APHC010196832019

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI

MONDAY, THE 26th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K SURESH REDDY

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE BALAJI MEDAMALLI

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO: 541 OF 2019

Between:

SanaboinaSuryanarayana @Surayya and Surya, S/o.Viswanatham, age 39 years, OCC Painter,R/o Dongavaripalem, PenugondaMandal, West Godavari Dist

...Petitioner

AND

STATE OF AP, Rep by its Public Prosecutor, High Court of Andhra Pradesh.

...Respondent

Appeal under Section 372/374(2)/378(4) of Cr.P.C praying that the High Court may be pleased to appellant is accused No 1 in S.C.No.316 of 2014 on the file of the Ld.IVAddl. District and Sessions Judge, Tanuku. The appellant is constrained to file this Criminal Appeal before this Hon'ble Court aggrieved by the conviction and sentence dated 28-12-2018 passed in S.C.No.316 of 2014 on the file of the Ld. IV. Addl. District and Sessions Judge, Tanuku

IA NO: 1 OF 2019

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to condone the delay of 127 days in filing the present Appeal against conviction and sentence dated 28-12-2018 passed in SC.No.316/2014 on the file of the IV Addl. District & Sessions Judge, Tanuku, West Godavari District, and pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2024

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to. suspend the execution of sentence passed in S.C. No. 316 of 2014 dated 28-12-2018 on the file of learned IV Additional District and Sessions Judge, Tanuku and to release the Petitioner/appellant/Al on Bail pending disposal of the above Crl. A. No. 316 of 2014 and pass

IA NO: 2 OF 2024

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to suspend the execution of sentence passed in S.C. No. 316 of 2014 dated 28-12-2018 on the file of learned IV Additional District and Sessions Judge, Tanuku and to release the Petitioner/appellant/A1 on bail pending disposal of the above Crl.A. No. 316 of 2014 and pass

AND

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO: 471 OF 2020

Between:

PECHETTI AMALA, s/o Satya Venkata Vara Prasad Age. 22 years Southern Street, Near Ashoka Wheel, ELURU, Now Lodged in Spl. Prison for Women, Rajamahendravaram, Vide CT No. 542

...Petitioner

AND

The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, Through the Inspector of Police, Penugonda Circle, Penugonda, West Godavari Dist.

...Respondent

Appeal under Section 372/374(2)/378(4) of Cr.P.C praying that the High Court may be pleased to Aggrieved by the Judgment passed in S.C. No. 316 of 2014 dated 28.12.2018 on the file of the Court of the IV Addl. District and Sessions Judge, Tanuku, West Godavari district

IA NO: 1 OF 2020

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to suspend the judgment imposed in the judgment dated 28.12.2020 passed in the S.C. No. 316 of 2014 by the Learned IV Addl. District & Sessions Judge, Tanuku, West Godavari district and release the petitioner on bail, pending disposal of the CRLA and pass such other

IA NO: 2 OF 2020

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to condone the delay of days in filing the Criminal Appeal against the Order Passed in S.C. No. 316 of 2014 dated 28.12.2018 on the file of the Court of the IV Addl. District & Sessions Judge, Tanuku, West Godavari district and pass such

IA NO: 1 OF 2024

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to suspend the execution of sentence passed in S.C.No. 316/2014 dated28.12.2018 on the file of IV Additional District &Sessions Judge, Tanuku and release the petitioner on bail in Crl.A.No.471of 2020 which is pending before this Hon'ble court, in the interest of justice

IA NO: 2 OF 2024

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to suspend the execution of sentence passed in S.C. No. 316 of 2014 dated 28-12-2018 on the file of learned IV Additional District and Sessions Judge, Tanuku and to release the Petitioner/appellant/A2 on Bail pending disposal of the above Crl.A. No. 316 of 2014 and pass

The Court made the following COMMON JUDGMENT:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K SURESH REDDY

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE BALAJI MEDAMALLI

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.541 OF 2019

AND

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.471 OF 2020

COMMON JUDGMENT:- *(Per the Hon'ble Sri Justice K.Suresh Reddy)*

1) As both the Appeals arise out of the same Sessions Case i.e., S.C.No.316 of 2014 on the file of the Court of IV Additional District & Sessions Judge, Tanuku, they are taken up together and being disposed of by way of this common judgment.

