

GAHC010007732013



2026:GAU-AS:5356

THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : Crl.A./156/2013

FAKRUL ISLAM
S/O LATE ARAB ALI, VILL. BATARASHI, P.S. and DIST. KARIMGANJ

VERSUS

STATE OF ASSAM

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR.A AHMED, MR.H R A CHOUDHURY,MR.A ALAM,MR.I A HAZARIKA

Advocate for the Respondent : PP, ASSAM, ,,

B E F O R E

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N. UNNI KRISHNAN NAIR

For the Appellant : Mr. A Ahmed

For the Respondent : Mr. R J Baruah

Date of Hearing : 03.12.2025

Date of Judgment : 30.03.2026

JUDGMENT AND ORDER (CAV)

Heard Mr. A Ahmed, learned counsel appearing for the appellant and Mr. R J Baruah, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, Assam.

2. The appellant by way of instituting the present criminal appeal has assailed the judgment and order dated 30.04.2013, passed by the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Karimganj, in Sessions Case No. 02/2009, convicting the appellant, herein, under Sections 457/324 IPC and sentencing him to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for 5 (five) years along with fine of Rs.3,000/-, in default, further Rigorous Imprisonment for 3 (three) months for the offence under Section 457 IPC and further, sentencing him to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for 1 (one) year and also to pay a fine of Rs.1,000/-, in default, to undergo further Rigorous Imprisonment for 1 (one) month for the offence under Section 324 IPC. Both the sentences were directed to run consecutively.

3. The prosecution case as unfolded during the trial is that one Afia Begum (informant), had lodged an Ejahar on 01.10.2000, inter-alia, alleging, therein, that on 29.09.2000, at about 2:00 AM, the appellant, herein, had entered into her house by breaking the Southern wall of the house, while she was sleeping and was not aware of his such entrance. It was alleged that after entering the house, the appellant, with an intention to kill her, attempted to assault her with a sharp weapon that he was carrying, however, she managed to save herself from sustaining injury from the sharp weapon. It was further alleged that the accused person, thereafter, bit on the left side of her face and caused grievous bleeding injury on the left side of her face.

In the FIR, it was further highlighted that a case for committing such illegal acts was pending, against the appellant, herein, before the Court of learned District and Sessions Judge. It was further highlighted that on she raising a commotion, the neighbouring people had come and saved her, otherwise, the accused would have killed her.

Police on receipt of the said FIR, registered the same as Karimganj P. S. Case No. 493/2000 under Sections 457/326/307 IPC.

On completion of the investigation, police laid a charge-sheet against the present appellant under Sections 457/324/307 IPC. On laying of the charge-sheet, the same was committed to the Court of Sessions. The learned Trial Court framed charges against the appellant, herein, under Sections 457/324/307 IPC. The charges, on being read over and explained to the appellant, he pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried. Accordingly, a trial ensued.

During the trial, the prosecution examined 5 witnesses, including the Medical Officer, examining the informant on 30.09.2000 and the Investigating Officer. Thereafter, the appellant was examined under Section 313 Cr.P.C., where he had pleaded innocence. The appellant had adduced one defence witness in his favour.

The learned Trial Court, upon conclusion of the trial, by appreciating the evidences coming on record, proceeded vide judgment dated 30.04.2013 to convict the appellant under Sections 457/324 IPC and sentenced him, as noticed hereinabove.

Being aggrieved, the appellant has instituted the present criminal appeal.

4. Mr. A Ahmed, learned counsel for the appellant, at the outset, has submitted that from the evidence of the Medical Officer, who had deposed during the trial as PW3, it is evident that the appellant was examined by him on 30.09.2000, at about 11:30 AM, on a police requisition dated 30.09.2000. He submits that the prosecution had contended that the FIR in the matter was lodged on 01.10.2000. He submits that a perusal of the FIR, which was exhibited as Ext. 2, during the trial would reveal that the same was seen by the jurisdictional Magistrate on 16.10.2000. He by referring to the deposition of the Investigating Officer during the trial as PW5, submits that no G.D. Entry was registered before receipt of the FIR about the incident. He further submits that the deposition of PW5 only projects that the appellant had come to the Police Station on 30.09.2000 and on a police requisition, she was sent for medical examination.

