sri Arbind Kumar Choudhary and was typed in his office.

In his cross-examination, he has stated that he did not remember who had typed the said letter, nor did he remember whether he himself had typed it. He has further stated that the S.D.O. had not put his signature on the letter in his presence. He has also stated that,

although he was officially aware of the contents of the subject matter, he had no personal knowledge thereof.

15. I have carefully considered the evidence on record, the impugned judgment and the submissions advanced by the parties. The prosecution case mainly rests upon the testimony of P.W.-1, supported by her daughter and son, P.Ws.-3 & 4 and to some extent by P.W.-5. The defence has pleaded long standing dispute between the parties regarding possession of the premises and agricultural land, previous criminal cases and false implication as a counterblast to such litigation.

16. The defence version cannot be treated as a mere bald plea. The evidence of D.Ws.-2 & 3 and the documents on record indicate the existence of prior proceedings concerning possession of the disputed premises. Significantly, P.W.-1 herself admitted that cases relating to alleged theft of coal and vegetables had previously been instituted against her husband and herself and that litigation between the parties had continued for several years. These admissions lend some substance to the defence plea of prior enmity and false implication.

17. The prosecution evidence also suffers from material deficiencies. Though the informant alleged that she was repeatedly assaulted with *lathi* and *danda*, the doctor who medically examined her was not examined and the injury report was not proved by its author. P.W.-7 merely produced a carbon copy of the injury report. Thus, there is no substantive medical evidence corroborating the alleged injuries.

18. P.W.-5, the alleged independent witness, has not materially corroborated the prosecution case. He does not support the allegations regarding caste-based abuse, molestation, threats or the alleged second occurrence near Chandmari Kanta. The evidence of P.Ws.-3 and 4, though not liable to be rejected merely because of their relationship with the informant and does not furnish satisfactory independent corroboration.

19. The allegations under Sections 3(1)(x) and 3(1)(xi) of the S.C./S.T. (Prevention of Atrocities) Act and Section 354 of the I.P.C. have not been established through clear and reliable evidence. The alleged caste-based humiliation and molestation are not adequately corroborated by independent evidence. Likewise, the prosecution has failed to satisfactorily establish the essential ingredients of Sections 341, 323, 506 and 448 of the I.P.C.

20. The learned Trial Court did not properly appreciate the material admissions of P.W.-1, the previous litigation between the parties, the absence of substantive medical evidence and the lack of independent corroboration. Even if the defence evidence is excluded from consideration, the prosecution evidence does not inspire sufficient confidence to sustain the conviction.

21. In the present case, the cumulative effect of the deficiencies in the prosecution evidence and the admitted prior hostility creates a reasonable doubt regarding the prosecution version. The appellants are, therefore, entitled to the benefit of doubt.

22. In view of above discussions and reasons, the impugned

judgment and order of conviction and sentence passed by learned Additional District & Sessions Judge-I-cum-Special Judge, (S.C.S.T.), Dhanbad in G.R. Case No. 2933 of 1997 is hereby set aside and this appeal is **allowed**.

23. Appellants are on bail, as such they are discharged from the liability of bail bonds and sureties are also discharged.

24. Pending I.A(s), if any, is also disposed of.

25. Let a copy of this judgment along with Trial Court Record be sent back to the court concerned for information and needful.

(Pradeep Kumar Srivastava, J.)

Jharkhand High Court
Dated 10/09/2026
Arpit/ ***N. A. F. R.***
Uploaded on 11/09/2026