

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO(s). 937 OF 2005

STATE OF RAJASTHAN  
Appellant (s)

VERSUS

TALEVAR AND ANR.  
Respondent (s)

WITH APPEAL(CRL) NO. 1636 of 2005  
[GHURELAL & ORS. V. STATE OF RAJASTHAN]

HEARD BY:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE B.S. CHAUHAN  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SWATANTER KUMAR  
[VACATION BENCH]

Date: 17/06/2011 These Appeals were called on for  
pronouncement of judgment today.

For Appellant(s)  
in Crl.A. 937 Mr. Milind Kumar, Adv.

In Crl.A. 1636 Mr. Altaf Husain, Adv.  
Mr. Harbans Lal Bajaj, Adv.

For Respondent(s)  
in Crl.A. 937 Mr. Altaf Hussain, Adv.  
Mr. Harbans Lal Bajaj, Adv.

In Crl.A. 1636 Mr. Milind Kumar, Adv.

\*\*\*\*\*

Hon'ble Dr. Justice B.S. Chauhan pronounced  
two separate judgments of the Court for a Bench  
comprising of His Lordship and Hon'ble Mr.  
Justice Swatanter Kumar.

The appeals are dismissed for the reasons  
recorded in two separate signed reportable  
judgments.

(KALYANI GUPTA)  
COURT MASTER

(INDU SATIJA)  
COURT MASTER

[TWO SEPARATE SIGNED REPORTABLE JUDGMENTS ARE PLACED ON THE  
FILE.]

REPORTABLE

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 937 of 2005

State of Rajasthan  
Appellant

...

Versus

JUDGMENT

Dr. B.S. CHAUHAN, J.

1. This appeal has been preferred by the State of Rajasthan against the judgment and order dated 27.10.2004 passed by the High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan, Jaipur Bench, in Criminal Appeal No. 1579 of 2002 acquitting the respondents, setting aside their conviction and the sentence passed by Additional District and Sessions Judge, (Fast Track), Laxmangarh, Alwar, dated 2.11.2002 in Sessions Case No. 4 of 2002 (14/2000) for the offences punishable under Sections 395, 396 and 397 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter called the IPC).

2. The facts and circumstances giving rise to this case are as under:

A. Santosh Jagwayan (PW.13) lodged an FIR on 17.12.1996 at 8.30 A.M., that in the intervening night between 16th and 17th December, 1996 on hearing the noise, he sent his Chowkidar Gopal Nepali (deceased) to the roof of his house. Gopal Nepali went upstairs and opened the gate of the roof and found that 8 to 10 accused persons were trying to enter into the house by breaking upon the door of the roof. They immediately fired shot at Gopal Nepali (deceased) and entered into the house. The accused persons locked Shashi Devi (PW.12) wife of complainant, Preeti (PW.14) and Sandhya (PW.15), his daughters, in the bathroom and started looting the moveable properties. In the meanwhile, his neighbours raised their voice. Thus, the accused immediately fired a shot at Mrs. Anita Yadav, as a result of which, she died on the spot. Kripa Dayal Yadav (PW.2), husband of Anita Yadav (deceased) caught hold of one of the accused but he was beaten with the butt of the gun by the other accused persons and they got the accused released from his clutches. The accused decamped with cash, jewellery and silver wares etc.

B. On the basis of the said complaint, an FIR No. 240 of 1996

(Ex.P-30) was registered under Sections 395, 396, 397 and 398 IPC and investigation ensued. The dead bodies of Gopal Nepali and Anita Yadav were recovered and sent for post-mortem examination. Kuniya - accused/respondent was arrested on 24.12.1996. He made a disclosure statement (Ex.P-76) on 29.12.1996 on the basis of which a silver glass and one thousand rupees were recovered vide recovery memo (Ex.P-53). Further, on his disclosure statement, a scooter bearing No. RJ-05-0678 was recovered vide recovery memo (Ex.P-52) on 2.1.1997.

C. Another accused Talevar - respondent, was arrested on 19.1.1997 and on his disclosure statement made on 26.1.1997, two thousand rupees, a silver key ring and a key of Ambassador car was recovered vide seizure memo (Ex.P-45).

