



2026:AHC:6896-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL APPEAL U/S 413 BNSS No. - 611 of 2025

Sagar

.....Appellant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and another

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Appellant(s)	: Manish Pandey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: G.A.

Court No. - 43

HON'BLE SALIL KUMAR RAI, J.
HON'BLE DR. AJAY KUMAR-II, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the appellant and learned A.G.A. for the State-respondent.
2. Challenge in this Criminal Appeal is to the judgment dated 11.08.2025 passed by Additional District and Sessions Judge, Court No.307 of 2024 (State Vs. Bhure Balmiki), arising out of Case Crime No.07 of 2024, under Section 302 of I.P.C. and Section 4/25 of Arms Act, Police Station Nagphani, District Moradabad, whereby accused opposite party No.2 has been acquitted by Court below of the charges framed against him.
3. Brief facts of the case are that appellant-informant, who is the son of opposite party No.2, filed a written report/Tehrir Ext. Ka-1 in Police Station Nagphani, District Moradabad stating therein that he is the son of Bhure (opposite party No.2). For the past few days, he has been living with his entire family at his brother-in-law's house in Daulatbagh Balmiki Basti, they are three siblings. His mother and father about 10 years ago adopted Chhotu, who is aged about 15 years. The said Chhotu had no one to support him. His mother loved Chhotu very much and

took care of him just like she did for us. Because of this father Bhure (opposite party No.2) was jealous of his mother Smt. Baby and they used to quarrel over this matter frequently. On January 09.2022, all of them (family members) had gone to work, his both parents were at home, around 06:00 PM when he and his brother-in-law Vimal returned home, his father was leaving the house. As soon as he entered the house, he saw his mother Smt. Baby lying on the floor in the room, covered in blood and with many injuries. He immediately raised alarm and people from the neighbourhood came. Then he took his mother to District Hospital in an ambulance, where the doctor declared her dead. His father Bhure (opposite party No.2) has murdered his mother by attacking her with the sharp weapon.

4. On the aforementioned written report/Tehrir (Ext. Ka-1) of appellant, an F.I.R. was registered on 09.01.2024 against the accused Bhure Balmiki as Case Crime No.07 of 2024, under Section 302 I.P.C., Police Station- Nagphani, District- Moradabad. Thereafter the investigating officer started the investigation and papered the site plan of the place of incident, and recorded the statement of witnesses. During investigation alleged murder weapon knife was recovered at the pointing of accused and section 4/25 of Arms Act was accordingly added. Chargesheet was submitted against the accused Bhure Balmiki in Court under Section 302 IPC and Section 4/25 of Arms Act. Thereafter, cognizance was taken upon the said chargesheet and the case was committed to the Court of Sessions.

5. After hearing both the parties, charges under Section 302 IPC and Section 4/25 of Arms Act were framed against accused. However, the accused-opposite party No.2 denied the charges levelled against him and claimed trial.

6. In order to prove it's case, the prosecution adduced PW-1 informant Sagar (son of the deceased), PW-2 Deepika (daughter of deceased), PW-3 Vimal (son-in-law of deceased), PW-4 Head Moharir Ajab Singh

(author of Chik FIR), PW-5 Dr. Yogendra Singh Lambey (Autopsy Surgeon), PW-6 S.I. Ankur Malik (witness, who has prepared inquest report), PW-7 Chaman Singh (Investigating Officer) and PW-8 Shiva alias Chhotu (alleged adopted son of deceased). The witnesses adduced by the prosecution have given their respective oral evidences and also proved 17 prosecution papers and 08 material objects which were marked as exhibits. The same is tabulated herein below:-

