

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD
R/FIRST APPEAL NO. 3440 of 2013
With
R/CROSS OBJECTION NO. 29 of 2014
In
R/FIRST APPEAL NO. 3440 of 2013

FOR APPROVAL AND SIGNATURE:

HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MOOL CHAND TYAGI

Approved for Reporting	Yes	No

ORIENTAL INSURANCE CO LTD

Versus

MADHUBEN WD-O CHANDUBHAI BHARATSINH GOHIL & ORS.

Appearance:

MR MITESH L RANGRAS(3324) for the Appellant(s) No. 1

MR MTM HAKIM(1190) for the Defendant(s) No. 1,2,3,4,5,6

Ms. DIXA PANDYA, AGP for the Defendant(s) No. 7,8

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MOOL CHAND TYAGI

Date : 09/12/2025

ORAL JUDGMENT

1 The captioned appeal and cross objections are filed against the impugned judgment and award dated 10.12.2012 passed by the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal (Auxiliary), Panchmahals at Godhra in MACP No.228/2001, whereby the learned Tribunal had partly allowed the claim petition and awarded a sum of Rs.9,82,000/- as a compensation along with interest at the rate of 9% per annum from the date of filing of claim petition till its realization.

2 The succinct facts leading to file the captioned appeal and cross objections are that Chandubhai Bharatsinh Gohil was working as a

Policeman-cum-Driver in the Police Department at Surat. On 09.11.2000, while he was on duty on the tanker bearing registration no.GJ-5-G-9205 and was transporting water from Dhoran Pardi, he parked the said vehicle at Dhaludi Head- Quarter near the Mess and was having food near the Mess, when due to some circumstances and geographical position, the said vehicle got started and gained the motion and in spite of trying to control the vehicle, the tanker moved further and caused the accident, wherein Chandubhai Bharatsinh Gohil sustained fatal injuries and lost his life.

3 On being served with the notices of the claim petition, the opponent nos.1 and 2 / respondent nos.7 and 8 herein filed the written statement at Exh.42, thereby denying the particulars of age and income of the deceased and contended that the offending vehicle was duly insured with the opponent no.3 i.e. the insurance company/appellant herein, therefore, the insurance company be made liable to pay the compensation, if any, on account of death of deceased-Chandubhai Bharatsinh Gohil. The opponent no.3/appellant herein filed the written statement at Exh.31, thereby contending that at the relevant point of time, Anwarbhai Dhuriyabhai Gamit was not holding the valid driving license and he was driving the said vehicle as per instruction of the deceased. It has been further contended that the said act of Anwarbhai Dhuriyabhai Gamit was in breach of the policy condition. Therefore, the opponent no.3/appellant herein cannot be held liable to pay the compensation and hence, prayed for dismissal of the claim petition.

4 Having considered the pleadings of the parties, the learned Tribunal framed the following issues at Exh.29 for determination:-

(1) Whether it is proved that the claimant sustained injuries and died on account of the rashness or negligent driving on the part of the driver of the vehicle involved in the accident?

(2) What amount, if any, the claimants are entitled to by way of compensation and from which of the opponents?

(3) What order?

5 In order to prove their claim, the original claimants/respondent nos.1 to 6 herein led the following oral as well as documentary evidence on record:-

Sr. No.	Evidence	Exh. No.
1.	Affidavit in examination-in-chief and cross-examination of Madhuben widow of Chandubhai Bharatsinh Gohil	33
2.	Affidavit and cross-examination of Parmar Bhavanbhai Mokambhai	40
3.	Affidavit and cross-examination of Anwarbhai Dhuriyabhai Gamit	57
4.	Copy of complaint	26
5.	Panchnama of place of accident	27
6.	PM Note of deceased	28
7.	Service Book of deceased	39
8.	Last pay certificate of deceased	46
9.	Pay slip of deceased for the period	47

	with effect from 01.11.2002 to 10.11.2000	
10.	Pay slip for the month of October, 2000	48
11.	Copy of Service Book of deceased	49
12.	Copy of notification dated 20.01.1998 issued by Finance Department	50
13.	Copy of notification dated 27.02.2009 issued by Finance Department	51

6 Having considered the evidence on record, the learned Tribunal had partly allowed the claim petition and awarded a sum of Rs.9,82,000/- as a compensation along with interest at the rate of 9% per annum from the date of filing of claim petition till its realization.

