

**IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE,
NAWADA -CUM -
MOTOR ACCIDENTS CLAIM TRIBUNAL
NAWADA (BIHAR)**

MACT/M.V. Case No. 76/2005

[Madanpur (Distt.-Aurangabad) P.S. case No.-141/2003]

Fatal Case

1. Lakhan Chauhan,
S/O Late Dhaneshwar Chauhan
2. Sumitra Devi,
W/O Lakhan Chauhan
Both R/O Vill.-Khaira Tola-Beldari, P.S.- Warisaliganj,
Distt.-Nawada (Bihar)

..... **Claimants/Applicants**
Versus

1. The Oriental Insurance Company Limited
Dutta Super Market, Akhan Bazar, Chinsura, Hoogly
712101 & Divisional Manager, Oriental Insurance Co.
Ltd., R.J. Palace, Ray Kashinath More, Gaya
(Insurer of Truck Lorry Bearing Reg. No WB-03-6289 vide Policy
No. 2004-2258, Valid from 30.09.2003 to 29.09.2004)
2. Sanat Banik, S/O- Swapan Banik,
R/O Village- Hansghapa, P.S- Mogra, Distt.-Hoogly
(Owner of Truck Lorry Bearing Reg. No WB-03-6289)
3. Narsingh Narayan Dubey, S/O- Not known,
R/O Vill- Bhatapur, Sant Ravidas Nagar, Bhadoi, P.S.-
Maharajganj, Distt.- Orain, U.P.
(Driver who was murdered while he was going with Truck
in question No.-WB-3-6289)

..... **Opposite Parties**

Learned Counsel for the Claimants:Sri Kumar Vidya
Bhushan, Ld. Adv.
Learned Counsel for the O.P. No.-1- Sri Ramanuj Sharma

Ld. Adv.

Learned Counsel for the O.P. No.- 2 & 3 – Not Appear

Date of judgment: 13.05.2026

Present:- Ashutosh Kumar Jha
Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal
-cum-
Principal District Judge, Nawada
13-05-2026

J U D G M E N T

Before passing the judgment, it is pertinent to mention here that order in this case has already been passed by the Ld. predecessor-Cum-Motor Vehicle Accident Claim Tribunal, Nawada on 28.11.2006 while deciding the preliminary issue held that the claim application is not maintainable. Thereafter claimants/Lakhan Chauhan and Sumitra Devi filed an appeal before the Hon'ble High Court, Patna vide Miscellaneous Appeal No.-35/2007 in which the Hon'ble High Court passed an order on 02.07.2010 that – "The impugned order is unsustainable in the eye of law. In the result, the impugned order is set aside. The matter is remanded back to the court below for proceeding according to law. The learned Tribunal shall proceed to decide the claim on merit after noticing the opposite parties. Appeal is accordingly allowed."

1. Present claim petition under Section 166/140 of Motor Vehicle was filed by the petitioners Lakhan Chauhan and



Sumitra Devi legal heirs of the deceased namely Late Vishundeo Chauhan (hereinafter referred to as deceased) for claiming compensation for the fatal injuries suffered by the deceased in a road accident.

Later on, Ld. Counsel for the applicants also filed a petition on 04.05.2026 praying therein that due to mistake at the time of filing of the case he wrongly mentioned the section 166 M.V. Act in the claim petition instead of 163A of the M.V. Act, so it was prayed that to correct the same on which Ld. Counsel for the O.P. No.-1 Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd. has no objection.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the deceased Vishnudeo Chauhan was a cleaner under employment of the truck owner Sanat Banik bearing Regn. No.-WB-03-6289. The death of the deceased occurred in course of his employment when the truck started its journey from Velore, Howrah to its destination of Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh. The dead body of the deceased was found by the chaukidar Sudhir Paswan under the bridge of Teldiha under jurisdiction of the Madanpur police station of district-Aurangabad. The said truck was captured by the criminals who murdered the driver thereafter they killed khalasi (Visnudeo Chauhan) by throttling and at the time of the incident the deceased Vishnudeo Chauhan was unmarried and aged about 28 years



and all family members of the claimants were survived by the income of the deceased.