Sl. No.	Name	Nature of evidence	Documents proved
PW-1	Sagar	Informant (son of the deceased) and witness of fact.	Written Tehrir as Ext. Ka-1
PW-2	Deepika	Daughter of deceased and witness of fact.	-
PW-3	Vimal	Son-in-law of deceased and witness of fact.	-
PW-4	Head Moharir Ajab Singh	Formal witness, who has prepared Chik FIR and made entry in GD.	FIR as Ext. Ka-2 and Kayami GD No.61 as Ext. Ka-3.
PW-5	Dr. Yogendra Singh Lambey	Autopsy Surgeon	Postmortem report of the deceased as Ext. Ka-4
PW-6	S.I. Ankur Malik	Formal witness who conducted proceeding of inquest.	Panchayatnama (inquest report as Ext. Ka-5, Police Information as Ext. Ka-6, Letter R.I. as Ext. Ka-7, Letter CMO as Ext. Ka-8, Photo-nash as Ext. Ka-9, Police Form as Ext. Ka-10, Paper No.5/18 sample seal as Ext. Ka-11, Recovery memo of knife as Ext. Ka-12.
PW-7	Chaman Singh	Investigating Officer.	Site plan as Ext. Ka-13, Cloth (in which knife was placed) as material Ext.1, Knife as material Ext.2, Cloth regarding swab as material Ext.3, Polythene of plain cotton swab as material Ext.4, Polythene of blood swab as material Ext.5, Plastic Box as material Ext.6, Mobiles as material Ext.7 and 8, Site plan of place from weapon was recovered as Ext. Ka-14, Chargesheet as Ext. Ka-15, Arrest memo on the spot as Ext. Ka-16, FSL report as Ext. Ka-17.

PW-8	Shiva alias Chhotu	Alleged adopted son of deceased.	
------	--------------------	----------------------------------	--

7. After the prosecution evidence was over, all adverse/incriminating circumstances relied upon by the prosecution were disclosed to accused in question answer form for his version of occurrence as per mandate of Section 313 Cr.P.C. Accused denied all those adverse/incriminating facts put to him and said that the prosecution case is false, he is innocent and he has not killed his wife. Vimal and Sagar had killed his wife. On the date of incident, he was in Haldawani and police has caught him from Haldawani. When police arrived at Haldawani to arrest him, then he came to know that his wife has died. Vimal promised his wife Baby to gave Rs.5 Lakh, because Baby lodged an FIR against those, in whose possession Vimal's house was for getting said house vacated. The said case was settled in the police station itself and he (Vimal) promised to give her Rs.5 lakh. When Baby demanded Rs.5 Lakh, then Vimal killed her. He has not committed any crime.

8. By the impugned judgment dated 11.08.2025, the Court below has acquitted the accused-opposite party of the charge under Sections 302 IPC and Section 4/25 of Arms Act. Thus, feeling aggrieved by the aforementioned impugned judgment passed by the Court below, the present appeal has been preferred by the informant-appellant.

9. We have heard the learned counsel for appellant as well the learned A.G.A. for State-opposite party and perused the record.

10. In the present case, informant-appellant is the son of accused, who has lodged FIR against his father for the murder of his mother. The present case is based on circumstantial evidence. Admittedly none of the prosecution witness examined, is an eye-witness of murder. However, informant-appellant Sagar PW-1 and Vimal PW-3 are the witnesses who have seen accused-opposite party leaving their house and on entering their house, they saw deceased Smt. Baby lying on the floor covered in blood with number of injuries. Therefore, prosecution case rests upon the testimony of these two witnesses i.e. PW-1 and PW-3 that they have seen

accused-opposite party coming out of his house soon after the incident and thereafter when the two witnesses entered their house, they found deceased badly injured.

11. While considering the scope of interference in an appeal against acquittal, it has been consistently held by the Supreme Court that if two views are possible, one supporting the acquittal and other indicating conviction, the High Court should not, in such a situation, reverse the order of acquittal recorded by the Court below. However, an Appellate Court must bear in mind that in case of acquittal, there is double presumption in favour of the accused. Firstly, the presumption of innocence is available to him under the fundamental principle of criminal jurisprudence that every person shall be presumed to be innocent unless he is proved guilty by a competent court of law. Secondly, the accused having secured his acquittal, the presumption of his innocence is further reinforced, reaffirmed and strengthened by Court below. It has also been observed that the Appellate Court can interfere with the order of acquittal only if it comes to a finding that the only conclusion which can be recorded on the basis of the evidence on record was that the guilt of the accused was proved beyond a reasonable doubt and no other conclusion was possible.