2) A1 in the above Sessions Case, has preferred Crl.A.No.541 of 2019, whereas A2 has preferred Crl.A.No.471 of 2020.

3) Both the accused were tried by the learned IV Additional District & Sessions Judge, under the following charges:

> "1st charge was *under Section 364 r/w.34 IPC against both the Accused.*
>
> *2nd charge was under Section 302 r/w.34 IPC against both the Accused."*

4) Substance of the charge is that, on 02.12.2012 at about 10.00 PM both the accused, in furtherance of their common intention, kidnapped one Petcheti Satya Venkata Vara Prasad (hereinafter

referred to as the "**deceased**"), who is none other than the husband of A2, as A1 & A2 were having illegal intimacy, and when the deceased and A2 went to first show movie, and in the same process A1 & A2 caused the death of the deceased by hacking him with MO.14 & MO.15 thereby committed offences punishable under Sections 364 and 302 r/w.34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short "**IPC.**")

5) After completion of trial, the learned IV Additional District & Sessions Judge convicted both the accused under Section 302 IPC and sentenced them to suffer imprisonment for life and also to pay a fine of Rs.1,000/- each; in default, to suffer simple imprisonment for two months. However, both the accused were acquitted of the offence punishable under Section 364 IPC

6) Aggrieved by the said conviction and sentence, both the accused preferred the present Criminal Appeals.

7) Case of the prosecution, as emanated from the evidence of prosecution witnesses, briefly, is as follows:

i) A1 is a resident of Dongavaripalem Village, Penugonda Mandal. A2 is a resident of Eluru Town. The deceased is none other than the husband of A2. A1 is none other the husband of elder sister of A2. A1 was eking out his livelihood by doing painting work.

The deceased was an Electrician by profession. The deceased was suffering from slight stammering and deafness.

ii) Marriage between the deceased and A2 was performed on 09.03.2012 at Penugonda village. As the father of A2 was residing in Dubai, A1 looked after the marriage affairs of A2. It is said that A2 was having extra marital relationship with A1 even prior to her marriage. A2 used to move closely with A1.

iii) After marriage, in the month of April 2012, A1 went to Dubai where he was working. Even thereafter, A2 used to telephone A1, on which A1 returned from Dubai in the month of October 2012. As the deceased became an obstacle, for their relationship, they decided to eliminate the deceased to continue their illegal intimacy. Thereafter, A1 went to his native place Dongavaripalem village. Since then, both the accused were waiting for an opportunity and they continued their illegal intimacy.

iv) In pursuance of their plan, A1 asked A2 to take the deceased to a movie and, thereafter, they can execute the plan. Accordingly, on 02.12.2012, A2 took the deceased to watch a movie. Both of them went to movie on the motorcycle belonging to the deceased, which was marked as MO.1. After watching the

movie, A2 informed the deceased that A1 asked them to come to Dongavaripalem village. Accordingly, the deceased and A2 went to Ashram Hospital, Tanuku. Then, A1 met the deceased and A2 at Ashram Hospital. All the three went on the motorcycle towards Tadepalligudem side. After reaching Dongavaripalem village, A1 diverted the motorcycle towards left side on the main road and proceeded ahead for five minutes. Thereafter, stopped the motorcycle in isolated place. It was around 2.00 A.M. to 3.00 A.M. on 03.12.2012. Thereafter, A2 caught hold of the deceased and A1 attacked the deceased with MO.14 (sickle) and MO.15 (blade). The deceased succumbed to injuries on the spot. Thereafter, A2 went to the house of her sister (house of A1) and informed her stating that someone kidnapped the deceased at Dongavaripalem village in a car and she escaped from their clutches and reached the house of her sister.