D. Some more recoveries were made from the other accused persons. After completing the investigation chargesheet was filed against 9 accused persons including the two respondents. As all of them pleaded not guilty, they were put to trial for the offences punishable under Sections 395, 396 and 398 IPC.

E. In the Sessions trial prosecution examined 34 witnesses in support of its case. The ornaments and stolen articles were identified by Shashi Devi (PW.12) and Santosh Jagwayan (PW.13). The trial court vide judgment and order dated 2.11.2002 convicted 8 accused including the two respondents. One accused named Ram Krishan, died during the trial. All of them stood convicted under the provisions of Sections 395, 396 and 397 IPC. All the accused were awarded punishment to undergo life imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 1,000/- and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo six months rigorous imprisonment under Section 396 IPC. All of them were convicted for the offence punishable under Section 397 IPC and a sentence to undergo rigorous imprisonment for seven years and a fine of Rs.500/- and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo three months rigorous imprisonment. They were further convicted under Section 395 IPC, awarded life imprisonment and fine of Rs. 1,000/- and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo six months rigorous imprisonment.

Accused namely, Ghurelal, Chunchu @ Bhagwan Singh, Kallu, Rajpal and Samay Singh were further convicted under Sections 3/25 and 3/27 of the Arms Act and sentence was awarded to undergo three years rigorous imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 500/- each of them, in default of payment of fine, to further undergo three months rigorous imprisonment.

F. Being aggrieved by the said decision, all the accused including the two respondents preferred Criminal Appeal No. 1579 of 2002, which has been decided by the High Court vide judgment and order dated 27.10.2004 acquitting the two respondents/accused though maintaining the conviction and sentence in respect of other accused. Hence, this appeal by the State against their acquittal.

3. Dr. Manish Singhvi, learned Additional Advocate General for the State of Rajasthan, has submitted that recovery of some of the looted property had been made on the basis of the disclosure statements made by the said respondents. The law provides for a presumption that they had participated in the crime and, therefore, the High Court has wrongly acquitted the said accused and thus, the appeal deserves to be allowed.

4. On the contrary, Shri Altaf Hussain, learned counsel appearing for the said two accused, has vehemently opposed the appeal contending that mere recovery of looted property on the disclosure statement of the accused, is not enough to bring home the charges of offence of loot or dacoity, when the recovery is made after expiry of a considerable period from the date of incident and particularly when the nature of the looted property is such which can change hands easily. Thus, no inference can be drawn against the respondents. The order of acquittal made by the High Court has been passed on proper appreciation of facts and application of law. The appeal lacks merit and is liable to be dismissed.

5. We have considered the rival submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. Admitted facts remained so far as the two respondents/accused are concerned, that no test identification parade was held at all. Further none of the eye witnesses, particularly, Shashi Devi (PW.12), Santosh Jagwayan (PW.13), Kripa Dayal Yadav (PW.2), Preeti (PW.14) and Sandhya (PW.15), identified either of the said respondents in the court. Therefore, there is no evidence so far as their identification is concerned.

7. Thus, the sole question remains to be decided whether adverse inference could be drawn against the accused merely on the basis of recoveries made on their disclosure statements.

7.1. In Gulab Chand v. State of M.P., AIR 1995 SC 1598, this Court upheld the conviction for committing dacoity on the basis of recovery of ornaments of the deceased from the possession of the person accused of robbery and murder immediately after the occurrence.

7.2. In Geejaganda Somaiah v. State of Karnataka, AIR 2007 SC 1355, this Court relied on the judgment in Gulab Chand (supra) and observed that simply on the recovery of stolen articles, no inference can be drawn that a person in possession of the stolen articles is guilty of the offence of murder and robbery. But culpability for the aforesaid offences will depend on the facts and circumstances of the case and the nature of evidence adduced.

It has been indicated by this Court in Sanwat Khan v. State of Rajasthan, AIR 1956 SC 54, that no hard and fast rule can be laid down as to what inference should be drawn from certain circumstances.

