

MHPU140033222024

SESSIONS CASE NO. 190/2024



**State of Maharashtra
Vs.
Gautam Shahaji Kakade and others**

ORDER BELOW EXH.8

This regular bail application is moved by accused-Gautam Shahaji Kakade being accused no. 1, to release him on regular bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (for short Cr.P.C.) in Crime No. 283/2024, registered at Wadgaon Nimbalkar Police Station, in offences under Sections 302, 307, 143, 147, 148, 149, 352, 504, 506 and 201 of the Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') and under Sections 3, 25, 29, 30 of the Arms Act.

2. Heard learned advocate for accused, learned A.P.P. for State, and learned advocate for complainant. Perused the charge-sheet and the documents filed with it, as also documents filed by accused.

3. Prosecution case against the accused persons is that complainant-Ankita Ranjeet Nimbalkar, aged 23 years, lodged report against accused persons on 28.06.2024, on which F.I.R. came to be registered, with the allegations that deceased Ranjeet Eknath Nimbalkar was having fond of bullock-cart racing, and was having two bullocks by names '*Sarja*' and '*Sundar*', which were kept in custody of Vitthal Chavan known as Vitthal driver, for maintenance at Budh, Tal. Khatav, Dist. Satara. *Sarja* was purchased one year ago from Gautam Kakade of Nimbut for Rs.61,00,000/-, being present accused. Both the bullocks were run in racing, who have won such racings. On 24.06.2024, the present

accused Gautam Kakade had been to deceased for purchasing bullock *Sundar*, and stated that he and Santosh Todkar wanted to purchase *Sundar*. The transaction was settled for Rs. 37,00,000/- and the present accused handed over Rs. 5,00,000/- as earnest contract money. The balance of Rs. 32,00,000/- was agreed to be paid on 27.06.2024 and further, to reduce into writing on stamp, the said transaction. The bullock was carried with him by present accused when the said transaction took place, which was witnessed by complainant. On 27.06.2024, at 11.00 a.m., the deceased and Santosh Todkar had been to the accused at Nimbut to discuss on the transaction and deceased returned home at 2.00 p.m. Deceased told complainant that without making payment of balance amount, the present accused asked him to put signature on stamp paper, which he refused, and further that the present accused called in the evening to the deceased. At about 9.00 p.m., on 27.06.2024, the complainant, her deceased husband, child daughter aged 10 months, with relative by name Vaibhav Kadam and his friend Pintu Jadhav, proceeded for village Nimbut in a vehicle. Santosh Todkar was waiting at village Lonand, who asked the deceased as to why he did not sign in spite of receiving the whole amount. Her deceased husband told Santosh Todkar that he received only Rs. 5,00,000/-, and the balance amount was not paid by the present accused. Santosh Todkar told that present accused told him that he paid all the amount to deceased Ranjeet and completed the transaction. Santosh Todkar then left for his village. Thereafter, as the present accused had called deceased to receive balance Rs.32,00,000/-, he accompanied with complainant and others to the house of present accused at 11.00 p.m. They all sat on one cot in the court yard of his house. Present accused asked her husband as

to why he told Santosh that balance amount was not paid. The present accused told that he would pay the balance amount in the next morning and asked the deceased to put signature on the stamp paper. Her deceased husband asked him to pay the balance and then he would immediately sign, and further that if the accused did not want to complete the transaction, deceased told him to be ready to refund Rs.5,00,000/-, and asked him to return the bullock. Then deceased, complainant and the persons with him went towards their vehicle. At that time, the present accused uttered to deceased that he would see as to how deceased would carry the bullock and the accused made phone call asking the boys to come. The accused also called his brother Gaurav there. Accordingly, accused Gaurav and three unknown boys came towards the deceased and others. The present accused uttered and told to Gaurav and three boys to assault on the deceased being talking much. Gaurav was possessing a stick, which was taken in his hand by present accused, and ran to assault the deceased and abused him. Vaibhav Kadam asked Gautam Kakade not to make dispute, and they would discuss on the transaction next day. The other three boys were abusing the deceased and complainant. At that time, accused Gaurav uttered that he would kill the deceased so as not to carry the bullock, and fired once by a pistol in his hand on the head of her deceased husband. The deceased fell down. She, with the help of persons with her, carried the deceased in their vehicle at Sai-Seva Hospital, Waglewadi, and then in ambulance, at Bhoite hospital, Baramati. Thereafter, she approached the police station and lodged report against the present accused, his brother Gaurav and three unknown boys. During the course of investigation, the three boys have been identified and total six accused have been arraigned including the