v) As the deceased did not return home, on the next day morning, the father of the deceased (PW6) went to the Police Station and gave a Report (Ex.P14).

vi) On 03.12.2012, PW25-Head Constable, Eluru I Town Police Station, received the Report (Ex.P14) from PW6 and registered a case in Crime No.270 of 2012 under Sections 341, 363 & 419 r/w.34 IPC. PW6 gave the said report on the basis of information

given by A2. PW25 issued copies of First Information Report (for short "**FIR**") to all the concerned. FIR was marked as Ex.P15.

vii) At about 1.00 P.M., on the same day, PW25 went to the river bund of Dongavaripalem village and seized MO.1 to MO.6 under a panchanama (Ex.P2) in the presence of mediator PW17. PW25 also got the scene photographed through PW22. Photographs were marked as Ex.P10 and C.D. was marked as Ex.P11.

viii) Further investigation was taken over by Sub-Inspector of Police (PW26), Eluru I Town Police Station, who verified the investigation conducted by PW25 and found it in correct lines.

ix) On 09.12.2012, PW26 recorded statement of PW6 and transferred the FIR to Penugonda Police Station, as the Penugonda Police has already registered another crime.

x) In the meanwhile, on 04.12.2012, PW1-maternal uncle of the deceased gave a report to the police. On the basis of which, Sub-Inspector of Police (PW27), Penugonda Police Station, registered a case in Crime No.148 of 2012 under Section 302 IPC and issued copies of FIR to all the concerned. FIR was marked as Ex.P16. Report of PW1 was marked as Ex.P1.

xi) PW1, in Ex.P1-report, stated that, on the information furnished by A2, they went to the scene-of-offence and found the motorcycle (MO.1) and the dead body at the scene-of-offence.

xii) On 04.12.2012, PW28-Inspector of Police, Penugonda Circle, took up investigation. He recorded statement of PW1. He secured the presence of mediators PW17 and others, visited the scene-of-offence situated in between two bridges at Dongavaripalem village. He found the dead body of the deceased with injuries. He prepared Scene Observation Report (Ex.P3) at the scene-of-offence and got the scene photographed through PW22. Photographs and C.D. were marked as Ex.P12 & Ex.P13. He secured the presence of PW2 to PW5 & PW7 to PW9 and recorded their statements. He held inquest over the dead body of the deceased in the presence of Mediators (PW17) and others. Inquest Report was marked as Ex.P4. Thereafter, PW28 sent the dead body of the deceased for post-mortem examination.

xiii) On 05.12.2012, PW21-Civil Assistant Surgeon, Government Hospital, Tanuku, conducted autopsy over the dead body of the deceased. He opined the cause of death was due to *"shock and haemorrhage because of ante-mortem injuries."* He issued post-mortem Certificate on 12.07.2013, which was marked as Ex.P9.

xiv) After post-mortem, PW28-Inspector of Police collected blood stained clothes (MO.8 & MO.9) and wrist watch (MO.10) worn by the deceased.

xv) On 05.12.2012, PW28-Inspector of Police sent PW23 (Police Constable) and PW24 (Head Constable) to Chennai Airport to serve Section 160 Cr.P.C. notice against A1. In the meanwhile, after executing the murder on 03.12.2012, A1 went to Dubai and landed there on 04.12.2012 and on the very next day i.e., 05.12.2012, A1 boarded a plane at Dubai and reached Chennai Airport on 06.12.2012. On reaching the Chennai Airport, PW23 apprehended A1 and produced him before the Investigating Officer (PW28).

xvi) On 07.12.2012, A2 was produced before PW28 by one Padala Nagamani stating that she confessed about the commission of murder of her husband. PW28 recorded the statement of the said Padala Nagamani under Section 164 Cr.P.C., which was marked as Ex.P20. As the said Padala Nagamani was no more, her evidence could not be recorded during the course of trial.

xvii) On inquiry, A1 also said to have confessed about the commission-of-offence before PW28. Thereafter, PW28 arrested both the accused, who were remanded to judicial custody.