4.1 Mr. Ahmed, submits that it is further evident that after registration of the FIR, the informant was produced before the jurisdictional Magistrate for recording her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. He submits that the statement of the victim (informant) was so recorded on 16.10.2000. However, on a perusal of the deposition of PW5, it would be evident that immediately on registration of the FIR, the Investigating Officer had gone to the place of occurrence and carried out investigation, therein, including examination of witnesses and the victim was produced before the Magistrate for recording her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C.

4.2 Mr. Ahmed, learned counsel for the appellant submits that the prosecution had not clarified the delay occasioning in forwarding a copy of the FIR to the jurisdictional Chief Judicial Magistrate and as to why the same was

forwarded after 16 days and not within 24 hours of registration of the case as mandated under law. The delay occasioning in forwarding the FIR reveals that the same is a manipulated one and was so registered as an after thought to cause prejudice to the appellant, herein.

4.3 Mr. Ahmed, learned counsel for the appellant submits that the said inconsistency noticed in the matter not being clarified by the prosecution, through the deposition of the Investigating Officer, i.e., PW5, has the effect of vitiating the entire investigation carried out in the matter and accordingly, basing on the said deficiency noticed in the investigation of the matter, which raises a doubt about the bonafide of the information submitted by the informant, the impugned judgment dated 30.04.2013, would mandate an interference.

4.4 With regard to the merit of the matter, Mr. Ahmed, by taking this Court through the evidences adduced by the prosecution witnesses as well as the DW1, submits that there from, it would be apparent that there was an enmity between the informant and the appellant, herein, since long. He submits that the informant, while deposing as PW1 during the trial had deposed that after she was injured by the appellant, herein, she had raised a voice and then her son and daughter, Kalu Mia and Shajid had got up from bed. He submits that the presence of the son and daughter of the informant during the time when the informant, was being assaulted by the appellant herein, has not been stated. He submits that PW2 Kalu Mia, who is the son of the informant, during his deposition in the trial, had deposed that the accused, who was in the house, had ran away and that the accused was holding a dao in his hands as well as a torch and had fled away from the Northern side of the house. He submits that

the evidence of PW1 (informant) and PW2, her son are inconsistent.

4.5 By referring to the statement recorded of the informant under Section 164 Cr.P.C., Mr. Ahmed, submits that the informant had deposed that on hearing her cry, her four children had arisen and raised an alarm and called her brother-in-law, who also rushed to the room. It is submitted that the informant had further stated that the appellant had kicked her son and bitten on her face and struck on her leg with torch and then fled away. However, the said statement has not been reiterated by the informant, PW1 or PW2, her son, in their depositions during the trial. Accordingly, he submits that considering the enmity already existing between the appellant and the informant and the informant's failure to get the appellant convicted in the cases filed by her earlier, she had hoisted the present case upon the appellant only to take vengeance upon him.

4.6 In support of his submissions, Mr. Ahmed, learned counsel for the appellant, has relied on a decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Rajeevan and Others Vs. State of Kerala* reported in (2003) 3 SCC 355.

5. Mr. R J Baruah, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, Assam, appearing for the State, has submitted that a perusal of the deposition of the witnesses deposing during the trial would go to reveal that the charge framed against the appellant stood established. He submits that the presence of the appellant in the house of the informant on the fateful day is established beyond reasonable doubt. He further submits that the injury caused to the appellant and her projection that it was on account of the appellant biting her stood established from the deposition of the Medical Officer, who had deposed as PW3.

5.1 Mr. Baruah, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, Assam, has submitted

that certain inconsistencies may exist in the deposition of the PWs, more particularly, the informant, who had deposed as PW1 and her son, who had deposed as PW2, inasmuch as, such deposition were made after around 12 years from the date of the incident. He, however, submits that the inconsistencies highlighted by the learned counsel for the appellant in the investigation of the case and/or in the deposition of the witnesses are not of relevance, inasmuch as, the same did not otherwise, cloud the materials brought on record connecting the appellant, herein, to the charges framed against him.