7 Being aggrieved and dissatisfied with the impugned judgment and award, the insurance company/appellant herein challenged the impugned judgment and award on the ground of its liability to satisfy the award while, the original claimants filed the cross objections for enhancement.

8 Heard learned counsels for the parties.

9 Mr. Mitesh L. Rangras, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant/insurance company vehemently submitted that at the time of accident, the driver of the offending truck was not having the valid driving license, therefore, the insurance company is not liable to satisfy the award. In support of his contention, learned counsel for the appellant relied upon the affidavit in examination-in-chief and cross-

examination of Anwarbhai Dhuriyabhai Gamit at Exh.57. He submitted that at the time of accident, Anwarbhai Dhuriyabhai Gamit was sitting on the seat of the driver and was driving the vehicle. He further submitted that in his cross-examination, he admitted that he was not holding the driving license, therefore, the insurance company is not liable to satisfy the award. In support of his contention, learned counsel for the appellant/insurance company placed the reliance upon the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court rendered in the case of ***United India Insurance Company Limited Through its Divisional Manager Vs. Sujata Arora***, reported in 2012 (0) GLHEL-SC 54295.

10 Learned counsel for the appellant further submitted that the insurance company cited the two judgments before the learned Tribunal at bar i.e. ***Sardari and Ors. Vs. Sushil Kumar and Ors.***, reported in 2008 AIR SCW 2075 and ***Jawahar Singh Vs. Bala Jain and Ors.***, reported in AIR 2011 SC 2436, but the learned Tribunal had not considered these judgments cited by the learned counsel for the insurance company at bar. He further submitted that on the sole ground, the impugned judgment and award is liable to be set aside and the matter can be remanded back to the learned Tribunal. To buttress his submission, learned counsel for the appellant placed the reliance upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court rendered in the case of ***Kishore Rungta Vs. State of Rajasthan***, reported in 2011 (0) GLHEL-SC 49332. Relying upon the ratio of the aforesaid judgment, learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the impugned judgment and award is liable to be set aside.

11 On the other hand, Mr. MTM Hakim, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the original claimants/objectors vehemently submitted that

there is no infirmity in the impugned judgment and award. He submitted that at the time of accident, the deceased, who was the authorized driver of the offending tanker bearing registration no.GJ-5-G-9205, parked his tanker near the Mess at Dhaludi Police Station Headquarter and he was taking his meal. One Anwarbhai Dhuriyabhai Gamit sat on the driver's seat and suddenly, the tanker got started. He further submitted that the owner of the vehicle had never handed over the vehicle to said Anwarbhai Dhuriyabhai Gamit and the deceased was himself the authorized driver of the vehicle. He further submitted that the insurance company cannot avoid its liability to satisfy the award. In support of his contention, learned counsel for the original claimants placed the reliance upon the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court rendered in the case of **Sohan Lal Passi Vs. P. Sesh Reddy and Ors.**, reported in (1996) 5 SCC 21 and Jawahar Singh (supra). Placing the reliance upon the aforesaid judgments, learned counsel for the original claimants submitted that the learned Tribunal has not committed any error in holding all the respondents jointly and severally liable to satisfy the award.

12 Learned counsel for the original claimants/respondent nos.1 to 6 herein further submitted that he is not challenging the award on the ground of income and the compensation awarded under the head of loss of dependency but he is challenging the impugned judgment and award on the ground that the learned Tribunal had awarded the meager amount of compensation under conventional head in total disregard to the settled principle of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Sarla Verma Vs. Delhi Transport Corporation and Anr.**, reported in AIR (2009) 6 SC 3104, **National Insurance Company Ltd. Vs. Pranay Sethi**, reported in 2017 (16) SCC 680 and **Magma General**

Insurance Company Limited Vs. Nanu Ram @ Chuhru Ram and Ors., reported in 2018 (18) SCC 130. Relying upon the ratio of the aforesaid judgments, learned counsel for the original claimants submitted that the compensation awarded under these heads are required to be enhanced and award is required to be modified accordingly.