3. Madanpur P.S. (District-Aurangabad) Case No. - 141/2003 dated 26.12.2003 under Sections 302/201/34 of the IPC got registered at Police Station Madanpur, District Aurangabad. Police conducted the investigation. After due investigation, the police submitted final as case is not true.

4. During proceedings, written statement was filed on behalf of the Respondent No. 1 Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd. wherein it was submitted that the claim is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties and claimants have not complied with the provision of Rule 92 of Bihar Motor Vehicle Rule and the concerned police station has not complied with Section 158(6) of the M.V. Act. It was also submitted by the Respondent No. 1 that the claim of compensation is excessive, imaginary and exaggerated and Respondent No. 1 also submitted that the insurer reserves his right to contest the claim petition as per Section 170 of M.V. Act. Respondent No. 1 Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd. further submitted that the offending vehicle was plying on road in rash and negligent manner and the vehicle has violated the terms and condition of the policy.

O.P. No.-1 further submitted that the person driving of vehicle Truck bearing Regn. No.-WB-03-6289 driver has "no



relation in force" as on the date of accident to drive the vehicle and involved Truck was not holding a valid and effective driving license at the time of the accident.. He further submitted that the driver and khalasi (cleaner) of Truck bearing Regn. No.-WB-03-6289 was under the influence of the alcohol at the time of murder of cleaner thereby violated the terms and condition of the policy.

Despite notice O.P. No.-2 Sanat Banik didn't appear before this court nor file written statement and on account thereof, the proceeding proceeded ex-parte against O.P. No.-2 Sanat Banik/Owner of the Truck bearing Regn. No.-WB-3-6289.

5. Following fresh issues were framed by the Ld. court of Addl. District Judge-11th-Cum-MACT Tribunal on 29.09.2021:-

- (i) Whether the claim case as framed as maintainable?
- (ii) Whether the vehicle No.-WB-3-6289 involved in the accident was duly insured with the Oriental Insurance Co. on alleged date and time of accident?
- (iii) Whether the deceased namely Bishnudeo Chauhan died due to accident on 25.12.2003 involving vehicle near Dadhapi More at Teldiha nahar situated at east of Shivganj (Aurangabad, Bihar) ?
- (iv) Whether the claimants are entitled to get compensation



and if so to what extent and from whom?

(v) Whether the vehicle involved in the accident was being driven by driver having a valid and effective driving license at the time of accident?

6. During evidence, C.W.1 Shrawan Kumar Chauhan who deposed in his affidavit-Cum-examination-in-chief that his deceased brother Vishnudeo Chuahan was working as khalasi of the Truck bearing Regn. No.-WB-3-6289 under the owner of Sanat Banik and driver and khalasi (Vishnudeo Chauhan) was going to Ghaziabad with Truck in which Topaz blade was loaded and in the night of 25.12.2003 some unknown criminals hijacked the said truck and murdered driver and khalasi and their dead body has thrown on the side of road. C.W.-01 further deposed that his deceased brother Vishnudeo Chauhan was unmarried and aged about 28 years old at the time of incident and his father went Madanpur police station and identified the dead body of the Vishnudeo Chauhan.

During cross-examination, C.W.-01 deposed that at the time of the incident his brother was unmarried and his brother Vishnudeo Chauhan was killed by throttling through robe whose dead body was found lying inside the road under the jurisdiction of Madanpur police station. He further deposed that the deceased was working as khalasi



and he has no document in this regard. C.W.-01 also deposed that he was minor on the date of incident and he heard about the incident from his parents. He lastly denies to the suggestion that his affidavit is false and deposing falsely.

C.W.-02 Sumitra Devi is claimant herself who stated in her affidavit-cum-examination-in-chief that categorically deposed that her deceased son was working as khalasi of Truck bearing Regn. No.-WB-3-6289 and on 25.12.2003 his deceased son alongwith driver of the truck was going towards Ghaziabad and truck was loaded with Topaz blade and in the night of 25.12.2003 some unknown criminals hijacked the said truck and murdered the driver and also killed her son Vishnudeo Chauhan (Khalasi) by way of strangulate by robe and threw his dead body next to the road. She further deposed that owner of the truck informed to her about the said incident. She also deposed that her deceased son was unmarried who aged about 28 years old and her deceased son was only earning person of her family.