7.3. In Tulsiram Kanu v. State, AIR 1954 SC 1, this Court has indicated that the presumption permitted to be drawn under Section 114, Illustration (a) of the Evidence Act 1872 has to be drawn under the 'important time factor'. If the ornaments in possession of the deceased are found in possession of a person soon after the murder, a presumption of guilt may be permitted. But if a long period has expired in the interval, the presumption cannot be drawn having regard to the circumstances of the case.

7.4. In Earabhadrapa v. State of Karnataka AIR 1983 SC 446,

this Court held that the nature of the presumption under Illustration (a) of Section 114 of the Evidence Act must depend upon the nature of evidence adduced. No fixed time-limit can be laid down to determine whether possession is recent or otherwise. Each case must be judged on its own facts. The question as to what amounts to recent possession sufficient to justify the presumption of guilt varies according "as the stolen article is or is not calculated to pass readily from hand to hand". If the stolen articles were such as were not likely to pass readily from hand to hand, the period of one year that elapsed could not be said to be too long particularly when the appellant had been absconding during that period.

7.5. Following such a reasoning, in Sanjay @ Kaka etc. etc. v. The State (NCT of Delhi), AIR 2001 SC 979, this Court upheld the conviction by the trial court since disclosure statements were made by the accused persons on the next day of the commission of the offence and the property of the deceased was recovered at their instance from the places where they had kept such properties, on the same day. The Court found that the trial Court was justified in holding that the disclosure statements of the accused persons and huge recoveries from them at their instance by itself was a sufficient circumstance on the very next day of the incident which clearly went to show that the accused persons had joined hands to commit the offence of robbery. Therefore, recent and unexplained possession of stolen properties will be taken to be presumptive evidence of the charge of murder as well.

7.6. In Ronny Alias Ronald James Alwaris & Ors. v. State of Maharashtra, AIR 1998 SC 1251, this Court held that apropos the recovery of articles belonging to the family of the deceased from the possession of the appellants soon after the robbery and the murder of the deceased remained unexplained by the accused, and so the presumption under Illustration (a) of Section 114 of the Evidence Act would be attracted :

"It needs no discussion to conclude that the murder and the robbery of the articles were found to be part of the same transaction. The irresistible conclusion would therefore, be that the appellants and no one else had committed the three murders and the robbery."

(See also: Baijur v. State of Madhya Pradesh, AIR 1978 SC 522; and Mukund alias Kundu Mishra & Anr. v. State of Madhya Pradesh, AIR 1997 SC 2622).

7.7. Thus, the law on this issue can be summarized to the effect that where only evidence against the accused is recovery of stolen properties, then although the circumstances may indicate that the theft and murder might have been committed at the same time, it is not safe to draw an inference that the person in possession of the stolen property had committed the murder. It also depends on the nature of the property so recovered, whether it was likely to pass readily from hand to hand. Suspicion should not take the place of proof.

8. In the instant case, accused Kuniya was arrested on 24.12.1996 and a silver glass and one thousand rupees were alleged to have been recovered on his disclosure statement on 29.12.1996. Again on disclosure statement dated 2.1.1997, a scooter alleged to have been used in the dacoity, was recovered. Similarly, another accused Talevar was arrested on 19.1.1997 and on his disclosure statement on 26.1.1997, two thousand rupees, a silver key ring and a key of Ambassador car alleged to have been used in the crime were recovered. Thus, it is evident that recovery on the disclosure statements of either of the respondents/accused persons was not in close proximity of time from the date of incident. More so, recovery is either of cash, small things or vehicles which can be passed from one person to another without any difficulty. In such a fact situation, we reach the inescapable conclusion that no presumption can be drawn against the said two respondents/accused under Section 114 Illustration (a) of the Evidence Act. No adverse inference can be drawn on the basis of recoveries made on their disclosure statements to connect them with the commission of the crime.

9. The instant appeal has been prepared by the State against the judgment and order of acquittal of the respondents by the High Court. The law on the issue is settled to the effect that only in exceptional cases where there are compelling circumstances and the judgment under appeal is found to be perverse, the appellate court can interfere with the order of acquittal. The appellate court should bear in mind the

presumption of innocence of the accused and further that the trial Court's acquittal bolsters the presumption of his innocence. Interference in a routine manner where the other view is possible should be avoided, unless there are good reasons for interference.