6. I have heard the learned counsels for the parties and also perused the materials available on record.

7. The learned Trial Court, upon appreciating the evidences coming on record, including the evidence adduced by the DW1, had drawn a conclusion that the evidences of all the witnesses were corroborative and no contradiction could be brought and proved. It further held that there is no discrepancy with regard to any material point or circumstances of the case.

8. On the basis of the said evidence, the learned Trial Court had drawn the following conclusions:

“11. In the above discussions it is seen that the evidences of all the witnesses are corroborative. No contradiction could be brought and proved. There is no discrepancy with regard to any material point or circumstances of this case. The injury as found by the doctor is identical with the ocular evidence of all the witnesses. No other probable reason of such injury is seen in the evidence. The defence

side tried to establish the plea of false implication by way of examination of the DW 1.

12. According to the DW 1 accused is maternal uncle by relation and of the same locality. He knew one Safique Miah, the nephew of the accused. The prosecutrix wanted to get married with the said Safique Miah about 10 years back. At that time Safique Miah was aged about 16/17. The accused opposed any such proposal of marriage and for that the prosecutrix lodged many cases against the accused. He further deposed that, at about 10 years back the prosecutrix went to his house and told that she lodged rape case against the accused. He also deposed that at that time his age was 8/9. Under the above context it seems to be very improbable that a woman could have disclosed anything about her personal affairs to a boy of 8/9 years. In his cross examination he stated that Safique Miah did not tell anything about the marriage proposal and he heard about the same. So, his evidence is considered as totally hearsay in nature. He further stated that at that time the prosecutrix was unmarried. That being the nature of evidence, it clearly appears that he adduced false evidence for the sake of his maternal uncle, the accused. Thus his evidence rather seems to have fortified the prosecution case. It appears that there is some exaggeration both with regard to the contents of the FIR and the evidence of the prosecutrix about the alleged attempt of committing murder of accused with a sharp weapon. It is not at all believable as there was no such injury with alleged sharp cutting weapon on the person of the victim. It is a fact that the victim is an illiterate. So, such

exaggerated ejahar is ignorable under the facts and circumstances of this case and also in view of the fact of corroboration of the evidence on all material particulars.

13. During argument Id. defence counsel strongly contended that there is a delay of 2 days in lodging of the FIR and there was no GD Entry In this context it is seen that there is no actual delay on the part of the prosecutrix to approach the police in as much as it clearly appears that she was medically examined on the following morning of the alleged occurrence by the doctor with reference to police requisition. So, for an illiterate woman delay of one day in filing written ejahar under the facts and circumstances of this case is considered as not fatal for the prosecution. The Id defence counsel also strongly contended that it is seems to be very improbable that the accused allegedly entered into the house of the complainant by breaking southern fencing and came out breaking through the northern bamboo wall. In the sketch map, the Ext.3 it clearly appears that the bed room of the prosecutrix is in the middle of the house. Distance between the northern and southern wall is almost equal from the bed room and the I/O found both the wall has broken. The evidence of all the witnesses also corroborates the same. Therefore, it is best known to the person as to why he chose to exist on the opposite side by breaking fencing. Upon consideration of the above I find no ground to disbelieve the testimony of the injured-prosecutrix and also other witnesses."

9. Accordingly, basing on the said conclusions, the learned Trial Court,

proceeded to convict the appellant under Sections 457/324 IPC and sentenced him, as noticed hereinabove.

10. For appreciating the arguments made by the learned counsels for the parties to the proceeding, this Court would refer to the evidences adduced by the witnesses during the trial;

The informant had deposed during the trial as PW1. PW1 after narrating the incident of the appellant entering into her house and threatening her not to raise a voice by showing a dagger and further that the appellant would kill her, deposed that the appellant had bitten her on the left side of her cheek and there was bleeding from the injury. She further deposed that on raising shouts, her son and daughter and two others got up from their bed and neighbours also came. The accused had fled away by breaking open the wall on the Northern side of her house. She had further deposed that the accused had earlier struck her by means of a spade and she had filed a case against the accused on account of the said incident and the same was pending.