12. The Supreme Court in **Gamini Bala Koteswara Rao vs. State of Andra Pradesh, (2009) 10 SCC 636**, has observed that interference in an appeal against acquittal should be rare and in exceptional circumstance. It was further held that it is open to the High Court to reappraise the evidence and conclusions arrived at by the Court below. However, it is limited to those cases where the judgment of Court below was perverse. This Court went on to declare that the word "perverse", as understood in law, has been understood to mean, "against the weight of evidence". If there are two views and Court below has taken one of the views merely because another view is plausible, the Appellate Court will not be justified in interfering with the verdict of acquittal.

13. Perusal of the impugned judgment in the light of above noted well settled legal position reveals that the trial Court, while acquitting the accused, has recorded the following findings:-

i. As per First Information Report, dispute between the accused and deceased regarding adopted child Shiva alias Chhotu was the motive behind the murder of deceased by accused. However, said Shiva alias Chhotu PW-8 in his cross-examination has stated that they are six siblings and he is the second oldest son in his family, he further stated that his elder brother is Ravi. It has come in evidence that financial status of the Shiva alias Chhotu was not well-off. Shiva alias Chhotu worked as a labourer at accused tent shop and wages so earned by him, were collected by his elder brother. It could not be proved that Shiva alias Chhotu had no support. Therefore, prosecution failed to prove the aforesaid alleged motive.

ii. Sagar PW-1 in his deposition has stated that all fights and quarrels between his father (accused) and mother (deceased) took place only on account of his father's consistent demand of money required for food and drinks. In his cross-examination, he stated that his father (accused) was doing tent business and all the equipments relating to tent belonged to his father. His father used to set up tents at wedding ceremonies and was thereby earning thousand of rupees from each tent booking. His father did not gave any money to the family. However, he earlier stated that all income of his entire family remained with his mother (deceased). Both these statements were contradictory.

iii. The documents placed on record by defence proved that accused got executed a sale-deed in favour of his wife (deceased and mother of the informant) and the documents so produced by the defence make it doubtful that accused had any dispute with deceased over money. Therefore, the prosecution even failed to proved alleged second motive as narrated by informant Sagar as PW-1 in his deposition.

iv. Hemendra Singh DW-1 has proved that informant PW-1 remained present in Kanha Gaushala, Municipal Corporation, Moradabaad on 09.01.2024 from 01:05 PM to 06:40 PM, which evidence raises suspicion on the presence of informant at the time of incident.

v. Sagar PW-1 in his deposition at one place stated that the time of incident is 12:00 noon, and at another place has stated that time of incident is 07:00 PM. Informant inspite of improving time of incident could not state the correct time of incident. At another place he admitted that his duty timings were from 01:00 PM to 07:00 PM and he had returned at 05:30 PM on the day of incident. He had also stated that they arrived on spot at about 12:00 noon and took his mother in an ambulance at 01:30 PM, his whole depositions as far as timing of incident and his arrival on the spot is concerned is full of contradiction, which further cast doubt on the veracity of deposition of Vimal-PW-3.

vi. Deepika PW-2 (who is the real sister of informant and wife of Vimal PW-3) has stated in deposition that at the time of incident she was in her in-law's

house. She further stated she got information of the incident from her husband.

vii. It has come in the evidence of Shiva alias Chhotu PW-8 that Akash (who is the son of deceased) and accused was not doing any work and there is no evidence that at the time of incident where said Akash was. Akash was shown as a witness in the charge-sheet, however he has been discharged from prosecution evidence on the request of prosecution.

viii. There is no independent witness of recovery of alleged weapon of crime i.e. knife.

ix. As per report of Forensic Science Laboratory, i.e. Ext. Ka-17, human blood is found on the alleged murder weapon. However, no blood sample of the deceased was taken, so as to compare the same with the blood found on the murder weapon. Therefore, failure to collect blood sample of the deceased and resultantly inability to match the blood sample casts doubt on the alleged recovery.

x. The recovery of alleged murder weapon at the pointing of the accused is not sufficient to convict accused for the crime of murder, unless it is proved that the accused used such weapon in the commission of offence.