(See : Brahm Swaroop & Anr. v. State of U.P., AIR 2011 SC 280; V.S. Achuthanandan v. R. Balakrishna Pillai & Ors., (2011) 3 SCC 317; and Rukia Begum & Ors. v. State of Karnataka, (2011) 4 SCC 779).

10. In view of the above, we do not find any reason to interfere with the well reasoned judgment and order of the High Court acquitting the said respondents. The appeal lacks merit and is accordingly dismissed.

.....J.

(Dr. B.S.

CHAUHAN)

.....J.

(SWATANTER

KUMAR)

New Delhi,  
June 17, 2011

REPORTABLE

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 1636 of 2005

Ghure and Ors.

...Appellants

Versus

State of Rajasthan

...Respondent

JUDGMENT

Dr. B.S. CHAUHAN, J.

1. This appeal has been preferred against the judgment and order dated 27.10.2004 passed by the High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan, Jaipur Bench in D.B. Criminal Appeal No. 1579 of 2002, upholding the conviction and the sentence of the appellants vide judgment and order dated 2.11.2002 in Sessions Case No. 4 of 2002 (14/2000) passed by Additional District and Sessions Judge, (Fast Track), Laxmangarh, Alwar, convicting the appellants under Sections 395, 396 and 397 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter called the IPC).

2. Facts and circumstances giving rise to this appeal are as under:

A. Santosh Jagwayan (PW.13) lodged an FIR on 17.12.1996 at 8.30 A.M. that

in the intervening night between 16th and 17th December, 1996, on hearing a noise, he sent his Chowkidar Gopal Nepali (deceased) to the roof of his house. Gopal Nepali went upstairs, opened the gate of the roof, and found that 8 to 10 accused persons were trying to enter into the house by breaking upon the door of the roof. They immediately fired a shot at Gopal Nepali (deceased) and entered into the house. The accused persons locked Shashi Devi (PW.12), wife of complainant and Preeti (PW.14) and Sandhya (PW.15), his daughters, in the bathroom and started looting moveable properties. Meanwhile, the complainant neighbours raised their voices. Thus, the accused immediately fired a shot at one of the neighbours, Mrs. Anita Yadav (deceased), and as a result, she died on the spot. Kripa Dayal Yadav (PW.2), husband of Anita Yadav caught hold of one of the accused but was beaten with a gun's butt by the other accused persons who managed to get the accused released from his clutches. The accused decamped with cash, jewellery and silver wares etc.

B. On the basis of the said complaint, an FIR No. 240 of 1996 (Ex.P-30) was registered under Sections 395, 396, 397 and 398 IPC and investigation ensued. The dead bodies of Gopal Nepali and Smt. Anita Yadav were recovered and sent for post-mortem examination.

C. During the course of investigation, the appellants were arrested. Raghuveer was arrested on December 19, 1996 and one Ambassador car was recovered at his instance. On his further disclosure and instance, one Kondhani of silver, 2 silver glasses, one silver Katori, one silver spoon and one torch were recovered. Raghuveer, Ghurelal and Kallu were put to the identification parade. On December 24, 1996, co-accused Ram Krishan (now dead) was arrested. On his arrest, case for offence under Section 120B, IPC was also added. On the information and at the instance of accused Kallu, a 12 bore gun, one silver Katori, one pair of ear tops and one earring was recovered on December 29, 1996. On the information furnished by Ghurelal, one golden ring, one ear 'jhala', one necklace, one Ilaychidani, one silver spoon and one Kondhani were recovered on December 30, 1996. On January 1, 1997, accused appellants Rajpal, Samay Singh and Chunchu @ Bhagwan Singh were arrested. One 12 bore gun, one worship platter, 4 silver glasses, one Katori and Rs.2,000/- in cash were recovered from Chunchu @ Bhagwan. On the information furnished by accused Samay Singh, one 32 bore revolver, two empty cartridges, 4 live cartridges, 5 glasses, one Katori, one silver

spoon and two coin of silver along with Rs.8,900/- in cash and two notes of Nepal currency were recovered. On the information of appellant Rajpal, one 32 bore Katta, one empty cartridge, 5 live cartridges, two golden bangles (Kangan), 3 silver button, one Katori of silver, one silver glass and Rs.1000/- in cash were recovered. Some recoveries were also made at the instance of co-accused Kuniya and Talevar (acquitted by the High Court). Appellants Samay Singh, Chunchu and Rajpal were also put to the identification parade.

