JHDH010083072022

District – Dhanbad

In the Court of District Judge-cum-Presiding Officer Motor Accident Claim Tribunal, Court No. XVI, Dhanbad.

Present: **Durgesh C Awasthi**
District Judge-cum– Presiding Officer
Motor Accident Claim Tribunal,Court No. XVI, Dhanbad

Dhanbad, dated the 25th day of September, 2024
Motor Accident Claim Case No.265/22

CNR No. JHDH01-008307-2022

1. Anjani Devi, W/o Late Maheshwar Mahato, aged about 29 years
2. (Minor) Manjil Raj , D/o Late Maheshwar Mahato, aged about 10 years
3. (Minor) Gaushik Raj, S/o Late Maheshwar Mahato, aged about 07 years
4. (Minor) Gaurav Raj ,D/o Late Maheshwar Mahato, aged about 07 years
5. Balak Mahato, S/o Late Jagmohan Mahto, aged about 76 years
6. Sukhmani Devi, W/o Sri. Balak Mahato, aged about 70 years
All R/o Vill. Kurse, P.O. Kurse, P.S. Lohardaga, Dist. Lohardaga (Jharkhand)- 835302

.... Plaintiffs

Versus

1. Bhagirath Rawani, S/o Nepal Rawani
R/o Dumra, Lohar Tola, P.O. Nawagarh, Dist. Dhanbad (Jharkhand)- 828306.
(Owner of Motor Cycle No. JH-10CK-4488)

2. M/s. Tata AIG Insurance Company Limited,
Legal Manager,
At. 2nd Floor,Hari Mangal Complex, Dhansar More,
P.O. Dhansar, P.S. Bank More, Dist. Dhanbad (Jharkhand),
(Insurer of Motor Cycle No. JH-10CK-4488)

............Defendants

Claim case filed on – 18.08.22

Compensation Claimed :- Rs.1,25,51,000/-

Motor Accident Claim Case No.265/22
CNR No. JHDH01-008307-2022

Compensation Awarded :- Rs.1,22,93,229/-

For the Claimants	: B.K.Sinha (Ld. Advocate)
For the O.P. No.2	: Mrs. Rishika Sanyal (Ld. Advocate)
For the O.P. No.1 (Owner)	: Ram Naresh Singh (Ld. Advocate)

A W A R D

1. The claimants have filed the instant claim case u/s 166 and 140 of M.V. Act for lump sum compensation amount to the tune of Rs.1,25,51,000/- (Rupees One Crore, twenty five lakhs, fifty one thousand only) along with interest in respect of death of Maheshwar Mahato (hereinafter referred to as the deceased) in vehicular accident, involving motorcycle bearing Regn. No. JH-10-CK-4488 owned by O.P. No.1 and insured with the O.P. No.2 vide Insurance Policy No. 3194760352/000000/00 valid from 03.05.22 to midnight of 02.05.27.

2. Claimant no.1 is wife, Claimants No.2 is daughter, Claimant No.3 & 4 are sons, Claimant No. 5 is father and Claimant No. 6 is mother of the deceased. The minor sons and daughter of the deceased are represented through claimant no.1 Anjani Devi (Mother).

FACTS :

3. On 09.06.22 at about 04.40 A.M, Maheshwar Mahato (deceased) was going to attend duty at CISF Camp by motorcycle no. JH-09AK-5365. It is said that when he reached near Harna Main Chowk curve, suddenly one motorcycle bearing regd. no. JH-10CK-4488 came being driven rashly and negligently by its driver and dashed the motorcycle bearing regd. no. JH-09AK-5365, as a result of which Maheshwar Mahato received serious injury. Thereafter, he was immediately shifted to Central Hospital, Dhanbad and referred by doctor for his better treatment Vivekanand Hospital, Durgapur where during the course of treatment he died. It has been alleged that the mishap occurred due to rash and negligent driving by the driver of offending vehicle bearing Regn. No. JH-10CK-4488.

4. On the basis of written report of Vishram Kandulna Baghmara P.S. Case No. 35/2022 dated 09.06.22 u/s 279, 337, 338 & 427 of the IPC was registered and investigation was taken up. On completion of investigation, the police submitted charge sheet bearing No. 09/23 dated 17.02.23 under the aforesaid sections against the driver of offending motorcycle bearing Regn. No. JH-10CK-4488 namely Bhagirath Rawani.