PW28 also seized the passport (Ex.P17) and flight ticket (Ex.P18) from A1. On the confession made by A1, PW28 seized MO.13 to MO.16 near Old Bridge situated in between Dongavaripalem and Siddantham, in the presence of PW17 and another under a panchanama (Ex.P5). Thereafter, PW28 added Sections 34 & 118 IPC under a Memo (Ex.P19).

xviii) On 08.12.2012, PW28 recorded statements of PW6 to PW11. On 09.12.2012, he visited Aswini Lodge, Tanuku, and recorded statements of PW12 & PW13. On 10.12.2012, he recorded statements of PW14, PW15 and others. On 11.12.2012, he recorded statements of PW16 and others. He also filed a Memo on 28.12.2012 with a requisition to record statements of PW9 to PW11 under Section 164 Cr.P.C. On 09.04.2013, he received copies of FIR in Crime No.270 of 2012 of Eluru I Town Police Station. He sent the material objects to RFSL. RFSL Report was marked as Ex.P8. After securing all the documents and after completion of investigation, PW28 filed charge-sheet.

8) In support of its case, prosecution examined PW1 to PW28, marked Ex.P1 to Ex.P20 and exhibited MOs.1 to 16.

9) When the accused were examined under Section 313 Cr.P.C., they denied the incriminating evidence appearing against them.

10) Accepting the evidence of prosecution witnesses, the learned IV Additional District & Sessions Judge convicted the accused as aforesaid.

11) Heard Dr.Challa Srinivasa Reddy, learned Counsel for the appellants/accused, in both the Criminal Appeals, and Sri Marri Venkata Ramana, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent/State.

12) Learned Counsel for the appellants strenuously contends that there are no eye witnesses, in the present case, and the prosecution rests its case on the basis of circumstantial evidence. He further contends that the prosecution has not established a single circumstance to connect both the accused with the alleged offence. He further contends that the ocular version spoken to by the prosecution witnesses was not corroborated by the medical evidence. He further contends that PW21 (Civil Assistant Surgeon) in his cross-examination admitted that death of the deceased occurred six to ten days prior to the date of post-mortem i.e., on 05.12.2012. He further contends that the prosecution has absolutely not adduced any evidence to establish the illegal intimacy between A1 and A2. As such, he requests this Court to allow the Appeals by setting aside conviction and sentence recorded by learned IV Additional District & Sessions Judge, Tanuku.

13) On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the Appeals contending that the prosecution could able to establish “Motive” for the accused to kill the deceased through the evidence of PW1, PW2 & PW5 to PW9. He further contends that prosecution was able to establish “Last Scene Theory” through the evidence of PW6, PW7 & PW9 to PW11. He also contends that prosecution could able to establish the homicidal death of the deceased. He further contends that, though the prosecution could able to prove “Last Seen Theory”, there was no explanation on the part of A2 as required under Section 106 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 (for short “**IEA**”). However, he contended that immediately after the incident i.e., on 02.12.2012, A1 left for Dubai on 03.12.2012 and returned on 06.12.2012. Further, MO.13 to MO.16 i.e., blood stained clothes of the deceased and weapons used for commission of offence were recovered, at the instance of the accused, from bushes nearby scene-of-offence. He also contends that RFSL Report (Ex.P8) shows that MO.13 to MO.16 contains human blood. As such, learned Additional Public Prosecutor contends that all the circumstances relied on by the prosecution have been established the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt. As such, he requests this Court to dismiss both the Appeals by confirming the conviction and sentence passed by the learned IV Additional District & Sessions Judge, Tanuku.

14) We have carefully scrutinized the entire evidence available on record.