During her cross, she had deposed that she had filed three Ejahars against the appellant, herein and one of them was a rape case. She further deposed that one case was pending and the others were disposed of. She further deposed that the appellant had started to disturb her since the death of her husband and that she did not know Safique Mia, who is the nephew of the accused and denied having any connection with Mia. She denied that she wanted to marry Safique Mia, the accused having raised protest to such marriage, she had instituted series of cases. She reiterated that the accused had entered into her house from the Southern side and escaped by the Northern side.

PW2 Md. Kalu Mia, who is the son of the informant reiterated that the incident had occasioned about 8 years ago and he was 8 years of age at the relevant point of time. He deposed that in the night hours, when he was sleeping in his house, his mother suddenly raised shouts, he along with his younger sister who was with him got up from bed and saw his mother with injury on the left side of her face and there was bleeding from the injury. He further deposed that the accused, who was in the house ran away and he was holding a dao in his hands and also had a torch with him. He deposed that the appellant had fled away by the Northern side of the house. Thereafter, it was deposed that neighbours had collected when they raised shouts. He deposed that police had come.

During his cross, he denied that his mother had filed a false case and that he could not recognize the person, who entered into their house.

PW3 is the Medical Officer, who during his deposition deposed that on 30.09.2000, while he was working as a Senior Medical & Health Officer, Civil Hospital, Karimganj, at around 11:30 AM, he had examined the informant, who was forwarded on a police requisition dated 30.09.2000. He further deposed that the assault was recorded to have occasioned on 29.09.2000 and there was a semi circular abrasion over the right cheek of the victim, which was opined to be perhaps due to teeth bite. He further deposed that the injury was simple fresh and caused by teeth bite.

During his cross, he denied the suggestion that the injuries was not caused by teeth bite and that he had prepared a false report in collusion with the informant.

PW4 Md. Fatir Mia Ali, is a neighbor and is not an eye witness to the incident. However, during his deposition, he deposed that on reaching the house of the informant, he had seen the walls on the Southern and Northern sides of her house were broken and also found the informant in an injured condition and also had seen bleeding wound on the cheek of Afia Begum. He deposed that he was informed by the informant that the appellant, herein, had entered into her house and caused injury to her and thereafter, fled away. Nothing material could be got by the appellant during the cross-examination of the PW4.

PW5 is the Investigating Officer. During his deposition he deposed that on 01.10.2000, he was at Karimganj serving as Attached Officer and that on the day, at about 8:30 AM, the informant had lodged an Ejahar before the Officer-in-Charge of Karimganj Police Station. He deposed that the FIR was registered as Karimganj P.S. Case No. 493/2000 under Sections 457/326/307 IPC and it was endorsed to him for investigation. He exhibited the FIR. He further deposed that thereafter, he went to the place of occurrence and drew a sketch map of the scene of occurrence and examined the witnesses. The sketch map was exhibited as Ext. 3. He further deposed that the victim was produced before the Magistrate for recording her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. and she was also medically examined. He deposed that the accused could not be arrested on several attempts and accordingly, the charge-sheet was submitted by him showing the appellant as an absconder.

During his cross, PW5 deposed that before registration of the case, no G.D. Entry was made. Further, from the case diary, he had deposed that the Ejahar victim was examined by the doctor. He also deposed that the victim had come to the police station on 30.09.2000 and on police requisition, she was sent

for medical examination. He further deposed that at the time of examination of PW2, namely, Kalu Mia, his age was found as 12 years, but was not produced before the Magistrate for recording his statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C.

The appellant was, thereafter, examined under Section 313 Cr.P.C. and on the circumstances of the case being put to him, the appellant had stated that after the death of her husband, the informant had wanted to marry his nephew, Safique Ali, but he had prevented her from doing so as he was only a student of Class-VI at that point of time. He further stated that out of grudge, the informant had lodged this case and two other cases on false ground. He denied of having gone to the house of the informant on the fateful day.

With regard to the deposition of PW4, the appellant had stated that PW4 was the son of the elder brother of the informant and his house is ½ kilometer away and he had adduced false evidence only to support the case of the informant. The appellant stated that he would adduce evidence of one Safik Uddin.