present accused. In the charge-sheet, it is mentioned that during course of treatment, deceased Ranjeet died on 29.06.2024, at 2.30 a.m., due to the injury suffered by him and in the *post mortem* report, the cause of death is stated to be head injury. All the accused persons are alleged to have committed the offences as above in prosecution of common object.

4. In the submissions of learned advocate for accused, by referring to the allegations in F.I.R., he submitted that the present accused though made transaction with the deceased, it was no object or knowledge on his part that his brother-accused no. 2 was holding pistol and would be using the same to kill deceased. He submitted that though the unknown boys and brother were called by present accused, his object was not to kill the deceased but only to beat him. No common object can be attributed to the present accused in the offence, as the allegations show that the incident occurred suddenly, in which the accused no. 2 has used the pistol. There is seven hours delay in lodging FIR. The statements of the eye witness Vaibhav and Pintu were recorded two days later, which shows the possibility of manipulation and concocting a story against accused. Both the witnesses are relatives and friends of the deceased. The statement of witness Santosh Todkar is totally at variance with report showing total payment of Rs. 23,50,000/- to the deceased and writing on stamp paper, and further at variance with statements of Vaibhav and Pintu regarding the alleged transaction. He submitted that the accused went in the hospital, where the deceased was admitted for treatment, in respect of which C.C.T.V. footage is there and photographs are obtained by accused, filed with the bail application showing his *bona fide* conduct and no object to kill the deceased. In the offence, no overt act is

attributed to the present accused. Statements of Vaibhav and Pintu are that the other accused ran away from the spot, but not the present accused. Statements of the two doctors would show that it was not mentioned before them that someone killed the deceased by hitting a bullet on his head. *Post mortem* notes would show that there were other injuries on the dead body being total 9 abrasions, which are not explained, and they show that some other incident also occurred with the deceased. It renders doubt regarding the prosecution case. Though there is alleged recovery at the instance of present accused of pistol, as per prosecution case, the accused has not used the same. He submitted that in view of the complaint and statements of witnesses, no *prima facie* case is made out against the present accused of murder, and acting with common object with the accused who fired pistol at the deceased. The statements of witnesses are contradictory and manipulated. He submitted that as charge-sheet is filed, the accused may be released on bail subject to conditions. The investigation is not made in a fair manner. The antecedents of two offences would not come in the way to release the accused. The accused is not at flight risk, as his family resides at Nimbut and he is having property. Learned advocate submitted that thus, the accused has made out a case to release him on regular bail, and relied on following citations:

(i) *Thulia Kali Vs. State of Tamil Nadu [(1972) 3 Supreme Court Cases 393]* in which, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that:

“12....Delay in lodging the first information report quite often results in embellishment which is a creature of afterthought. On account of delay, the report not only gets bereft of the advantage of spontaneity, danger creeps in of

the introduction of coloured version, exaggerated account or concocted story As a result of deliberation and consultation.”

(ii) ***Subramanya Vs. State of Karnataka [(2023) 11 Supreme Court Cases 255]*** wherein, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that:

“78. If, it is say of the investigating officer that the accused appellant while in custody on his own free will and volition made a statement that he would lead to the place where he had hidden the weapon of offence, the site of burial of the dead body, clothes etc., then the first thing that the investigating officer should have done was to call for two independent witnesses at the police station itself. Once the two independent witnesses would arrive at the police station thereafter in their presence the accused should be asked to make an appropriate statement as he may desire in regard to pointing out the place where he is said to have hidden the weapon of offence etc. When the accused while in custody makes such statement before the two independent witnesses (panch-witnesses) the exact statement or rather the exact words uttered by the accused should be incorporated in the first part of the panchnama that the investigating officer may draw in accordance with law. This first part of the panchnama for the purpose of Section 27 of the Evidence Act is always drawn at the police station in the presence of the independent witnesses so as to lend credence that a particular statement was made by the accused expressing his willingness on his own free will and volition to point out the place where the weapon of offence or any other article used

in the commission of the offence had been hidden. Once the first part of the panchnama is completed thereafter the police party along with the accused and the two independent witnesses (panch-witnesses) would proceed to the particular place as may be led by the accused. If from that particular place anything like the weapon of offence or blood stained clothes or any other article is discovered then that part of the entire process would form the second part of the panchnama. This is how the law expects the investigating officer to draw the discovery panchnama as contemplated under Section 27 of the Evidence Act. If we read the entire oral evidence of the investigating officer then it is clear that the same is deficient in all the aforesaid relevant aspects of the matter.”