13 Per contra, Ms. Dixa Pandya, learned Assistant Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the respondent nos. 7 and 8 vehemently submitted that the vehicle was never handed over to Anwarbhai Dhuriyabhai Gamit to drive. The vehicle was handed over to the deceased himself. She further submitted that the deceased was holding valid driving license to drive the vehicle in question. She further submitted that there is no infirmity in the impugned judgment and award. In support of her contention, learned AGP placed the reliance upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court rendered in the case of Sohan Lal Passi (supra). Relying upon the ratio of the aforesaid judgment, she submitted that there is no infirmity in the impugned judgment and award, therefore, the present appeal deserves to be rejected.

14 Having considered the submissions of the learned counsels for the parties and having gone through the record, it is to be noted that there is no dispute about the age, income and number of legal representatives. The appellant/insurance company has challenged the impugned judgment and award on the ground of its liability to satisfy the award. It is undisputed fact that at the time of accident, the deceased- Chandubhai Bharatsinh Gohil himself was the driver of the vehicle and he parked the vehicle near the Mess at Dhaludi Police Station

Headquarter and he was taking his food at the time of accident. It is also not in dispute that Anwarbhai Dhuriyabhai Gamit sat on the driver's seat and the vehicle got started accidentally and the said vehicle ran over Chandubhai Bharatsinh Gohil and resultantly, he succumbed to the injuries sustained by him in the said accident. The main contention of the learned counsel for the appellant is that at the time of accident, said Anwarbhai Dhuriyabhai Gamit was not holding valid driving license. The said Anwarbhai Dhuriyabhai Gamit filed his affidavit at Exh.57. In his affidavit in examination-in-chief, he admitted that the FIR was lodged by one Alubhai Snehsingh Gamit. He also admitted that as per FIR, he was sitting on the driver's seat at the time of accident. In para 8 of his affidavit, he also admitted that the said tanker got started accidentally and he was not the driver of the said tanker and he never drove the said tanker. In his cross-examination, he admitted that the Police Department has not appointed him as a driver. He also admitted that the charge-sheet was filed against him. He also admitted that no departmental inquiry was initiated against him. In his cross-examination, he also admitted that at the time of accident, he was sitting on the driver's seat by keeping his legs outside the window and the said tanker got started accidentally. From the record and more particularly from the affidavit in examination-in-chief of Anwarbhai Dhuriyabhai Gamit and his cross-examination, it is evident that at the time of accident, he was sitting on the driver's seat. It is also evident that he was not holding the valid driving license and it is also evident that he was not appointed as a driver to drive the vehicle by the owner of the vehicle.

15 It is also undisputed fact that the authorized driver of the offending tanker was Chandubhai Bharatsinh Gohil. Neither said Chandubhai Bharatsinh Gohil nor the respondent nos.7 and 8 herein

ever authorized the said Anwarbhai Dhuriyabhai Gamit to drive the said tanker. He sat casually on the seat of the driver and said vehicle got started accidentally and thereby the accident had occurred. In these facts and circumstances, as to whether the insurance company can avoid its liability to satisfy the award. The reliance has been placed by the learned counsel for the appellant on the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court rendered in the case of Sujata Arora (supra), wherein para 6, the Hon'ble Apex Court observed as under:-

“6 However, learned Single Judge of the High Court proceeded on wrong assumption and held it otherwise giving rise to filing of the present appeal. The findings of learned Single judge that even if driver was having a fake licence, would not exonerate the Insurance Company as he was not negligent in driving, are certainly erroneous. Driving without licence or with a fake licence as a driving a vehicle negligently are two different aspects of the matter. Holding a valid driving licence is a requirement of law, was being driven by a person holding a valid licence, but rashly and negligently, is a matter of evidence. The very fact which stood established that licence of driver Jagdish was a fake one, would completely exonerate Insurance Company.”