5. It has been put forward that the deceased was 44 years of age at the time of accident. He was a service holder as a permanent employee of CISF (Central Armed Police Force) ministry of Home affairs under government of india he was posted at Katras Block-II , Baghmara, Dist.Dhanbad designated as Constable GD, CISF No. 032310582. He was getting monthly salary of Rs. 72,563/- per month and had future earning prospects. On this factual background, Rs. 1,25,51,000/- has been claimed as compensation amount.

6. The owner and insurer both have been arrayed as opposite parties. In pursuant to issuance of notice, OP no.1 and 2 appeared and filed their respective W.S.

7. **Written statement of Opposite Party No.1 (Owner of Motor Cycle No. JH-10CK-4488)-** O.P. No.1 namely Bhagirath Rawani who is the owner of motorcycle bearing Regn. No. JH- 10CK-4488 filed his W.S on 25.07.23. It has been pleaded that the suit is wholly misconceived and hence, not maintainable either in law or in facts. The vehicle in question was insured under the policy cover of M/s Tata AIG Insurance Company Ltd. vide policy no. 3194768352/00 0000/00 was valid up to 02.05.27 at the time of alleged occurrence. In that view of the matter, the Insurance company will be liable for the payment of compensation.

8. **Written statement of Opposite Party No.2 (Insurer of Motor Cycle No. JH-10CK-4488)-** The insurer O.P. No.2 M/s Tata AIG General Insurance Company Ltd. filed WS on 12.02.24. The company has pleaded that there is no cause of action for the present claim case as against Insurance company. The present case against the answering defendant is not maintainable either on facts or in law. It has been pleaded that the driver of the vehicle was under the influence of alcohol at the time of accident, thereby violated the terms and conditions of the policy. It has further been pleaded that the driver of the offending vehicle was not holding any valid and effective driving licence to drive the relevant vehicle at the time of the accident and further was not qualified for holding or obtaining such driving licence. Lastly, it has been pleaded that the amount of compensation as claimed by the claimants is highly excessive, exorbitant and exaggerated.

9. **On the basis of the pleadings of the parties, following issues have been framed for determination:-**

(I) Whether the suit as framed maintainable in its present form?

(II) Whether there is valid cause of action for the present suit?

(III) Whether Maheshwar Mahato died in road accident due to rash and negligent driving by the driver of motorcycle bearing registration no. JH-10CK-4488 ?

(IV) Whether the driver of motorcycle bearing registration no. JH-10CK-4488 had valid and effective driving licence at the time of accident?

(V) Whether the motorcycle bearing registration no. JH-10CK-4488 was insured under the policy cover of M/s Tata AIG Insurance Company Ltd. at the time of accident ?

(VI) Whether the applicants/plaintiffs are entitled for compensation as claimed and from whom?

10. **In order to support the claim, the claimants have examined altogether five witnesses. They are :-**

C.W.1	Anjani Devi (wife of deceased)

C.W.2	Hiralal Ram (eye witness)
C.W.3	Jageshwar Mahato (eye witness)
C.W.4	Niwas Singh (formal witness)
C.W.5	Sunil Kumar Mahato (formal witness)

11. **The claimants have brought on record following documents in support of their case :-**

Ext.1	Authorization letter dt. 06.04.24 issued by Asst. Commandant CISF unit BCCL, Dhanbad
Ext.2, 2/1, 2/2,2/3, 2/4 & 2/5	Salary/ Pay Slip of Jan 22, Feb 22, March 22, April 22, May 22 & June 22 of deceased Maheshwar Mahato
Ext.3	Form 16 of assessment year 2022-23 of deceased Maheshwar Mahato
Ext.4	Identity card of deceased Maheshwar Mahato
Mark X and X/1	Xerox copy of aadhar card of Niwas Singh and Xerox copy of identity card of Niwas Singh
Ext.5	C.C of charge sheet of Baghmara P.S. 35/22
Ext.6	C.C. of FIR of Baghmara P.S. 35/22
Mark X/2	Xerox copy of insurance policy
Mark X/3	Xerox copy of owner book
Mark X/4	Xerox copy of driving licence
Mark X/5	Xerox copy of vehicle particular
Mark X/6	Xerox copy of postmortem report

12. **The defendant no. 01 have brought on record following documents in support of their case :-**