(iii) *Rajesh and Another Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh [2023 SCC OnLine SC 1202]* in which, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that:

33. *“.....Significantly, though the Crime Details Form notes that two panch witnesses were present, there is no narrative by them and they simply signed the form. The same is the position with the Crime Details Form (Ex. P14), relating to the finding of blood on the walls of the washing area and the floor; black plastic slippers; and an empty bottle of liquor. The same panch witnesses find mention in this Crime Detail Form and they affixed their signatures but again, it is not their narrative and there is no recording of how they went about finding these objects. Further, the form straightaway records the opinion that Rajesh Yadav and Raja Yadav had murdered Ajit Pal, put his body in a plastic sack and threw it*

into the well.”

“34. Property Seizure Memos (Ex. P18 and Ex. P23), relating to the seizure of the blood-stained clothes of Rajesh Yadav and Raja Yadav respectively, are drafted likewise wherein the witnesses, Bambam (PW-9) and Surjeet Singh, are named but there is no narrative on their part as to how they were led and assisted by someone to find these objects. On the same lines, Property Seizure Memo (Ex. P9), relating to the seizure of the blood-stained soil, controlled soil and the plastic slippers; Property Seizure Memo (Ex. P10), relating to seizure of the liquor bottle; Property Seizure Memo (Ex. P12), relating to seizure of the body of the deceased and his clothes along with the hair found in his right fist; Property Seizure Memo (Ex. P11), relating to seizure of the murder weapon; and Property Seizure Memo (Ex. P19) relating to seizure of the two mobile phones; also reflect the same style of recording. Witnesses to the panchnamas and the seizures acted as mere attestors to the documents and did not disclose in their own words as to how these objects were discovered, i.e., at whose instance and how. Ergo, no lawful validity attaches to these proceedings recorded by the police in the context of collection of all this evidence.”

(iv) ***Manoj Madanlal Tekam Vs. State of Maharashtra [2014 SCC OnLine Bom 1236]*** wherein, the Hon’ble Supreme Court observed that:

“39. The admissible part of memorandum recorded under section 27 of the Evidence Act is reproduced hereunder:

‘I have concealed the said sword-cane.’”

“40. From the aforesaid, it is crystal clear that the appellant has not stated the place where the sword-cane (gupti) was concealed by him. Though, Ananta (PW5) claims from his evidence that such a statement was made in respect of the place in contemporaneous document namely; memorandum statement, it is absent. If the place was not stated by the appellant, the consequent recovery from the place from where the recover is made, according to us, is of no use”

(v) ***Pavan s/o. Nandkishor Sedani Vs. State [2021 DGLS (Bom) 2915]*** in which, the Hon’ble Bombay High Court observed that:

“The prosecution is however heavily relying on two circumstances to contend that prima facie, the chain of circumstances is complete. The first circumstance is that pursuant to memorandum recorded under section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, which contains a disclosure that the applicant has hidden the spare magazine of the weapon used and that such place will be shown to the police, an empty magazine can fit in the butt stock of the weapon forwarded by the Investigating Agency. Surprisingly, the Investigating Agency does not appear to have sought a specific opinion from the ballistic expert as to whether the empty magazine was unique or typical to the weapon seized or could have been used in any weapon of similar make or structure. In the absence of material to suggest that the empty magazine could have been used, or was intended to be used only in the weapon of offence which is allegedly recovered on the basis of the memorandum of the co-accused, at least, at this stage, I am not inclined to hold the same against the applicant-

accused.”