16 The Hon'ble Apex Court further in para 8 observed as under:-

“8 We are also fortified in our view in the light of the two judgment of this Court reported in 2007 (4) SCALE 36 : 2007 (2) T.A.C. 398, “National Insurance Company Ltd. v. Laxmi Narain Dhut” and 2011 (5) SCALE 494 : 2011 (3) T.A.C. 12 “Jawahar Singh v. Bala Jain and other”, where in it has been held that in case, it is found that the offending vehicle was driven by driver who was either holding no licence or a fake licence, then it amounts to violation of terms and conditions of policy and in that circumstances, no liability can be

fastened on the Insurance Company.”

17 Coming to the case on hand, it is undisputed fact that the authorized driver of the offending tanker was deceased himself and the said Anwarbhai Dhuriyabhai Gamit sat on the driver's seat casually. Therefore, it cannot be held that the owner of the vehicle i.e. respondent nos.7 and 8 authorized said Anwarbhai Dhuriyabhai Gamit to drive the vehicle in question. Therefore, in my humble view, the ratio of the aforesaid judgment is not applicable in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

18 So far as the contention of the learned counsel for the appellant that the learned Tribunal had not considered the judgments cited by the learned counsel for the insurance company before the learned Tribunal at bar in para 11 is concerned, the learned Tribunal has recorded the contentions of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the insurance company before the learned Tribunal. The learned Tribunal has also taken the note that the insurance company has relied upon the judgments of Hon'ble Apex Court rendered in the case of Sardari and Ors. (supra) and Jawahar Singh (supra). Careful perusal of the impugned judgment and award transpires that the learned Tribunal had not made any discussion on these judgments in the reasoning part of the impugned judgment and award. The Hon'ble Apex Court in case of Kishore Rungta (supra) held that, if the judgment, cited on bar has not been considered by the Court, constitutes the sufficient ground to set aside the judgment and remand back to the Trial Court for fresh consideration. There is no doubt in the present case that these two judgments were not discussed by the learned Tribunal in the impugned judgment; however, the learned Tribunal decided the matter after

considering the ratio of the judgment. The accident took place in the year 2000, wherein Chandubhai Bharatsinh Gohil lost his life. His legal representatives as well as insurance company are still in litigation. The legal representatives filed the cross-objections for getting just compensation. Since last 25 years, the claimants could not get the just compensation on account of pending litigation and if at this juncture, the matter is remanded back to the learned Tribunal for fresh reconsideration, it would cause the gross injustice to the claimants. Therefore, in my considered view, it would be just and proper if these two judgments are considered by this Appellate Court and to record the finding after considering the ratio of the aforesaid judgments.

19 In case of Sardari and Ors. (supra), the Hon'ble Apex Court exonerated the insurance company on the ground that the driver of the tractor was not holding a valid driving license at the time of accident. The facts of Sardari and Ors. (supra) are entirely different from the case on hand. In case of Sardari and Ors. (supra), the owner of the tractor engaged one Sushil Kumar as a driver of the tractor. The said Sushil Kumar appeared in the witness box and he categorically stated that he did not know how to drive the tractor and he never even tried to learn the driving of tractor. Despite this fact, the owner of the tractor has authorized said Sushil Kumar to drive the tractor. But in the case on hand, the respondent nos.7 and 8 never engaged said Anwarbhai Dhuriyabhai Gamit as a driver. He was never authorized by them to drive the offending tanker. The owner of the tanker authorized the deceased to drive the tanker and said Anwarbhai Dhuriyabhai Gamit sat on the driving seat casually when the authorized driver, who is the deceased himself taking his food near the mess. Therefore, in my considered view, the ratio of judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court rendered

in the case of Sardari and Ors. (supra) would not be applicable in the facts and circumstances of the present case. So far as the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court rendered in the case of Jawahar Singh (supra) cited at bar by the learned counsel for the appellant is concerned, the Hon'ble Apex Court in para 11 of the judgment observed as under:-

“11 It has been well settled that if it is not possible for an awardee to recover the compensation awarded against the driver of the vehicle, the liability to make payment of the compensation awarded fell on the owner of the vehicle. It was submitted that in this case since the person riding the motorcycle at the time of accident was a minor, the responsibility for paying the compensation awarded fell on the owner of the motorcycle. In fact, in the case of Ishwar Chandra Vs. Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd. [(2007) 3 AD (SC) 753], it was held by this Court that in case the driver of the vehicle did not have a licence at all, the liability to make payment of compensation fell on the owner since it was his obligation to take adequate care to see that the driver had an appropriate licence to drive the vehicle.”