15) The first circumstance relied upon by the prosecution is "**Motive**" for the accused to kill the deceased.

i) PW1, PW2 & PW5 to PW9 were examined to establish the "Motive". PW1 is the maternal uncle of the deceased. PW2 is the elder brother of the deceased. PW5 is the neighbour of PW1. PW6 & PW7 are parents of the deceased. PW8 is the known person. PW9 is the maid in the house of the deceased.

ii) All these witnesses i.e., PW1, PW2 & PW5 to PW9 in their evidence have categorically stated that A1 & A2 were moving closely and they were acquainted with each other.

iii) PW6, in his evidence, has stated that on one day he noticed A1 slept on a cot in his house and A2 was sitting on his lap and he chastised both A1 and A2.

iv) The evidence of PW1, PW2 & PW5 to PW9 consistently disclose that both A1 and A2 were having illegal intimacy.

16) Coming to second circumstance relied upon by the prosecution i.e., "**Last Seen Theory**", the prosecution relied on the evidence of PW6, PW7 & PW9 to PW11.

i) PW6 & PW7 in their evidence have categorically stated that on the evening of 02.12.2012, A2 and the deceased went to watch a first show movie and did not return till 9.15 PM. They searched for the deceased and A2 till midnight. On the next day morning, sister of A2 i.e., wife of A1 informed PW6 stating that A2 came to her house and informed stating that on the previous night someone kidnapped the deceased in a car and she escaped from their clutches and reached her home. Having got the said information, PW6 went to the house of the sister of A2 and inquired with A2, who informed him stating that between 2.00 AM to 3.00 AM on 03.12.2012 some unknown persons kidnapped the deceased in a car and beat him. He was also informed by A2 that she escaped from their clutches and reached the house of his sister (husband of A1). Having received the said information from A2, PW6 went to the Police Station and set the criminal law into motion.

ii) On the basis of such information, furnished by PW6, PW25 registered a case in Crime No.270 of 2012 of Eluru I Town Police Station.

iii) PW9, in her evidence, has stated that A2 along with the deceased went to watch a movie on 02.12.2012 and did not return.

iv) PW10, in his evidence, has stated that on 02.12.2012 he went to Satyanarayana Theatre, Eluru to watch a movie. After watching movie, the deceased informed PW10 stating that they were going towards Ashram Hospital, Eluru as A1 was waiting there. Thereafter A1 and the deceased left towards Tanuku.

v) PW11, in his evidence, has stated that at about 9.45 PM on 02.12.2012 while he was returning from Kurellagudem, he got down at Ashram Hospital and when he was waiting for auto, he noticed the deceased and A2 standing at the bus stop. He also noticed A1 present along with them. Thereafter, A1 drove the motorcycle on which the deceased and A2 sat as pillion riders. He further stated that they proceeded towards Tadepalligudem.

17) Apart from the evidence of PW6, PW7 & PW9 to PW11, the version of A2 also show that she along with the deceased went to watch a movie and from there, they went towards Ashram Hospital from where some unknown persons kidnapped the deceased in a car. As such, the prosecution could able to establish the “Last Seen Theory” of the deceased in the company of A1 and A2 on the fateful day, at the relevant point of time.

18) Coming to the next circumstance i.e., "**Explanation in terms of Section 106 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872**".

i) Admittedly, A2 went along with the deceased to watch a movie on the evening of 02.12.2012. Thereafter, the dead body of the deceased was found on 04.12.2012. The prosecution could able to establish that the deceased met with homicidal death, as such, it is incumbent on the part of A2 to offer explanation in terms of Section 106 of IEA.

ii) In-stead of giving explanation, as required under Section 106 of IEA, A2 came up with a false explanation stating that some unknown persons kidnapped the deceased in a car. As such, this circumstance can be taken as additional circumstance connecting the accused with the offence.

19) Coming to Ex.P17 & Ex.P18 i.e., Passport and Air Ticket of A1 are concerned, the incident took place on 02.12.2012. On the very next day, A1 boarded a flight at Hyderabad Airport and reached Dubai on 04.12.2012. Immediately on the very next day i.e., 05.12.2012 again A1 boarded a flight at Dubai and reached Chennai Airport on 06.12.2012. Immediately, after landing, PW23-Head Constable apprehended A1 and handed over to PW28 (Inspector of Police) on 07.12.2012.