(vi) ***Mukesh Tiwari Vs. State of U.P. [2021 SCC OnLine ALL 193]*** wherein, the Hon’ble Supreme Court observed that:

“On the basis of the facts and circumstances discussed above, an inference can easily be drawn that this is a case of blind murder; no one actually witnessed the incident and the FIR was lodged on the basis of guess-work and suspicion and the appellants have been implicated on account of suspicion because of the previous enmity. Even the possibility of the FIR being ante-timed cannot be ruled out as at the time of conducting inquest the G.D. Entry of the Chick FIR was not available and the dispatch time of the Special Report has not been proved by the prosecution.”

(vii) ***Ram Govind Upadhyay Vs. Sudarshan Singh and others [(2002) Supreme Court Cases 598]*** wherein, the Hon’ble Supreme Court observed that:

“4. Apart from the above, certain other which may be attributed to be relevant considerations may also be noticed at this juncture though however, the same are only illustrative and nor exhaustive neither there can be any. The considerations being:

(a) While granting bail the Court has to keep in mind not only the nature of the accusations, but the severity of the punishment, if the accusation entails a conviction and the nature of evidence in support of the accusations.

(b) Reasonable apprehensions of the witnesses being tampered with or the apprehension of there being a threat

for the complainant should also weigh with the Court in the matter of grant of bail.

(c) While it is not accepted to have the entire evidence establishing the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt but there ought always to be a prima facie satisfaction of the Court in support of the charge.

(d) Frivolity in prosecution should always be considered and it is only the element of genuineness that shall have to be considered in the matter of grant of bail and in the event of there being some doubt as to the genuineness of the prosecution, in the normal course of events, the accused is entitled to an order of bail.”

5. Learned A.P.P. for State submitted that role of the present accused is specifically mentioned in F.I.R., who entered into transaction with the deceased to purchase bullock, and when the deceased went to the present accused for balance consideration, he called the other accused and in prosecution of common object of unlawful assembly at the spot, pistol was used by accused no. 2 to fire on the head of deceased, resulting into death. Complainant, Vaibhav and Pintu are the witnesses of the incident. There is recovery of pistol from the present accused as per the statement made by him under Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act. The witnesses will be threatened and persuaded, if the present accused being main accused, is released on bail. He submitted that F.I.R. came to be lodged after some hours as the complainant had taken the deceased to one hospital and then to another for the purpose of treatment who succumbed to fatal brain injury caused by bullet fired on head. There are antecedents against the accused for offences under Section 420 of I.P.C. Clothes of accused nos. 4 and

6 are seized, and they are identified by complainant and witnesses in Test Identification Parade. He submitted that there is sufficient material with the charge-sheet against the accused, and therefore, bail application may be rejected.

6. Learned advocate for complainant adopted the arguments made by learned A.P.P. and further submitted that delay itself is explained in F.I.R. that complainant had gone to hospitals for treatment and then lodged report. He referred to the statements in complaint that accused no. 1 called the deceased and the transaction that was entered into is not disputed in the arguments. There was altercation by the present accused with deceased and then, gun was used by accused no. 2 to eliminate the deceased resulting into homicidal death. He submitted that the other injuries mentioned in *post mortem* may be caused due to handling of dead body in hurry. There was intention and motive on the part of present accused. There is evidence against him for acting under Section 34 or 149 of I.P.C. He submitted that statement of witness Santosh does not negate the transaction, which is stated by all the witnesses. There is no reason to falsely implicate the accused. The accused has not explained as to why allegedly, he went to the hospital where deceased was admitted. He submitted that statements of witnesses were recorded after funeral. Accused has antecedents. He submitted that there is sufficient material against the accused, and releasing him on bail would result in tampering evidence. Therefore, he submitted to reject the application and relied on following citation:

Rohit Bishnoi Vs. The State of Rajasthan and another [2023 Live Law (SC) 560] in which, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as under:

“18. This Court has, on several occasions discussed the factors to be considered by a Court while deciding a bail application. The primary considerations which must be placed at balance while deciding the grant of bail are:

(i) The seriousness of the offence;

(ii) The likelihood of the accused fleeing from justice;

(iii) The impact of release of the accused on the prosecution witnesses;