During cross-examination, she deposed that she has no documents regarding his deceased son was working as khalasi. She also deposed that the deceased were abducted first thereafter their murder has been committed and her deceased son had no harm on the vehicle or from the from and she didn't see incident. She further deposed that



she has no paper regarding income of the deceased. She lastly deposed that this is true that her son was murdered.

C.W.-03 Lakhan Chauhan is also claimant himself and father of the deceased who deposed in his affidavit-cum-examination-in-chief as deposed by C.W.-02 in her affidavit.

During cross-examination, he deposed that he didn't see the incident. He saw the dead body lying near canal which was approx 100 feet from the road under the jurisdiction of Madanpur police station of district Aurangabad and he saw the robe around the neck of the deceased and there is no blood mark over the body of the deceased. He further deposed that owner of the vehicle having a document showing his deceased son was khalasi and he filed the same after brought from him. He also deposed that he has no papers which shows that his deceased son was working as khalasi on the alleged date of incident. He further states that he has no papers which shows that his deceased son was earning Rs. 3,000/- per month. He lastly denies the suggestion of Ld. counsel of O.P. No.-1 that his son was working as labour and someone killed his son and threw the dead body.

7. Documents filed on behalf of Claimants and the same has been marked as exhibits:-



Sl. No.	Exhibit No.	Description of exhibit
1.	Ext.1	Certified copy of F.I.R. of Madanpur P.S. Case No.-141/2003
2.	Mark-X	Photocopy of certificate of registration of Truck bearing Regn. No.-WB-3-6289
3.	Mark-X/1	Photocopy of Insurance paper of truck WB-3-6289
4.	Mark-X/2	Photocopy of postmortem report of the deceased Vishnudeo Chauhan
5.	Mark-X/3	Photocopy of entire case diary of Madanpur P.S. Case No.-141/2003 alongwith charge-sheet

8. No other witness has been examined by the petitioners.

9. No witness has been examined on behalf of opposite party No.-1 Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd. nor filed any document on its behalf.

10. After hearing the arguments and considering the material on record, my issue-wise findings are as follows :-

ISSUE No. (i), (ii), (iii) & (v) :-

11. The issue No. (i), (ii), (iii) & (v) will be decided together because they are interrelated. To determine the negligence of the driver of the offending vehicle, I am relying on propositions laid down by the Hon'ble High Court and the Hon'ble Supreme Court in catena of judgments "wherein it has been held that the registration of a criminal case against the driver of the offending vehicle is enough to record the finding that the driver of offending vehicle is responsible for causing the accident. Further it has been held in catena of



cases that the proceedings under the Motor Vehicles Act are not akin to the proceedings as in civil suit and hence strict rules of evidence are not required to be followed in this regard. and wherein it was held that in case the petitioner files the certified copy of the criminal record or the criminal record showing the completion of the investigation by the police or the issuance of charge sheet under Section 279/304 of IPC or the certified copy of the FIR or in addition the recovery memo or the mechanical inspection report of the offending vehicle, these documents are sufficient proof to reach to the conclusion that the driver was negligent. It is also settled law that the term rashness and negligence has to be constructed lightly while making a decision on a petition for claim for the same as compared to the word rashness and negligence as finds mention in the Indian Penal Code. This is because the chapter in the Motor Vehicle Act dealing with compensation is a benevolent legislation and not a penal one."

12. As per above discussion, the main contention of the counsel for the O.P. No.-1 is that it was a plain murder and does not come within the ambit of the word 'accident' and hence no claim can be allowed in this regard. The Ld. Counsel submitted a citation **2003 (1) T.A.C. 229 (Pat.)**
Ranju Rani alias Ranju Devi and others Vs. Branch



Manager, New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Civil Revision

No.-790 of 2002, decided on 19th September 2002.