Mark Y	Xerox copy of C.C of FIR of Baghmara P.S. Case No. 36/2022
Mark Y/1	Xerox copy of prescription of treatment of Health Centre , Baghmara
Mark Y/2	Xerox copy of discharge ticket of PMCH, Dhanbad
Mark Y/3	Xerox copy of owner book of motorcycle no. JH-CK-4488
Mark Y/4	Xerox copy of insurance policy of motorcycle
Mark Y/5	Xerox copy of driving licence

13. **Bhagirath Rawani** has been examined as **D.W1** on behalf of OP No.1. He has stated that on 09.06.2022 in the morning time , he was going to his son Roshan to leave tuition on motorcycle, then one army man of CISF he came from the opposite side by his motorcycle no. JH-09AK-5365 and dashed the motorcycle. As a result of which, he and his son was fell down on the road and rider of motorcycle no. JH-09AK-5365 was also due to speed collided with the pillar ahead and fell down. In this matter, he was filed a FIR against them which has been registered in Baghmara P.S. Case No. 36/22, u/s 279, 337, 338 of IPC.

In his cross-examination, the witness has stated that at the time of accident, his vehicle was insured. He has been lodged the FIR in Baghmara P.S. No. 36/22 which against in CISF.

FINDINGS

14. I have heard the arguments on behalf of the parties and carefully examined the pleadings, evidence and the materials on the record. Before embarking upon the issues settled for adjudication, I need to conjure up the settled legal propositions governing the cases of this nature.

It is well settled that when a petition u/s 166 of the MV Act is instituted, it becomes the duty of the claimant to establish rash and negligent driving. To prove rash and negligent driving in petition under Motor Vehicle Act, the Tribunal need not go into the technicalities because strict rule of procedure and evidence are not followed. In road accident cases, the Tribunal is simply to quantify the compensation which is rational and reasonable on the basis of the injury/death. Besides, the proceedings under M.V.Act are not akin to proceedings in civil suit.

Hon'ble Apex court in its judgment and order dated 09.02.2018 passed in the case of **Archit Saini and Another Vs. The Oriental Insurance Company Limited and Others, Civil Appeal No.7300-7309 of 2016,** held as under :

"....While considering the claim petition, the Tribunal is required to hold an enquiry and act not as criminal court so as to find whether the claimants have established the occurrence beyond shadow of any reasonable doubt. In the enquiry, if there is prima facie evidence of the occurrence there is no reason to disbelieve such evidence. The statements coupled with the facts of registration of FIR and trial of the accused in a criminal court are sufficient to arrive at a conclusion that the accident has taken place.

*Likewise, in **Kusum Lata Vs. Satbir, 2011 (2) RCR A(C)379 (SC)** Hon'ble Apex Court has held that in a case relating to motor accident claims, the claimants are not required to rove the case as it is required to be done in a criminal trial. The court must keep this distinction in mind. Strict proof of an accident caused by a particular bus in a particular manner may not be possible to be done by the claimants. The claimants were merely to establish their case on the touchstone of preponderance of probability. The standard of proof beyond reasonable doubt could not have been applied."*

In a very recent judgment of the *Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Anita Sharma & Others Vs. The New India Assurance Co. Ltd & Anr. Civil Appeal Nos.4010-4011 of 2020,** it has been held that "strict principles of evidence and standards of proof like in a criminal trial are inapplicable in MACT claim cases. The standard of proof in such like matters is one of preponderance of probabilities, rather than beyond reasonable doubt."*

15. On the basis of evidence both oral and documentary, the issues are adjudicated as hereinunder.

<u>Issue no. III</u> - Whether Maheshwar Mahato died in road accident due to rash and negligent driving by the driver of motorcycle bearing registration no. JH-10CK-4488 ?

This issue is crux of the matter and therefore, taken up firstly for discussion and consideration. On 09.06.22 at about 04.40 A.M, Maheshwar Mahato (deceased) was going to duty CISF Camp by motorcycle no. JH-09AK-5365. It is said that when he reached near Harna Main Chowk curve, suddenly one motorcycle bearing regd. no. JH-10CK-4488 came being driven rashly and negligently by its driver and dashed the motorcycle bearing regd. no. JH-09AK-5365, as a result of which Maheshwar Mahato received serious injury. Thereafter, he was immediately shifted to Central Hospital, Dhanbad and referred by doctor for his better treatment at Vivekanand Hospital, Durgapur where during the course of treatment he died.