xi. From the evidence of Hemendra Singh DW-1 it is concluded that the informant was not present at 06:00 PM on the alleged place of incident. Thereby the very prosecution story as narrated in First Information Report as well evidence of the prosecution witnesses becomes suspicious. No person from the locality was present at the time of alleged recovery of murder weapon, such as ward member, municipal councilor etc.

xii. The postmortem report of deceased reveals 10 sharp cut injuries, and in this background, when 10 blows of sharp edged weapon were inflicted on the body of the deceased, yet she did not cry. If such serious injuries were inflicted by the accused, then why no blood was seen on the cloth of accused by any of the witnesses. There is no evidence that whether or not there were blood stains on accused's cloths or not.

xiii. There is no other witness except PW1 and PW-3 of the incident. Presence of PW-1 has been found to be doubtful, which automatically cast doubt on the presence of PW-3 as well. Therefore, the involvement of accused in the present case is not proved.

xiv. First Information Report in the present case was lodged after consultations and deliberations and such an FIR is fatal to the prosecution case.

xv. Investigating Officer did not exercise due diligence regarding the involvement of accused in the present case. There is complete lack of thorough investigation and the investigating officer has filed the chargesheet without analysing and investigating the surrounding circumstances of present case.

xvi. The prosecution has completely failed to prove the charges levelled against accused under Section 302 Indian Penal Code and Section 4/25 of Arms Act, beyond reasonable doubt.

14. After recording our findings, the trial court has granted the benefit of doubt to the accused/opposite party and thus acquitted him of the charges framed against him.

15. Undisputedly, the present case rests on circumstantial evidence. Law with regard to evaluation of a case based on circumstantial evidence stands crystallized in the judgment of Apex Court in **Sharad Birdhichand Sarda v. State of Maharashtra, (1984) 4 SCC 116**. Paragraphs 153 to 154 of the report are relevant and accordingly, the same are reproduced herein below:-

"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

*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 v. State of Maharashtra** where the following observations were made: (SCC para 19, p. 807)*

19. ... 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."

16. Informant-appellant as PW-1 in his deposition as recorded in the impugned judgment has stated that he arrived at his home at around 06:00 PM in the evening and saw his father leaving their house. However, in his cross-examination he first stated the time of incident to be 12:00 noon, and thereafter said that incident occurred at 07:00 PM. This witness in his further cross-examination has also stated that his brother-in-law Vimal met him at 11:00 to 12:00 in Daulatabagh from where they went to Katghar and from Katghar they came to their house. He further stated that they arrived their house at around 12:00 noon. This statement of witness is further fortified by his deposition, wherein he stated that he took his mother to hospital in ambulance at 01:30 PM. In the written Tehrir Ext. Ka-1 the time of incident has been stated to be 06:00 PM, whereas this witness in his cross-examination is not consistent on the time of his arrival in his house and/or the incident. Therefore, inconsistencies in his statement regarding time, when he actually arrived on spot are so apparent that his very presence on spot becomes suspicious.

17. Moreover in the background of inconsistencies regarding time of arrival of PW-1 in his house, the defence has produced oral as well as documentary evidence, whereby it is apparent that he was on duty from 12:00 noon to 07:00 PM. Which fact also raises serious doubt on his presence at the spot on the time of incident as narrated in FIR. When presence of informant-appellant PW-1 becomes doubtful, the presence of other witness Vimal PW-3 automatically becomes doubtful.

18. Vimal PW-3 in his deposition has stated that they arrived at about 06:00 PM on the spot. Moreover, PW-3 in his cross-examination has admitted that he was inside Court, when deposition of his wife as PW-2 was being recorded in the Court and he was on his mobile and was using his Whatsapp when Presiding Officer was sitting on dias. Further cross-

examination of this witness revealed that he visited his friend Vikram at around 10:30 in the morning in Daulatabagh. Whereas informant-appellant PW-1 in his cross-examination has stated that he met his brother Vimal PW-3 at around 12:00. PW-1 further stated that he went to the house of his brother-in-law and arrived there at about 09:00 AM and he stayed there for about 15-20 minutes. From there his brother-in-law took him to Gulabbari, where he stayed for about half an hour, and from there they arrived at Daulatabagh. However, Vimal PW-3 in his deposition has stated that informant-appellant met him in Daulatabagh after finishing his duty, where he went to take money from his friend. Therefore, there is a sharp contradiction in the depositions of these witnesses regarding their meeting, which took place earlier in the morning of the fateful day of the incident.