20 In case of Jawahar Singh (supra), the minor Jatin took away the key of the motor cycle lying on the dining table and he met with an accident, the key was taken without the knowledge and consent of the owner of the motor cycle. In these facts and circumstances, the Hon'ble Apex Court in para nos.13 and 14 further observed as under:-

“13 Having heard learned counsel for the respective parties, we are inclined to agree with the Respondents that this is not a case for interference in view of the fact that admittedly the motorcycle belonging to the Petitioner was being driven by Jatin, who had no licence to drive the same and was, in fact, a minor on the date of the accident. While issuing notice on 2nd April, 2009, we had limited the

same to the question regarding liability to pay compensation on account of contributory negligence by the deceased who was riding a scooter, in causing the accident to happen.”

“14 We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that it was Jatin, who came from behind on the motorcycle and hit the scooter of the deceased from behind. The responsibility in causing the accident was, therefore, found to be solely that of Jatin. However, since Jatin was a minor and it was the responsibility of the Petitioner to ensure that his motorcycle was not misused and that too by a minor who had no licence to drive the same, the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal quite rightly saddled the liability for payment of compensation on the Petitioner and, accordingly, directed the Insurance Company to pay the awarded amount to the awardees and, thereafter, to recover the same from the Petitioner. The said question has been duly considered by the Tribunal and was correctly decided. The High Court rightly chose not to interfere with the same.”

21 Now coming to the case on hand, Chandubhai Bharatsinh Gohil, who was the authorized driver of the offending vehicle has never handed over the key nor the key was taken by the Anwarbhai Dhuriyabhai Gamit, who casually sat on the seat of the driver. Nor it is the case of the insurance company that the key was handed over by the deceased to Anwarbhai Dhuriyabhai Gamit but it is on record that the tanker in question got started accidentally and thereby the accident occurred. Therefore, in my considered view, the ratio of the judgment of Jawahar Singh (*supra*) is not applicable in the facts and circumstances of the present case. Now so far as the contention of the learned counsel for the original claimants as well as the learned AGP is concerned that there is no infirmity in the impugned judgment whereby all the respondents were held liable jointly and severally to satisfy the award.

The reliance has been placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court rendered in the case of Sohan Lal Passi (supra), wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court in para 13 observed as under:-

"13 This Court in the case of Kashiram Yadav and Another. vs. Oriental Fire and General Insurance Co. and Others, (1989) 4 SCC 128 reiterated the views expressed in Skandia Insurance Co. Ltd. vs. Kokilaben Chandravadan (supra) while referring to that case it was said:

".....There the facts found were quite different. The vehicle concerned in that case was undisputedly entrusted to the driver who had a valid licence. In transit the driver stopped the vehicle and went to fetch some snacks from the opposite shop leaving the engine on. The ignition key was at the ignition lock and not in the cabin of the truck. The driver had asked the cleaner to take care of the truck. In fact the driver had left the truck in care of the cleaner. The cleaner meddled with the vehicle and caused the accident. The question arose whether the insured (owner) had committed a breach of the condition incorporated in the certificate of insurance since the cleaner operated the vehicle on the fatal occasion without driving licence. This Court expressed the view that it is only when the insured himself entrusted the vehicle to a person who does not hold a driving licence, he could be said to have committed breach of the condition of the policy. It must be established by the Insurance Company that the breach is on the part of the insured. Unless the insured is at fault and is guilty of a breach of the condition, the insurer cannot escape from the obligation to indemnify the insured. It was also observed that when the insured has done everything within his power inasmuch as he has engaged the licensed driver and has placed the vehicle in his charge with the express or implied mandate to drive himself, it cannot be said that the insured is guilty of any breach.

We affirm and reiterate the statement of law laid down in the above case. We may also state that without the knowledge of the insured, if by driver's acts or omission others meddle with the vehicle and cause an accident, the insurer would be liable to indemnify the insured. The insurer in such a case cannot take the defence of a breach of the condition in the certificate of insurance."