In the present case, there was animosity between the deceased and the accused. The deceased Suman Yadav alongwith Pramod Yadav was going to Bhagalpur from Kehalgaon on a motorcycle bearing Regn. no.-BR-10B-4332 when they reached near Khanditta culvert one Ramashish Singh fired upon Suman Yadav which resulted into his instantaneous death and the said accident arose out of the use of the motor vehicle, the claimant/petitioners stated that they are entitled to compensation under the provision of Motor Vehicle Act. The question before the Hon'ble High Court was whether the accident for which the compensation has been claimed under the provisions of the act, arose out of the use of the motor vehicles. The Tribunal by the impugned order held that the death of the deceased was a murder simpliciter and as such cannot be termed as death or permanent disablement due to accident arising out of the use of motor vehicle entitling payment of compensation in terms of section 163A of the Motor Vehicle Act. The Hon'ble High Court considered the question whether the murder of the deceased was a murder simpliciter or it was an accidental murder. The Honb'le High court held that according to the F.I.R. it is not the case of the claimant that the accused



wanted to loot away the motorcycle and in the process of protest the deceased was murdered. The clear case as evident from the F.I.R. is that there was an animosity between the deceased and the accused and on the date of the occurrence while the deceased was going on a motorcycle the accused fired at him resulting into his instantaneous death, thus, the dominant intention of the accused was to commit murder of the deceased and thus the .. It is murder simpliciter, at a result as motive attributed in the F.I.R. therefore the murder of the deceased even at the time of use of motorcycle cannot be a ground to award the compensation under the provision of the act. Accordingly the Patna High Court held that the Ld. Tribunal has rightly rejected the claim of the petitioner.

The Ld. counsel for the insurance Co. stated that the case of the claimant is covered by the said case and the claimant is not entitled to any compensation. This contention of the Ld. Counsel of the insurance Company has vigorously opposed by for counsel of the O.P. Now question for deciding before this tribunal is as- Whether the accident for which the compensation has been claimed under the provisions of the act arose out of the use of motor vehicle and whether the death of the deceased arose due to accident arising out of the use of motor vehicle entitling payment of compensation in



terms of section 163A of the Act?

It is an admitted fact that vehicle was insured with the O.P. It prima-facie it is found that the death was an accident and the same arose out of use of a motor vehicle then the tribunal cannot dismissed the claim at the threshold and has to decide the matter in accordance with law.

The word 'accident' has not been defined under the act for the same has been subject matter of interpretation and decision by the Apex Court in several cases. The direct case which has bearing on the question involved in this case is the case of Rita Devi v. New India Assurance Co. Ltd., reported in A.I.R. 2000 S.C. 1930. There the deceased was a driver of an autorickshaw, which was registered as public carrier vehicle and used for hire by passengers. Some unknown persons hired the said autorickshaw on the 22nd March, 1995, from rickshaw stand at Dimapur between 5 to 6 p.m. The aforesaid autorickshaw was, therefore, stolen and the dead body of the driver was found, but the autorickshaw was not traced. The Insurance Company allowed the claim of the owner for the loss of the autorickshaw. The heir of the deceased the holder of the power of Attorney, claimed compensation under Section 163-A of the Act. The Tribunal allowed the claim, but the High



Court held that the case was of a murder and not an accident arising out of the use of the motor chicle and rejected the claim case. The matter went before the Apex Court and there it was held that the death of the driver of the autorickshaw was an accident within the meaning of the Act and as that accident arose out of use of motor vehicle, claimants were entitled to compensation. It was further held that the question whether the murder is an accident or not within the meaning of the Act has to be determined on the proximity of the cause of murder. If the dominant intention was to commit murder then such accident is not an accidental murder but is a murder simpliciter. However, if the cause of murder was originally not intended but the same was caused while committing other crime then such murder is an accidental murder. In this connection it is useful to refer to paragraph 10 of the judgment, which runs as follows:—

"The question, therefore, is can a murder be an accident in any given case? There is no doubt that 'murder' as it is understood in the common parlance is a felonious act where death is caused with intent and the perpetrators of that act normally have a motive against the victim for such killing. But there are also instances where murder can be by accident on a given set of facts. The difference between a 'murder' which is



not an accident and a murder' which is an accident depends on the proximity of the cause of such murder. In our opinion if the dominant intention of the fact of felony is to kill any particular person then such killing is not an accidental murder but is a murder simpliciter, while if the cause of murder or act of murder was originally not intended and the same was caused in furtherance of any other felonious act then such murder is an accidental murder."

It was further held that in that case that when such an accident had connection with the use of the motor vehicle even it may not be direct. or immediately the claim of compensation is maintainable under Section 163-A of the Act.