However, one Abdul Jabbar had deposed during the trial as DW1. DW1 deposed that the appellant was his maternal uncle by relation and they were from the same locality. He deposed that the informant was known to him and he also knows Safik Mia, the nephew of the appellant. He further deposed that the informant wanted to get married with Safik Mia about 10 years ago and at that point of time Safik Mia was aged about 16/17 years, which was opposed by the appellant. He further deposed that at the relevant point of time, he was around 8/9 years and had only heard about the same. He further deposed that as the appellant had opposed the marriage proposal, the victim had lodged many cases against the appellant and about 10 years back, the informant had gone to

his house and told that she had lodged rape case against the accused.

During his cross-examination, he deposed that Safik Mia had not told him about the aforesaid marriage proposal and he had heard about the same. He further deposed that at the relevant point of time, the informant was unmarried and that he had seen the informant lastly about 3/4 years back in her house.

11. From the above deposition, it is clear that the eye witnesses to the incident are the victim herself and the PW2. On a perusal of the statement of the victim, this Court finds that she had not deposed any material facts which she had stated during the recording of her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. on 16.10.2000.

12. A perusal of the statement of the victim recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C., would reveal that she had stated, therein, that at the time of the incident, the son of the informant was present along with her, inasmuch as, she had stated that the appellant, herein, had kicked her son and thereafter, bit on her face and also stuck her leg with a torch before fleeing away. The said statement, however, was not reiterated during her deposition in the trial as PW1.

13. PW2 had also not deposed on those lines. The said omission is material, inasmuch as, had the said deposition come on record, the PW2, would also have been required to be considered as an eye witness.

14. The evidence of PW4 would not be of much importance, inasmuch as, he is not an eye witness to the incident and had reached the place of occurrence only after the accused appellant had purportedly fled away there from.

15. Accordingly, considering the litigation history between the appellant and the informant and the omissions made in her statement, from what was stated during the recording of her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. and the inconsistency existing in the deposition of PW1 and PW2, this Court is of the considered view that the offence alleged against the appellant, herein, was not established beyond reasonable doubt.

16. A further aspect that would be required to be considered by this Court, is the issue pertaining to the injury sustained by the informant/victim. The victim in her FIR had categorically stated that the appellant had bit her on her left cheek, resulting in bleeding injury. The said injury as sustained by the informant, is found to have been reiterated by her in her statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C., as well as during her deposition as PW1 in the trial. The medical examination report of the petitioner, issued by the PW3, was exhibited as Exhibit-1. From Exhibit-1, it is revealed there from, that the informant had sustained injury on her right cheek. The said position was affirmed by PW3, i.e., the Senior Medical & Health Officer during the trial. It was deposed by PW3 that the victim had a semi circular abrasion over her right cheek. The evidence adduced by PW3 contradicts the injury sustained by the victim/informant (PW1). The said discrepancy is not found to have been clarified by the prosecution during the trial. Accordingly, the injury sustained by the victim/informant cannot be held to have been conclusively established.

17. Having drawn the said conclusions, this Court would now consider the contention of the appellant that a prejudice was caused to him on account of the delay in registration of the FIR as well as in forwarding the same to the Magistrate.

18. As noticed hereinabove, the incident was of 29.09.2000, the informant was medically examined on 30.09.2000, on a police requisition and the FIR was registered on 01.10.2000, the same being forwarded to the jurisdictional Chief Judicial Magistrate on 16.10.2000. While the petitioner had appeared before the police on 30.09.2000 and she was sent on police requisition for medical examination, no G.D. Entry came to be made, about the said aspect of the matter. The said position is clear from the evidence adduced by PW5-Investigating Officer. Further, the delay occasioning of more than 12 hours in lodging the FIR, since the appellant had appeared in the police station also gives rise to a suspicion about the bonafide of the allegations leveled against the appellant, herein.

19. The delay in forwarding the FIR to the jurisdictional Chief Judicial Magistrate and the same being forwarded after around 16 days, when examined in the light of the evidence adduced by PW5-Investigating Officer, about the sending of the victim/informant for recording her statements under Section 164 Cr.P.C. immediately, after lodging of the FIR, raises a doubt in the matter. The said discrepancy was however, not clarified by the prosecution during the trial. The said clarification was permissible to be brought on record during the examination of the Investigating Officer as PW5.