We are in respectful agreement with the view expressed in the case of Skandia Insurance Co. Ltd. vs Kokilaben Chandravadan (supra)."

22 Coming to the case on hand, it is squarely covered by the ratio of the aforesaid judgment. The respondent nos.7 and 8 have never authorized said Anwarbhai Dhuriyabhai Gamit to drive the said vehicle but they appointed the deceased as a authorized driver to drive the vehicle. Thus, in my considered view, the ratio of the Sohan Lal Passi (supra) judgment is squarely applicable to the facts of the present case. Therefore, the contention raised by the appellant that the insurance company cannot be held liable to satisfy the award is not sustainable.

23 So far as the quantum is concerned, the learned Tribunal has awarded a sum of Rs.9,56,760/- under the head of loss of dependency. The original claimants by way of filing the cross objections have not challenged the compensation awarded under the head of loss of dependency, therefore, the same is not required to be interfered with and is accordingly maintained. It has been contended on behalf of the original claimants that the learned Tribunal has awarded a meager amount of Rs.10,000/- under the head of loss of estate and a meager amount of Rs.10,000/- under the head of loss of consortium and a meager amount of Rs.5,000/- under the head of funeral expenses. In

case of Pranay Sethi (supra), the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that the learned Tribunal has to award a sum of Rs.15,000/- under the head of loss of estate. The Hon'ble Apex Court further directed that after the lapse of three years, the said amount will be further increased by 10%. Thus, having regard to the ratio laid down in the case of Pranay Sethi (supra), a sum of Rs.18,150/- is awarded under the head of loss of estate.

23.1 It is on record that the deceased was survived by six legal representatives i.e. widow and 5 children. It is settled proposition of law that the learned Tribunal has to award the spousal, filial and parental consortium. The deceased was left behind by his widow and 5 children, therefore, all the legal representatives are entitled for the compensation under the head of loss of consortium in view of the principle of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Pranay Sethi (supra) and Nanu Ram @ Chuhru Ram (supra). Thus, having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, a sum of Rs.2,90,400/- i.e. (48,400X6) is awarded under the head of loss of consortium. The learned Tribunal has also awarded a meager amount of Rs.5,000/- under the head of funeral expenses. Therefore, in view of ratio of judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court rendered in the case of Pranay Sethi (supra) and Nanu Ram @ Chuhru Ram (supra), a sum of Rs.18,150/- is awarded under the head of funeral expenses. Thus, in view of the above discussion, the original claimants shall be entitled for the following amount of compensation under the following heads:-

Sr. No.	Particular	Amount
1.	Loss of dependency	9,56,760/-
2.	Loss of estate	18,150/-

3.	Loss of consortium	2,90,400/-
4.	Funeral expenses	18,150/-
	Total	12,83,460/-

24 The learned Tribunal had awarded a sum of Rs.9,82,000/- as a compensation, therefore, the original claimants shall be entitled for additional compensation of Rs.3,01,460/- i.e. (12,83,460-9,82,000). The learned Tribunal had awarded the interest at the rate of 9% per annum, therefore, the claimants shall also be entitled for the interest at the rate of 9% per annum on the additional amount of compensation from the date of filing of claim petition till its realization.

25 In view of the above discussion, the appeal filed by the insurance company stands dismissed; however, the cross objections filed by the original claimants stand allowed partly. The appellant/insurance company shall deposit the additional amount of compensation along with interest at the rate of 9% per annum from the date of filing of claim petition till its realization within a period of six weeks from today.

26 Upon depositing of the said amount, the learned Tribunal shall disburse the amount to the original claimants after deducting deficit of Court fee, if any, after due verification. The amount, if any, lying deposited with the registry of this Court, be transmitted to the learned Tribunal concerned forthwith. No order as to costs.

27 Record & Proceedings, if any, be sent back to the learned Tribunal concerned.

(MOOL CHAND TYAGI, J)

HARSHIT

Original copy of this order has been signed by the Hon'ble Judge.
Digitally signed by: HARSHIT SANCHETI(HCD0070), ENGLISH STENOGRAPHER GRADE TWO CLASS TWO, at High Court of Gujarat on 16/12/2025 17:53:36