Here, the case of the claimant is that the deceased was a working as a khalasi/cleaner in the ill-fated truck bearing Regn. No.-WB-03-6289 was under the employment of owner of the truck. The deceased has embarked on a journey from Kolkata to Varanasi and in the way the said ill-fated truck was kidnapped which was loaded with Topaz blade and the deceased and the driver were killed by unknown criminals. The said fact has not been controverted by the opposite party. The F.I.R. in this concerned has registered as Madanpur P.S. Case NO.-141/2003 dated 26.12.2003 U/S

302/201/34 of the I.P.C. The dead body of the deceased was found near Teldih canal and the allegation was that he was done to death by strangulation by a rope around his neck. The police submitted charge-sheet against the unknown person. The postmortem report has brought on record which shows that the death of the deceased was caused due to asphyxia due to strangulation. In the case diary in para-15 and 16 the manager of the Safety razor blade company and the manager of the Kanpur Agra Transport company who has bearing Regn. No.-WB-03-6289 categorically stated that the driver of ill-fated truck was Narsingh Narayan and cleaner is Vishnudeo Chauhan of Nawada. The dead body of the deceased was identified by the family members. The said truck has been looted and the deceased was done to death. The said truck was insured at the time of the said incident with O.P. No.-1 The Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd. which is not in dispute. The Apex Court in Rita Devi Vs. New India Insurance CO. Ltd. reported in AIR 2000 SC 1930 the Hon'ble Apex Court held that the death of the driver of the autorickhsaw was an accident within the meaning of that and as that accident arose out of use of motor vehicle, claimants were entitled to compensation. It was further held that the question whether the murder is an accident or not within the meaning of the Act has to be determined on the



proximity of the cause of murder. If the dominant intention was to commit murder then such accident is not an accidental murder but is a murder simpliciter. However, if the cause of murder was originally not intended but the same was caused while committing other crime then such murder is an accidental murder. In this connection it is useful to refer to paragraph 10 of the judgment, which runs as follows:—

"The question, therefore, is can a murder be an accident in any given case? There is no doubt that 'murder' as it is understood in the common parlance is a felonious act where death is caused with intent and the perpetrators of that act normally have a motive against the victim for such killing. But there are also instances where murder can be by accident on a given set of facts. The difference between a 'murder' which is not an accident and a murder' which is an accident depends on the proximity of the cause of such murder. In our opinion if the dominant intention of the fact of felony is to kill any particular person then such killing is not an accidental murder but is a murder simpliciter, while if the cause of murder or act of murder was originally not intended and the same was caused in furtherance of any other felonious act then such

Jha
13/05/2016



murder is an accidental murder."

It was further held that in that case that when such an accident had connection with the use of the motor vehicle even it may not be direct. or immediately the claim of compensation is maintainable under Section 163-A of the Act.

In that case there the deceased was a driver of an autorickshaw, which was registered as public carrier vehicle and used for hire by passengers. Some unknown persons hired the said autorickshaw on 22nd March, 1995, from rickshaw stand at Dimapur between 5 to 6 P.M. The aforesaid autorickshaw was, therefore, stolen and the dead body of the driver was found, but the autorickshaw was not traced. The Insurance Company allowed the claim of the owner for the loss of the autorickshaw. The heir of the deceased the holder of the power of Attorney, claimed compensation under section 163-A of the Act.

In the present case, it is established fact that the deceased was a cleaner in the ill-fated truck which was stolen and the deceased was done to death and his dead body was thrown elsewhere. Here the dominant intention of the murderer was to commit the loot of truck and its goods not the murder of the deceased. The prime motive of the killer was to loot the truck and to conceal the said loot the driver



and the deceased/cleaner of the truck was done to death. Here, the act of murder was not originally intended and the same was caused in furtherance of the felonious act of stealing the truck and hence this murder was an accidental murder. In the present case, the said accident has connection with the use of the ill-fated motor vehicle truck even though it may not be direct or immediately, the claim of compensation is maintainable under section 163A of the Motor Vehicle Act. In the present case, it is clear from the F.I.R. and the case diary that there was no animosity between the deceased and the accused. The accused wanted to loot away the ill-fated truck and in that process the deceased were murdered. On the ill-fated day the deceased were going on the ill-fated truck which resulted into their death. The dominant intention of the accused was loot the truck and the deceased were done to death in that consequence of loot, hence, the present murder of the deceased was not a murder simpliciter. It was an accidental murder and accordingly, the claimants are entitled to get compensation under section 163A of the M.V. Act. as per structured formula mentioned under section 164 of the M.V. Act. Hence, the issue No.- (i), (ii), (iii) & (v) are decided in the favour of the claimants and against the O.P. No.-1. The Oriental Insurance Company Ltd.



