

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

COMMERCIAL APPEAL FROM ORDER NO. 28 OF 2023

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 14485 OF 2023

1. **Mr. Hardasmal Hazarimal Tharwani**
(Since deceased) through his LRs.
- 1/1. **Mr. Dhiren Anil Tharwani &**
- 1/2. **Mr. Abhishek Anil Tharwani**
Age : Adult, Occ : Business,
Both R/o. Hampton Flat No. 2601 &
2602, One Hiranandani Park,
Ghodbhunder Road,
Thane (W) – 400 067.

2. **Mr. Anil Hardasmal Tharwani**
Age : 51 yrs, Occ. Business,
Partner of M/s. Sai Associates,
R/o. 2nd Floor, Tharwani Villa,
Royal Residency Complex,
Near Telephone Exchange,
Ulhasnagar – 421 002.

3. **Mr. Mohan Hardasmal Tharwani**
Age : 47 yrs, Occ. Business,
Partner of M/s. Sai Associates,
R/o. 4th Floor, Tharwani Villa,
Royal Residency Complex,
Near Telephone Exchange,
Ulhasnagar – 421 002.

**... Appellants/
Petitioners**

V/s.

1. **Mr. Sunil Hardasmal Tharwani**
Age : 49 yrs, Occ. Business,
Partner of M/s. Sai Associates,
R/o. 3rd Floor, Tharwani Villa,
Royal Residency Complex,
New Telephone Exchange,

Ulhasnagar – 421 002.

2. Mrs. Anisha Sunil Tharwani
Age : 45 yrs, Occ : Business,
Partner of M/s. Sai Associates,
R/o. 3rd Floor, Tharwani Villa,
Royal Residency Complex,
New Telephone Exchange,
Ulhasnagar – 421 002.
3. M/s. Tharwani Construction Pvt. Ltd.
A Company registered under the
Companies Act, 1956,
O/at : 310-313, Persipolis Premises CHS,
Plot No. 74, Sector-17 Vashi,
Navi Mumbai – 400 705.
Through its Directors,
(Mr. Sunil Hardasmal Tharwani &
Mrs. Anisha Sunil Tharwani)
4. Mr. Prakash D. Deshmukh
Age : 50 yrs, Occ : Business,
R/o. Parkar Complex,
S.T. Stand Road, Bhogle, Chiplun,
Dist. Ratnagiri (Maharashtra)
5. Radhe Construction
(through its Partner Mr. Haresh Vidharia)
Age : 54 yrs, Occ : Business,
O/o. Opp. Barac No. 2002,
Near Swami Shanti Prakash Ashram,
Ulhasnagar, Thane – 421 005.
6. Mrs. Ritu Vinod Karasai
Age : 27 yrs, Occ : Housewife,
R/o. Mathura Mahal,
Near Sai Baba Temple,
Ulhasnagar, Thane – 421 005.
7. Mrs. Bhavna Tarani
Age : 56 Yrs, Occ. Housewife,
R/o. C612/1224, Riddhisiddhi,
Block No. 3rd Lane, Bunglow Area,

**Opp. Kalani Section 24,
Ulhasnagar, Thane – 421 004.**

**... Respondents/
Orig. Defendants**

Mr. Anil Y. Sakhare, Senior Counsel a/w. Mr. S.S. Kanetkar for Appellant in COMAO/2/2023.

Mr. Yash Dewal for Appellant in COMAO/3/2023.

Mr. Prasad Shenoy i/b. Mr. J.M. Joshi for Appellant/Petitioner in COMAO/28/2023 & WP/14485/2023.

Mr. Anil Y. Sakhare, Senior Counsel a/w. Mr. Valmiky H. Narvekar for Respondent No. 1 in WP/14485/2023 & COMAO/28/2023.

Mr. Simil Purohit, Senior Counsel a/w. Mr. Shrikant M. Seegarla i/b. M/s. RMG Law Associates for Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 in COMAO/28/2023.

Mr. Simil Purohit a/w. Mr. Sunil Gangan a/w. Mr. Manav Chetwani i/b. M/s. RMG Law Associates for Respondent No. 3 in COMAO/2/2023 & COMAO/3/2023.