19. In the totality of the circumstances, the very presence of informant-appellant PW-1 at the date, time and place of incident seems to be doubtful, which automatically makes the presence of his brother-in-law Vimal PW-3 doubtful, more so in the light of sharp contradictions in their depositions as noted above.

20. It is the case of prosecution that alleged murder weapon was recovered at the pointing of accused, however no independent witness of alleged recovery has been produced. The said murder weapon i.e. knife was sent to FSL and vide FSL report Ext. Ka-17 human blood was found on it. However, no blood sample of the deceased was taken, therefore, the blood found on the alleged murder weapon could not be compared with the blood of the deceased.

21. Defence has examined Hemendra Singh as DW-1 and deposition of DW-1 is clear that informant-appellant was present on his duty from 01:05 PM to 06:40 PM. This defence witness has produced the attendance register in the trial court and informant-appellant PW-1 in his deposition has stated that whenever he used to come earlier, the guard of Kanha Gaushala used to enter his time of exit. DW-1 further stated that he came out of Kanha Gaushala at 05:30 PM on the date of incident and

said time was recorded by guard in the register. However, DW-1 in his deposition has given a consistent statement that informant-appellant was present in Kanha Gaushala from 01:05 PM to 06:60 PM on 09.01.2024. This witness i.e. DW-1 in his cross-examination further stated that time of entry and exit is being recorded by the concerned employee himself. In the light of deposition of this witness time of entry and exit has been recorded by informant-appellant himself to be 01:05 PM to 06:40 PM respectively, therefore, his presence in the Kanha Gaushala in between is established. There is no mention of his exit at 05:30 PM from the Kanha Gaushala, therefore, the defence has successfully established the presence of informant-appellant PW-1 in Kanha Gaushala at the relevant time of incident.

22. In written report/ Tehrir Ext. Ka-1 the motive of murder was stated to be love and affection shown by informant-appellant's mother towards his alleged adopted son Chhotu which was not liked to by informant-appellant's father i.e. accused Bhure. However, the prosecution has failed to prove that said Chhotu, who has been examined as PW-8 in prosecution case was the adopted son of deceased. The deposition of Shiva alias Chhotu PW-8 established that he belongs to another family and was working with deceased in his tent business and whatever wages were earned by him were received by his elder brother. Therefore, the prosecution has failed to prove the motive as alleged in the first information report. Informant-appellant Sagar PW-1 in his deposition has stated another motive of the incident that his father was consistently demanding money for his food and drinks. As all income of his entire family remained with his mother. Therefore, there was consistent fighting and quarrel between his father (accused) and mother (deceased). However, in his deposition it has come on record that his father was earning well, where Chhotu PW-8 was also working and earning wages. It has also come on record that accused got a sale deed in the name of his wife i.e. deceased. Meaning thereby that there was no financial dispute between accused and deceased. Therefore, prosecution also failed to prove the second motive developed during the course of evidence. The

present case is based on circumstantial evidence, therefore, motive is relevant, more so when specific motive is assigned in first information report, but prosecution has failed to prove the said motive and even subsequent motive developed during course of evidence could also not be proved by prosecution. Therefore, the whole prosecution story is surrounded by suspicious circumstances.