D. After completing the investigation, the police filed challan for offences punishable under Sections 395, 396, 397, 120B and 412 IPC, and under Sections 3/25 and 3/27 of the Arms Act, 1950. The charges were framed against the accused appellants. The accused denied the charges and claimed to be tried. Prosecution produced as many as 34 witnesses and exhibited 80 documents (Ex.P-1 to Ex.P-80) in support of its case. The accused appellants were examined under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. They denied the correctness of the statements made against them and pleaded that they have been falsely implicated.

E. The trial court convicted all the accused under the provisions of Section 396 IPC and awarded them punishment to undergo life imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 1,000/-, and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo six months rigorous imprisonment. All of them were also convicted for the offence punishable under Section 397 IPC, and a sentence to undergo rigorous imprisonment for seven years and a fine of Rs.500/- and in default of payment of fine, three months rigorous imprisonment was awarded. They were further convicted under Section 395 IPC, awarded life imprisonment and fine of Rs. 1,000/- and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo six months rigorous imprisonment. Accused Ghurelal, Chunchu @ Bhagwan Singh, Kallu, Rajpal and Samay Singh were further convicted under Sections 3/25 and 3/27 of the Arms Act and to each, a sentence was awarded to undergo three years rigorous imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 500/- and in default of payment of fine, to further undergo three months rigorous imprisonment.

F. Being aggrieved by the said decision, all the accused preferred Criminal Appeal No. 1579 of 2002 which has been decided by the High Court vide judgment and order dated 27.10.2004 acquitting the accused Talevar and Kuniya, though maintaining the conviction and sentence in respect of the other accused. Hence, this appeal.

3. Shri Altaf Hussain, learned counsel appearing for the appellants has submitted that the appellants had not been kept baparda. Therefore, the identification was not proper. He further submitted that there had been most material discrepancies in the deposition of witnesses which go to the root of this case, and therefore, the conviction and sentence of the appellants is liable to be set aside.

4. On the other hand, Shri Manish Singhvi, learned Additional Advocate General, appearing for the State of Rajasthan, has opposed the appeal contending that it is a case wherein two persons had been killed and one seriously injured, valuable moveable properties have been looted, appellants-accused have been identified by all the witnesses in jail as well as in court, and recoveries on their disclosure had been made and proved. Therefore, no interference is required, the appeal lacks merit and is liable to be dismissed.

5. We have considered the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. In the instant case, 9 persons were put to trial. One accused, namely, Ram Krishan died during the course of trial. Two persons, namely, Talevar and Kuniya stood acquitted by the High Court by the same impugned judgment and order. The appeal against their acquittal i.e. Criminal Appeal No. 937 of 2005 is being dealt with separately. Therefore, we are concerned only with the remaining six appellants.

7. There are concurrent findings of fact so far as the involvement and participation of all the six accused-appellants are concerned. They had been properly identified in the Test Identification Parades as well as in the Court by the witnesses. More so, the looted property, particularly, ornaments, jewellery, silver glasses have been recovered and identified correctly. In respect of this, the findings recorded by the Trial Court as well as by the High Court are based on the evidence of Shri G.L. Sharma (PW.26), Judicial Magistrate, who conducted the Test Identification Parade and by the statements of Narendra Singh Kulhari (PW.20), the Tahsildar who conducted the proceedings of identification of stolen articles. According to Narendra Singh Kulhari (PW.20), Smt. Shashi Devi (PW.12)