20) Ex.P17 (Passport) and Ex.P18 (Air Ticket) of A1 clearly show that on the following day of the incident, A1 left for Dubai and returned to India on 06.12.2012. Further, A1 did not give any reason as to why he went to Dubai on 03.12.2012 and returned to India on 06.12.2012. As A2 has already confessed about commission of offence, A1 returned to India thinking that the investigating officer may take coercive steps in bringing him back to India from Dubai. Further, the investigating officer in his evidence has stated that he arrested both the accused on 07.12.2012. PW28 further stated that on the confession made by A1, he seized MO.13 to MO.16 in the presence of PW17 and another. Further, as seen from the RFSL report (Ex.P8), MO.13 to MO.16 contain human blood. As such, the prosecution could able to establish all the circumstances pointing the guilt towards accused alone.

21) The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Sharad Birdhi Chand Sarda Vs. State Of Maharashtra***[1] held as follows:

> "**153**. A close analysis of this decision would show that the following conditions must be fulfilled before a case against an accused can be said to be fully established:
>
> *(1)* the circumstances from which the conclusion of guilt is to be drawn should be fully established.

[1] 1984 Supreme Court Cases (Cri) 487

It may be noted here that this Court indicated that the circumstances concerned 'must or should' and not 'may be' established. There is not only a grammatical but a legal distinction between 'may be proved' and 'must be or should be proved' as was held by this Court in *Shivaji Sahabrao Bobade & Anr. v. State of Maharashtra* where the observations were made: [CC para 19, p.807: SCC (Cri) p. 1047]

"Certainly, it is a primary principle that the accused *must* be and not merely *may* be guilty before a court can convict and the mental distance between 'may be' and 'must be' is long and divides vague conjectures from sure conclusions."

(2) The facts so established should be consistent only with the hypothesis of the guilt of the accused, that is to say, they should not be explainable on any other hypothesis except that the accused is guilty,

(3) the circumstances should be of a conclusive nature and tendency,

(4) they should exclude every possible hypothesis except the one to be proved, and

(5) there must be a chain of evidence so complete as not to leave any reasonable ground for the conclusion consistent with the innocence of the accused and must show that in all human probability the act must have been done by the accused.

154. These five golden principles, if we may say so, constitute the panchsheel of the proof of a case based on circumstantial evidence."

22) Having analysed the entire evidence carefully, we have no hesitation to come to the conclusion that the prosecution could able to establish all the circumstances pointing out the guilt towards accused and to none others. As such, there are no grounds to interfere with the conviction and sentence recorded by the learned Additional District & Sessions Judge. Accordingly, the Criminal Appeals are liable to be dismissed.

23) In the result, Criminal Appeals are **dismissed**, confirming the conviction and sentence recorded against the appellants/accused No.1 and 2 vide Judgment, dated 28.12.2018, in Sessions Case No.316 of 2014 by the learned IV Additional District & Sessions Judge, Tanuku, for the offence under Section 302 of I.P.C.

24) As the appellants were released on bail by Orders, dated 26.07.2024 & 05.09.2024, vide I.A.No.2 of 2024, in terms of the Order passed by the Combined High Court in ***Batchu Rangarao and Others Vs. The State of Andhra Pradesh***[2], they are directed to surrender before the learned IV Additional District & Sessions Judge, Tanuku, to serve the remaining part of sentence, failing which the learned IV Additional District & Sessions Judge, Tanuku, is directed to secure the presence of the appellants by issuing non-bailable warrants and commit them to prison for serving the remaining part of the sentence.

[2] Crl.A.M.P.No.1687 of 2016 in Crl. A. No.607 of 2011

Needless to state that period undergone by the appellants/accused shall be given set-off as per the provisions of Section 428 of Cr.P.C.

Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, in both the Criminal Appeals, shall stand closed in consequence.

JUSTICE K. SURESH REDDY

JUSTICE BALAJI MEDAMALLI

Date: 26.10.2026
SM…

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K SURESH REDDY

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE BALAJI MEDAMALLI

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.541 OF 2019

AND

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.471 OF 2020

Dated: 26.10.2026

SM…