ISSUE No.- (iv) :-

Section 164 of the M.V. Act states that-

Compensation on the basis of “No Fault Liability” -

Section 164 prescribes “No Fault Liability” compensation of Rs.5,00,000/- in death cases and Rs.2,50,000/- in grievous hurt cases without any need to prove Section 93 of 2019 Act has omitted the Second Schedule of 1998 Act which provided the Structured Formula for compensation on No-Fault basis under Section 163A. Upon accepting the compensation under Section 164, the Claimant cannot claim the compensation under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicle Act.

13. Earlier the claim petition has been filed U/S-166/140 of the M.V. Act but the nomenclature of the wrong provisions of the M.V. Act will not dis-entitled the claimants from obtaining the suitable compensation under section 163A of the M.V. Act.

Since 166 of M.V. Act is based n fault liability, where negligence of opposite party has to be proved, whereas 163A of the M.V. Act, the same is based on no fault liability and the case of the claimant is covered U/S-163A of M.V. Act. The Ld. Counsel of claimants has submitted that the wrong quoting of provision of 166 of M.V. Act requires to be permitted and the same petition be regarded as 163A of the



M.V. Act. The Ld . Counsel of O.P. No.-1 does not have any objection if the heading of claim compensation be read as 163A of the M.V. Act. Accordingly, the present motor accident claim case decided U/S-163A of M.V. Act and the quantum of compensation be decided U/S-164 of M.V. Act, which is based on structured formula for compensation on no fault liability.

14. I hereby award an amount of **Rs. 5,00,000/- (Rs. Five Lacs Only)** as compensation with interest @ 7% per annum, from the date of claim petition till the date of realization of the amount in favour of the petitioners and against the Respondent No. 1 The Oriental Insurance Company Limited.

15. **Share of petitioners in awarded amount:**

Petitioners will get ½ (half) of the compensation amount through account payee cheque.

Petitioner No. 1 (Lakhan Chauhan, father of the deceased):

Rs.2,50,000/- (Rs. Two Lacs Fifty Thousand only),

Petitioner No. 2 (Sumitra Devi, mother of the deceased):

Rs.2,50,000/- (Rs. Two Lacs Fifty Thousand only),

15. All the payments shall be made through A/c payee cheque on the name of claimants. If any interim relief given

to petitioner during pendency of trial or prior to initiation of trial same will be deducted from compensation granted to the petitioners.

16. It is pertinent to mentioned here itself regarding the payment of court fee by the claimant, it was crystal clear by the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Patna in **Miscellaneous Appeal No.-419/2013 dated 24.01.2017, (M/S United India Insurance Company Limited Vs. Most. Mangli Devi & Ors.)** wherein :-

“28.....the amount of court fee payable in terms of Rule 227 shall be added in the memo of cost to be prepared and shall be recoverable from the tortfeasor. Once the amount of compensation and the cost is deposited, the amount of cost will stand appropriated to the State and the remaining amount shall be paid to the claimants, but calling upon the claimants at the first instance and then to recover from the tortfeasor actually multiplies the burden of the claimants, that will be the just and equitable reading of Rule 227.

29. Thus, it is held that the expression ‘judgment’ and ‘award’ are inter changeable and that the Tribunal shall announce award on completion of inquiry, which shall be executable and appealable. The amount of court fee shall be affixed by the tortfeasor, which would be recoverable as



arrears of land revenue along with the amount of
compensation in terms of Section 174 of the 1988 Act.”

Dictated and corrected by me.

Ashutosh Kumar Jha
Motor Accidents
Claims Tribunal
-cum-

Principal District Judge,
Nawada
13.05.2026



Ashutosh Kumar Jha
(Ashutosh Kumar Jha)
Motor Accidents
Claims Tribunal
-cum-

Principal District Judge,
Nawada
13.05.2026