(iv) Likelihood of the accused tampering with evidence. While such a list is not exhaustive, it may be stated that if a Court takes into account such factors in deciding a bail application, it could be concluded that the decision has resulted from a judicious exercise of its discretion, vide *Gudikanti Narasimhulu vs. Public Prosecutor, High Court of Andhra Pradesh- [(1978) 1 SCC 240]* ; *Prahlad Singh Bhati vs. NCT, Delhi- [(2001) 4 SCC 280]* ; *Anil Kumar Yadav vs. State (NCT of Delhi) - [(2018) 12 SCC 129]*”

7. Learned advocate for the accused in rejoinder arguments, submitted that intention to kill is absent in the prosecution case against the present accused. Though stick is alleged in F.I.R. to have been used by him, he has not used the same. Allegations in F.I.R. and statements of Vaibhav and Pintu do not show that present accused is *prima facie* responsible for the offence under Section 302 of I.P.C. He submitted to release the accused.

8. Insofar as the prosecution case brought against the accused including the present accused for offence punishable under Section 302 of I.P.C. being the major offence and Section 149 of I.P.C., from the *prima facie* material produced with the charge-

sheet, the facts and circumstances appearing therefrom are as under:

(i) The transaction in respect of bullock was entered into between present accused and deceased Ranjeet Nimbalkar on 24.06.2024, and both were knowing well each other, however, there was dispute between them with respect to payment of money, for which deceased had been to present accused. Witness Santosh Todkar was also involved in the transaction. Deceased was again called in the evening, and pursuantly, he proceeded to visit accused with his wife, witnesses Vaibhav and Pintu.

(ii) They met with Santosh Todkar in the way who left from there, and then deceased and others proceeded to the spot where there was altercation between present accused and deceased. The present accused called accused nos. 2, 4 and 6 on the spot on phone, who approached there, to whom the present accused told to assault the deceased. The stick in the hands of accused no. 2 Gaurav was taken by present accused and he went to assault deceased with abuses. Witness Vaibhav prevented him. Accused nos. 2, 4 to 6 were abusing the deceased and witnesses present with him. Accused no. 2 uttered that he would kill the deceased and took out the pistol and fired in the head of deceased, who died during the course of treatment.

(iii) FIR came to be registered on report wife of deceased, and it is stated therein that the deceased was taken by informant-wife first at one hospital and then to another.

9. For accused, the case of *Thulia Kali (supra)* is relied on, which is a matter of appeal wherein trial took place and the above observations are made. At this stage of the matter, from the *prima facie* material on record, the complainant-wife stated that

after her husband was injured by bullet. She with the help of witnesses Vaibhav and Pintu, took him to hospitals and then came to lodge report, and therefore, the said delay in such a serious nature of offence cannot be fatal, looking to the stage of matter where the accused has sought bail.

10. With regard to knowledge or intention to kill, the evidence by way of statements of complainant, Vaibhav and Pintu are *prima facie* material, which show that all the transaction of the deceased was with present accused. There was earlier meeting between accused and deceased on 27.06.2024, which fact is also stated by witness Santosh Todkar in his statement dated 29.06.2024, which is referred to for accused during arguments. The present accused is alleged to have called the deceased who accompanied with his wife and two witnesses to the spot of house of present accused. It is the present accused who after altercation with deceased, called accused nos. 2, 4 to 6 at the spot, and the present accused took the stick in the hands of accused Gaurav to assault deceased, whom witness Vaibhav Kadam was preventing to do so. Accused nos. 4 to 6 were abusing deceased. In the meantime, accused no. 2 uttering to kill the deceased, took out pistol and fired a bullet in the head of deceased whereby he fell down. It is pertinent to note here that all the transaction took place between present accused and deceased. Accused no. 2 as well as accused nos. 4 to 6 are not alleged to have any transaction or any other incident with deceased so as to assault in such a manner as to kill the deceased. It is on the call of the present accused, accused nos. 2, 4 to 6 approached the spot with a gun and stick, and the present accused used the said stick to assault deceased, who was prevented by witness Vaibhav. In this background, the words of

the present accused to assault the deceased are relevant to show that the said accused were called for the purpose by him. Accused no. 2 when fired at deceased, he was not prevented by the present accused from doing so. Therefore, knowledge or intention to kill on the part of present accused is brought by prosecution with the charge-sheet. Further contention for present accused that he went to the hospital after incident where deceased was admitted is his defence to show *bona fide* conduct. However, there is nothing on record to show that similar such conduct can be attributed to him when accused no. 2 uttered to kill the deceased and then fired at him on head, which appears in pursuance of utterance of the present accused to assault the deceased, after accused nos. 2, 4 to 6 were called by present accused on spot. The case of *Mukesh Tiwari (supra)* is relied on for accused wherein the matter was in appeal after trial where there were no witnesses to the incident and F.I.R. was lodged on guess work. In the present case, there are three eye witnesses of the incident including wife of deceased who lodged report.