16. In order to substantiate their case, the claimants have examined altogether five witnesses. **Anjani Devi (CW1)** is the wife of the deceased and one of the claimants. She has stated that on 09.06.22 at about 04.40 A.M, Maheshwar Mahato (deceased) was going to duty CISF Camp by motorcycle no. JH-09AK-5365. It is said that when he reached near Harna Main Chowk curve, suddenly one motorcycle bearing regd. no. JH-10CK-4488 came being driven rashly and negligently by its driver and dashed the motorcycle bearing regd. no. JH-09AK-5365, as a result of which Maheshwar Mahato received serious injury. Thereafter, he was immediately shifted to Central Hospital, Dhanbad and referred by doctor for his better treatment Vivekanand Hospital, Durgapur where during the course of treatment he died. In her cross-examination, the witness has candidly stated that she is not an ocular witness of the occurrence.

17. **Hiralal Ram(CW2)** is said to be an eye witness of the occurrence. He has stated in his affidavited examination-in-chief that on 09.06.22 at about 04.40 A.M, Maheshwar Mahato (deceased) was going to duty CISF Camp by motorcycle no. JH-09AK-5365. It is said that when he reached near Harna Main Chowk , all of sudden, one motorcycle bearing regd. no. JH-10CK-4488 came being driven rashly and negligently by its driver and dashed the motorcycle bearing regd. no. JH-09AK-5365, as a result of Maheshwar Mahato received serious injury. Thereafter, he was immediately shifted to Dumra Hospital and referred by doctor for his better treatment to Central Hospital, Dhanbad and thereafter, he was taken for his better treatment at Vivekanand Hospital, Durgapur where during the course of treatment he died. Over and above, he has fully supported the claim case on the point of death of the deceased caused by offending vehicle due to rash and negligent driving by its driver.

18. **Jageshwar Mahato (CW3)** is also said to be an eye witness of the occurrence. He has stated that at the time of occurrence, he was taking tea near tea shop which the accident took place near Harna Main Chowk. His affidavited examination- in- chief, is more or less on the same mode as that of **CW2** and therefore, his evidence needs no repetition on those factual scores. Suffice to say that he has supported the factum of rash and negligent driving by the erring driver of motorcycle bearing registration no. JH-10CK-4488 who struck the deceased so forcefully that he died during the course of treatment in hospital.

19. **Niwas Singh (CW4)** is posted as Assistant Sub Inspector, in BCCL, Headquarter of Koyla Nagar, Dhanbad. He has filed authorization letter of BCCL- CCWO, Dhanbad which has been marked as **Ext.01.** He has proved the salary slip of Maheshwar Mahato for the months of January 2022 to June 2022 and also Form-16 for the Assessment year 2022-23. The documents have been marked as **Ext.2 to 2/5 and**

Ext.3 respectively. He has also filed the Id- Card of the deceased Maheshwar Mahato issued by the BCCL- CCWO, Dhanbad which has been marked as **Ext.4.**

20. **Sunil Kumar Mahato (CW5)** is a formal witness of the case. He has been filed many documents in the favour of deceased.

21. Apart from the oral evidence, the claimants have produced certified copy of FIR of Baghmara PS case no. 35/22 dated 09.06.22 registered u/s 279, 337, 338 and 427 IPC against the driver of the motorcycle bearing Regn. No. JH-10CK-4488 (Ext.6). Ext.5 is the charge-sheet no. 09/23 dated 17.02.23 u/s 279, 337,338, 427 and 304A of IPC against the driver of the said vehicle namely Bhagirath Rawani. Obviously, the police after thorough investigation found the occurrence to have taken place owing to rash and negligent driving by the erring driver of the offending vehicle namely Bhagirath Rawani. The postmortem examination report of the deceased marked as **'X/6'** shows death was due to the effects of ante mortem injuries sustained as described on P.M report. The post-mortem report further corroborates the testimony of the witnesses on the point of accidental death of the deceased Maheshwar Mahato.

22. On appraisal of the oral and documentary evidence on the record, I am led to irresistible conclusion that the offending motorcycle bearing Regn. no. JH-10CK-4488 was being driven rashly and negligently in uncontrolled speed by the erring driver due to which Maheshwar Mahato sustained serious injuries. Unfortunately, his injuries eventually got better of him and he died during the course of treatment in hospital. There is no whisper in the entire evidence suggesting any 'want of care' by the deceased contributing to the accident. Even if the final outcome of the criminal proceedings against the erring driver is unknown, the same would make no difference for the purposes of deciding the claim petition under the M.V. Act as here the standard required under the law is different

vis- a- vis the criminal law.