20. This Court on a perusal of the deposition of PW5 finds that the said aspects of the matter was not clarified. No deposition was made with regard to the delay in registration of the FIR, as well as the delay occasioning in forwarding the FIR to the jurisdictional Chief Judicial Magistrate and forwarding the victim for recording her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C.

21. PW5 during his deposition had admitted that there was a delay of two

days in lodging the FIR, however, no explanation for the purpose was given and he had further deposed that there was no G.D. Entry made on 30.09.2000, before the informant was forwarded for medical examination on a police requisition. The said aspect of the matter is also not found to have been examined by the Trial Court while passing the impugned judgment.

22. With regard to the delay in lodging the FIR, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Rajeevan and Another Vs. State of Kerala* (supra) had drawn the following conclusions:-

"12. Another doubtful factor is the delayed lodging of FIR. The learned counsel for the appellants highlights this factor. Here it is worthwhile to refer Thulia Kali v. State of T.N. wherein the delayed filing of FIR and its consequences are discussed. At para 12 this Court says: (SCC p. 397)

"First information report in a criminal case is an extremely vital and valuable piece of evidence for the purpose of corroborating the oral evidence adduced at the trial. The importance of the above report can hardly be overestimated from the standpoint of the accused. The object of insisting upon prompt lodging of the report to the police in respect of commission of an offence is to obtain early information regarding the circumstances in which the crime was committed, the names of the actual culprits and the part played by them as well as the names of eyewitnesses present at the scene of occurrence. 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. It is, therefore, essential that the delay in lodging of the first information report should be satisfactorily explained."

13 This is the position consistently followed by this Court in Maharaj Singk v. State of U.P.² and recently in Thanedar Singh v. State of M.P.³

14. As feared by the learned counsel for the appellants, the possibility of subsequent implication of the appellants as a result of afterthought, maybe due to political bitterness, cannot be ruled out. This fact is further buttressed f by the delayed placing of FIR before the Magistrate, non-satisfactory explanation given by the police officer regarding the blank sheets in Ext. P-30, counterfoil of the FIR and also by the closely written bottom part of Ext. P-1, statement by PW 1. All these factual circumstances read with the aforementioned decisions of this Court lead to the conclusion that it is not safe to rely upon the FIR in the instant case. The delay of 12 hours in filing g FIR in the instant case irrespective of the fact that the police station is situated only at a distance of 100 metres from the spot of incident is another factor sufficient to doubt the genuineness of the FIR. Moreover, the prosecution did not satisfactorily explain the delayed lodging of the FIR with the Magistrate.”

23. Applying the said decision to the facts of the present case, this Court finds that a serious doubt arises in the matter, on account of the delayed lodging of the FIR as well as delayed dispatch of the same to the Magistrate concerned, moreover, there is an apparent delay in getting the statement of the informant recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. and no explanation has been adduced for the same by the prosecution.

24. Coupled with the above, this Court finds that the informant on 30.09.2000, having been forwarded for medical examination on a police requisition, it is surprising that no G.D. Entry for the purpose came to be made. The circumstances, noted, hereinabove, raises a serious doubt with regard to the projections made by the prosecution in the matter against the appellant.

25. Accordingly, this Court is of the considered view that the delayed FIR cannot be relied upon safely. The genuineness of the allegations made in the FIR on account of the attending factors, noticed hereinabove, is also doubtful. Accordingly, this Court is of the considered view that the case against the appellant is not proved beyond reasonable doubt.

26. Accordingly, basing on such sketchy evidence and that too, on the basis of a faulty investigation, it would not be safe to convict the appellant, herein.

27. In view of the above conclusions drawn by this Court, the impugned judgment and order dated 30.04.2013 passed by the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Karimganj, stands set aside.

28. The appellant stands acquitted for the offence, which he was charged and the bail bond furnished by him stands cancelled. The appeal accordingly, stands allowed.

29. Registry to send down the Trial Courts Records forthwith.

JUDGE

Pratibha
Baruah