11. The cases of *Subramanya, Rajesh and Manoj Tekam (supra)* are relied on for accused which are appeals which arose from the trial held and the above observations relating to Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act are made. The case of *Pavan Sedani (supra)* is also relied on in which above observations on matters under Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act are made. At this stage of the matter of deciding bail application, it appears that the pistol by which accused no. 2 fired a bullet in the head of deceased, is recovered from the present accused and the said panchanama under Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act is challenged. The pistol is seized by police and apart therefrom, there is evidence of

three eye witnesses in the matter *prima facie* showing that pistol was fired at deceased at head, in which, he received bullet injury. The seized muddemal is deposited with Forensic Laboratory for the purpose of chemical analysis and report of the Analyzer.

12. In *Ram Govind Upadhyay (supra)*, it is held by Hon'ble Supreme Court *inter alia* that frivolity of prosecution is always to be considered, and it is only the element of genuineness that shall have to be considered in the matter of grant of bail. Applying the said principle to the instant case, the statements of eye witnesses and evidence collected by Investigating Officer does not show frivolity of prosecution case.

13. After receiving injury, deceased was initially admitted to Sai-Seva hospital at Waglewadi and then Bhoite hospital, Baramati, and further at Ruby Hall Clinic, Pune, who died on 29.06.2024, in the morning. The inquest was carried out and then the *post mortem*, in which, it is stated that death of deceased resulted due to firearm injury to head associated with head injury. Learned advocate for accused submitted that there were 9 other abrasion injuries on the dead body of deceased. Learned A.P.P. submitted that after receiving bullet injury, deceased was rushed to the hospital by his wife and witnesses Vaibhav and Pintu and from that hospital to another hospital. At this stage of the matter, evidence of eye witnesses coupled with the recovery of the weapon shows that the observations in the *post mortem* report are made relating to cause of death, as well as the position of dead body. Alongwith pistol, empty round cartridge, one iron magazine and *bamboo* stick have been seized in the offence. The bullet was taken out from the brain of deceased, and all the muddemal is sent for chemical analysis.

14. The CCTV footage DVR is also seized by the police of the spot where incident occurred. Accused nos. 4 to 6 have been identified in Test Identification Parade held by the Executive Magistrate at Central Prison Jail, Pune, by complainant and witnesses Vaibhav and Pintu. Accused no. 3 Shahaji Mugutrao Kakade being father of accused nos. 1 and 2 was also apprehended, whose bail application was rejected, and thereafter, he approached Hon'ble Bombay High Court by filing Cri. Bail Application No. 3148/2024, in which, it is held that at the most Section 201 of IPC would apply in respect of the said accused, aged 70 years, and he came to be released on bail.

15. Learned advocate for complainant relied on the case of Rohit Bishnoi (supra) in which, factors to be considered by Hon'ble Court are laid down including seriousness of offence, tampering evidence and witnesses. Therefore, looking to the nature of offence, evidence collected against accused and filed with the charge-sheet, his main role in the offence committed in prosecution of common object, likelihood of tampering of evidence and witnesses, no case is made out by the accused to release him on regular bail. Hence, the following order:

ORDER

Application is hereby rejected.

Date :- 22.11.2024.

(V. C. Barde)
Additional Sessions Judge,
Baramati.

CERTIFICATE

I affirm that the contents of this P.D.F. file Order are same word for word as per original Order.

Name of Stenographer : V.B.Lalsangi
Stenographer (G-1)

Court Name : V. C. Barde
Additional Sessions Judge,
Baramati, Dist. Pune.

Date of Order : 22.11.2024.
Order signed by
Presiding Officer : 22.11.2024.
Order uploaded on : 22.11.2024.