Accordingly, this issue no. III is decided in favour of the claimants and against the O.P.

23. **<u>Issue No I</u>:- Whether the suit as framed maintainable in its present form?**
<u>Issue No. II</u>:- Whether there is valid cause of action for the present suit?

Both the aforesaid issues are interlinked and therefore, I intend to decide them together. The claimants have instituted the present claim case being the legal heirs of deceased. Legal heir or representative ordinarily means a person who in law represents the estate of a deceased person or a person on whom the estate devolves on the death of an individual. Hence, legal representative including the wife, sons, daughter and parent of deceased victim of a motor accident are entitled to get compensation under the provisions of Motor Vehicles Act. As per the pleadings and evidence both oral and documentary, it has been established that the deceased met with an accident due to rash and negligent driving by the erring driver of the offending vehicle. Besides, the claim petition has been instituted in accordance with the rules. During argument, the question of cause of action and maintainability of the present claim was raised by the Insurer. However, the argument has no leg to stand inasmuch as the statutory recognition has been given to the heirs and successors to lay the claim of compensation. Even otherwise, there is no denial by the Insurer that the claimants are not the rightful heirs and successors of the deceased.

In view of the discussion made above, I find that the claimants have valid cause of action for the present claim and the claim petition is maintainable in its present form. Accordingly, Issue No. I & II are decided in favour of the claimants and against the opposite parties.

24. **<u>Issue no.IV</u>- Whether the driver of motorcycle bearing registration no. JH-10CK-4488 had valid and effective driving licence at the time of accident?**

OP no.1 in his WS has pleaded that the offending vehicle was being driven by Bhagirath Rawani who was having a valid driving licence at the time of accident. Photocopy of driving license of Bhagirath Rawani bearing DL no.JH-10/2008/0020713 having validity till 03.10.2025 has been **marked X/4.**

Accordingly, the issue no. IV is decided in favour of the claimants and against OP No.2.

25. **Issue No.V - Whether the motorcycle bearing registration no. JH-10CK-4488 was insured under the policy cover of M/s Tata AIG Insurance Company Ltd. at the time of accident ?**

The documents like owner book and vehicle particular have been taken on record and **marked X/3 and X/5** respectively. No dispute has been raised by the Insurer as to their authenticity.

The copy of insurance policy **(X/2)** suggests that the offending vehicle stands in the name of OP no.1 and was insured with OP no.2 vide Insurance Policy No. 3194760352/000000/00 valid from 03.05.22 to midnight of 02.05.27. There is no dispute with regard to insurance coverage. The paper is up-to-date with regard to its validity. Hence, it can be safely said that the offending vehicle was duly insured under the policy cover of OP no.2 M/s Tata AIG Insurance Company Limited.

Accordingly, issue no. V is decided in favour of claimants and against OP no.2 (Insurer of the vehicle).

26. **Issue No.VI- Whether the applicants/plaintiffs are entitled for compensation as claimed and from whom?**

In order to arrive at the amount of compensation, basically three fundamental facts need to be established. They are :

1. Age of deceased
2. Number of dependents
3. Income of deceased

In the instant case, it has been pleaded that the deceased was 44 years of age. The witnesses namely Anjani Devi (CW1) and Hiralal Ram (CW2) have uniformly stated that the age of the deceased was about 44 years at the time of his death. In the postmortem report **(Mark X/6),** the age of the deceased has been shown to be about 44 years. In the attending facts and circumstances of the case, the age of the deceased is assessed to be 44 years.

The second point is the number of dependents of the deceased. It has been pleaded that the claimants were fully dependent upon the earnings of the deceased. It has also come in evidence that the deceased being a service holder fully contributed for the maintenance of the family. Thus, in the emerging circumstances, it can be said that Anjani Devi (wife of the deceased), one daughter , two of her sons and parent namely Manjil Raj, Gaushik Raj, Gaurav Raj, Balak Mahato and Sukhmani Devi are the actual dependents. So, dependents are six in number i.e. his wife who is claimant no.1, claimant no. 2 to 4 (non-earning sons and daughter of the deceased) and claimant no. 5 & 6 (father and mother of the deceased) .