and Santosh Jagwayan (PW.13) accurately identified the stolen articles as 15 silver glasses, 5-7 katories, silver spoons, silver plates, tagri, golden ear rings and 21 coins of silver as well as packet of notes. Similarly, Shri G.L. Sharma, (PW.26), Judicial Magistrate, has deposed that on December 23, 1996, he had conducted the identification parade of accused Raghuveer, Kallu and Ghurelal. He further deposed that Santosh Jagwayan (PW.13), Smt. Shashi Devi (PW.12) and Kripa Dayal Yadav (PW.2) were summoned for identifying the accused. Santosh Jagwayan (PW.13) and Smt. Shashi Devi (PW.12) have also identified the accused Raghuveer, Kallu and Ghurelal. Thereafter, Kripa Dayal Yadav was summoned and he identified accused Raghuveer, Kallu and Ghurelal. All the three identified the aforesaid accused correctly. He further deposed that on January 6, 1997, on the order of the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Alwar, he also conducted the identification parade of the accused. Witnesses Santosh Jagwayan (PW.13), Smt. Shashi (PW.12) and Kripa Dayal Yadav (PW.2) appeared for identifying the accused. First of all, Santosh Jagwayan (PW.13) was called to identify the accused. He identified the accused Samay Singh and Bhagwan Singh, but in place of accused Rajpal, he identified another accused Suraj. Smt. Shashi Devi (PW.12) identified accused Samay Singh, Bhagwan Singh and Rajpal accurately. He also prepared memos Ex.P-3 and Ex.P-4 of the identification parade. These two witnesses have been cross-examined. However, nothing could be elicited by the defence to discredit their testimonies.

8. So far as the recovery is concerned, it stood proved by Laxman Gaur (PW.34), the Investigating Officer that on the disclosure statements made by the accused under Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 and at their instances, he had recovered the stolen articles, alleged gun, revolver, pellets, scooter and an ambassador car used by the appellants at the time of committing dacoity. He also faced grilled cross-examination at length, but nothing came out from his statement which may enable us to draw an adverse inference against the prosecution.

9. The post-mortem report of Smt. Anita Yadav and Gopal Nepali stood proved by Dr. Jitendra Bundel (PW.21) who deposed that he had conducted the autopsy on the body of Smt. Anita Yadav and she had gun shot injuries, lot of pellets in her body, and that she died of excessive bleeding because of gun shot injuries. Similarly, he deposed that Gopal Nepali also died because of gun shot

injuries. He also deposed that he had examined Kripa Dayal Yadav (PW.2) on 17.12.1996 and had found 7 simple injuries on his body which had been caused by a blunt weapon. The said injury had been caused within 12 hours of examination. Thus, he corroborated the injuries as well as the manner and the weapon with which such injuries were caused.

10. The recoveries made at the instances of the appellants stood proved by examining the panel witnesses, except in case of recovery made on disclosure statement of Ghurelal in respect of one gun of 12 bore live cartridges, one golden ear ring, one necklace of gold, one Iliayachi Dani made of silver, one silver spoon and one silver bowl, as the two panch witnesses, namely, Sher Singh (PW.30) and Udaibir Singh (PW.31) turned hostile. Both the courts below have held that the recovery from Ghurelal, one of the accused, cannot be dis-believed merely because the panch witnesses turned hostile. We do not find any cogent reason to take a view contrary to the view taken by the two courts below.

11. Shri Altaf Hussain, learned counsel appearing for the appellants, had taken us through the entire evidence. He could not point out any material discrepancy in the statements of the witnesses which goes to the root of the case. Nor could he satisfy us how the judgment impugned requires any interference. We do not find any cogent reason to interfere with the concurrent findings of fact, recorded by the courts below. The appeal lacks merit and is accordingly dismissed.

12. It is evident from the record, particularly, the order dated 28.4.2006 that all the six appellants had already served 9 years of actual imprisonment and, thus, had been enlarged on bail by this Court. Thus, their bail bonds are cancelled and they are directed to surrender within a period of two weeks from today, failing which, the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Laxmangarh, Alwar, will take them into custody and send them to jail to serve out the remaining part of the sentence. A copy of the judgment and order be sent to the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Alwar, for compliance.

.....J.  
(Dr. B.S. CHAUHAN)

.....J.

(SWATANTER KUMAR)

New Delhi,  
June 17, 2011