23. Apex Court in the case of "**Bhaskarrao and others Vs. State of Maharashtra**", (2018) 6 SCC 591 has observed in Paragraph Nos. 14, 15, and 23 as under:-

*"14. As the trial court and High Court, having appreciated the evidence on record, has come to diametrically opposite conclusions, mandating herein to observe certain witness statements which may have an important bearing in this case. In the processes of appreciating the evidence at the appellate stage, we need to keep in mind the views of this court as expressed in **Tota Singh and Anr. v. State of Punjab**, 1987 Cri LJ 974.*

"The High Court has not found in its judgment that the reasons given by the learned Sessions Judge for discarding the testimony of PW2 and PW 6 were either unreasonable or perverse. What the High Court has done is to make an independent reappraisal of the evidence on its own and to set aside the acquittal merely on the ground that as a result of such re-appreciation, the High Court was inclined to reach conclusion different from the one recorded by the learned Sessions Judge.

This Court has repeatedly pointed out that the mere fact that the Appellate Court is inclined on a re-appreciation of the evidence to reach a conclusion which is at variance with the one recorded in the order of acquittal passed by the Court below will not constitute a valid and sufficient ground for setting aside the acquittal. The jurisdiction of the Appellate Court in dealing with an appeal against an order of acquittal is circumscribed by the limitation that no interference is to be made with the order of acquittal unless the approach made by the lower Court to the consideration of the evidence in the case is vitiated by some manifest illegality or the conclusion recorded by the Court below is such which could not have been possibly arrived at by any court acting reasonably and judiciously and is, therefore, liable to be characterized as perverse.

Where two views are possible on an appraisal of the evidence adduced in the case and the court below has taken a view which is plausible one, the Appellate Court cannot legally interfere with an order of acquittal even if it is of the opinion that the view taken by the Court below on its consideration of the evidence is erroneous."

15. In **Ramesh Babulal Doshi v. State of Gujarat, 1996 CriLJ 2867**, this Court observed:

“This Court has repeatedly laid down that the mere fact that a view other than the one taken by the trial Court can be legitimately arrived at by the appellate Court on reappraisal of the evidence cannot constitute a valid and sufficient ground to interfere with an order of acquittal unless it comes to the conclusion that the entire approach of the trial Court in dealing with the evidence was patently illegal or the conclusions arrived at by it were wholly untenable. While sitting in judgment over an acquittal the appellate Court is first required to seek an answer to the question whether the findings of the trial Court are palpably wrong, manifestly erroneous or demonstrably unsustainable. If the appellate court answers the above question in the negative the order of acquittal is not to be disturbed.”

*“23. Before we proceed to analysis of the case, we must first focus on the aspect concerning the standard the High Court has to apply, while hearing a case against an acquittal order of the trial court. In the case on hand, the trial court, followed by a fullfledged trial, comes to the conclusion and by cogent reasoning acquits the accused. In such a case the appellate Court is further burdened with the task of reaffirming the innocence of the accused. In such cases, the appellate Court is expected to be very cautious and its interference with the order of acquittal is called for only when there are compelling reasons and substantial grounds. In other words, the High Court has full power to review the evidence upon which an order of acquittal is founded, yet the presumption of innocence of the accused being further reinforced by his acquittal by the trial Court, the findings of that Court which had the advantage of seeing the witnesses and hearing their evidence can be reversed only for very substantial and compelling reasons (refer **Surajpal Singh & Ors. v. The State, 1952 Cri LJ 331**)”.*

24. Keeping in view the above referred discussion and the law laid down by Supreme Court, it can be safely concluded that the impugned judgment of trial Court is based on sound reasons. We do not find any perversity in the judgment so as to interfere with the findings returned by Court below. The conclusion drawn by Court below is the outcome of due appreciation of evidence on record. No misreading or omission could be pointed out by the learned counsel for appellant. Being the last Court of fact, we have ourselves evaluated the evidence on record to find out whether there is any perversity in the impugned judgment or Court below has misconstrued any material evidence. However, we could not gather any such fact from the record so as to conclude that the conclusion drawn by Court below is against the weight of evidence on record. It thus, cannot be said that only the view consistent with the guilt

of accused is possible as per the evidence on record. We, therefore, do not find any good ground to entertain the present appeal filed under Section 413 BNSS, which consequently fails and is, accordingly **dismissed.**

25. The file be consigned to record after certifying the judgment of this Court to the trial Court.

(Dr. Ajay Kumar-II,J.) (Salil Kumar Rai,J.)

January 12, 2026

Ashish/-