Now, coming to the question relating to the income earned by the deceased, Anjani Devi (CW1) has stated that her husband used to draw a monthly salary of Rs.72,563/-. CW2 and CW4 have also stated the same figure of salary in their respective evidence. CW4 who is Assistant Sub Inspector of CISF, as posted at BCCL, Headquartor, Koyla Nagar Dhanbad has proved the salary slip of the deceased, month of January 2022 to June 2022 which have been marked as **Ext. 2 to 2/5.** The Form 16 **(Ext.3)** of the Maheshwar Mahato (deceased) for the financial year 2021-22 shows the gross salary of deceased Rs. 9,48,168/- after tax deduction his net salary was Rs.8,95,475/-. As per his evidence, the salary of the deceased is assessed to be Rs. 8,95,475/- per annum.

Having discussed the instant case at length, it can be safely said that OP No.2 i.e. M/s Tata AIG Insurance Co. Ltd being the insurer of the offending vehicle is required to indemnify third party (applicants) in respect of the liabilities which the policy covered and to satisfy the award of compensation in respect thereof. Accordingly, the insurer shall be liable to pay the amount of compensation which is assessed as here under:

HEAD	CALCULATION
Annual Income of deceased	Rs.8,95,475/- per annum
Deduction of ¼ th towards personal and living expenses [number of dependants is 6]	Rs.2,23,869/-
Annual Income after deduction	Rs.6,71,606/-
As the deceased was aged about 44 years multiplier of 14 will be applicable (As per Sarla Verma and Ors vs DTC and Anr.)	Rs.6,71,606 x 14 = Rs.94,02,484/-
Future prospect 30% of the established income as the deceased was a permanent employee of M/S Eastern Coal Field Limited and aged about 44 years. **[National Insurance Company Ltd. vs Pranay Sethi 2017(13)SCALE12]**	Rs. 94,02,484 + Rs 28,20,745/- = Rs.1,22,23,229/-
Conventional Head:- Loss of estate Funeral expenses Loss of spousal cosortium **(vide National Insurance Company Ltd vs Pranay Sethi and Ors)**	 Rs.15,000 Rs.15,000 Rs. 40,000 Rs.70,000/-
Total compensation	**Rs.1,22,93,229/-**

27. In view of the totality of findings given on all issues recorded in the foregoing paragraphs, it is hereby

ORDERED

That, this Claim Application is allowed on contest. An award of **Rs.1,22,93,229/-** (Rs. One crore, twenty two Lacs, ninety three thousand, two hundred and twenty nine rupees only) is passed in favour of the claimants and against O.P. no.2 M/s. Tata AIG Insurance Company Limited (Insurer of offending vehicle bearing no. JH-10CK-4488). It is made clear that OP no.2 shall satisfy the award by depositing the awarded amount of **Rs.1,22,93,229/-** along with interest @ 7.5% per annum from the date of filing of the claim petition i.e. since 18.08.22 till its realization in the bank account no. 21060110044704, DJ 16, UCO Bank, Civil Court Branch, Dhanbad within thirty days from the date of receipt of this award.

It is made clear that 50% of the awarded amount with interest shall be paid to the wife of the deceased who is Claimant No. 1 and rest 50% of the awarded amount with interest shall go to the other claimants i.e Claimant No. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 in equal proportion. The share of minor children (Claimant no. 2, 3 and 4) will be deposited by way of FD Scheme in any nationalized bank which they will get after attaining the age of majority. An undertaking in this respect will be given by Anjani Devi (Claimant No.1,mother).

The payment of ad-interim compensation if made earlier shall be deducted from the aforesaid amount. The award shall be executable only after payment of remaining court fee, if any.

In the result, the instant claim petition filed on behalf of the claimants is hereby allowed on contest. The parties shall bear their own cost.

Let a copy of this award be sent to O.P No. 2 M/s. Tata AIG Insurance Company Ltd. for the necessary compliance and needful.

(Dictated, corrected and signed by me) (Awarded by me)

(D. C. Awasthi)	**(D.C. Awasthi)**
District Judge-cum-Presiding Officer, MACT	**District Judge-cum-Prisiding Officer MACT**
Dhanbad	**Dhanbad**
J.O Code JH0484	**J.O Code JH0484**
Dated- 25.09.2024	**Dated- 25.09.2024**