Mr. Venkatesh Dhond, Senior Counsel a/w. Mr. Prasad Shenoy a/w. Mr. Sujit Lahoti a/w. Ms. Tejasvi Kudtarkar a/w. Mr. Aditya Sheth i/b. M/s. Sujit Lahoti & Associates for Respondent Nos. 1A, 1B & 3 in COMAO/2/2023 & COMAO/3/2023.

**CORAM : R.I. CHAGLA AND
FARHAN P. DUBASH, JJ.**

**RESERVED ON : 21st NOVEMBER 2025
PRONOUNCED ON : 27th NOVEMBER 2025**

ORDER (per Farhan P. Dubash J.):

1. Two Orders, both dated 5th September 2023, came to be passed by the District Judge-2, Panvel-Raigad, in Commercial Suit No. 2 of 2021. The first order was passed below Exhibit 11, being an application on behalf

of the original Plaintiffs/Appellants herein under Order 39 Rule 1 and 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (**CPC**) for grant of a temporary injunction, whilst the other, below Exhibit 13, was an Application also filed by the original Plaintiffs/Petitioners herein under the provisions of Order 38 of the CPC for attachment before judgment.

2. The impugned order passed below Exhibit 11 has been challenged by the original Plaintiffs/Appellants in Commercial Appeal from Order No. 28 of 2023 whilst the Impugned Order passed below Exhibit 13 has been challenged by the original Plaintiffs/Petitioners in Writ Petition (L) No. 14485 of 2023. Since there is commonality of parties and of subject matter and since both orders were passed in the same proceedings, viz. in Commercial Suit No. 2 of 2021, the parties have agreed that both the above-referred proceedings can be disposed of by a common order. For convenience, the impugned order passed in the Appellants' Application under Order 39 of the CPC for temporary injunction shall hereinafter be referred to as the "***impugned order passed below Exhibit 11***", whilst the other one, passed under Order 38 of the CPC for attachment before judgment shall hereinafter be referred to as "***impugned order passed below Exhibit 13***". Also, for convenience, the Appellants/Petitioners herein are referred to as the original Plaintiffs whereas, the Respondents herein are referred to as the original Defendants.

3. For the purposes of this order, it is not necessary to go into a detailed factual background of the disputes between the parties and instead, it would suffice that only a brief factual narration be given. The same is as under:

- i) Mr. Hardasmal Tharwani and his three sons – Anil, Mohan and Sunil carried on business of a partnership known as M/s. Sai Associates (**Partnership Firm**) with each of them, having a 25% share in the profits and losses therein.
- ii) In addition to this partnership, the said parties also undertook similar business of construction and development of residential and commercial buildings through various other partnerships, such as M/s. Sai Homes, M/s. Sai Properties and M/s. Sai Home Makers, with a similar profit sharing ratio therein.
- iii) After the filing of the captioned Commercial Appeal from Order and Writ Petition, Mr. Hardasmal Tharwani has passed away and his legal representatives have since, been impleaded.
- iv) Respondent No. 2 - Mrs. Anisha Tharwani ('Anisha') is the wife of Respondent No. 1 – Sunil Hardasmal Tharwani ('Sunil').
- v) M/s. Tharwani Construction Pvt. Ltd. – Respondent No. 3

herein (**Tharwani Construction**) is a limited company wherein, Sunil and Anisha are stated to be its only 2 Directors and shareholders.

vi) The dispute which led the parties to court emanated between Mr. Hardasmal Tharwani (since deceased) and his two sons, Petitioner No. 1 - Anil Hardasmal Tharwani ('Anil') and Petitioner No. 2 – Mohan Hardasmal Tharwani ('Mohan') on the one hand and Sunil (and Anisha) – on the other hand, with the former, alleging that Sunil (and Anisha) themselves and also through Tharwani Construction had fraudulently sold 36 premises/units of the Partnership Firm in the "*Tharwani Residency*" project, without their consent which led to a discord between them. This has resulted in acrimonious disputes which further led to the former, dissolving the Partnership Firm and approaching the District Judge by filing Commercial Suit No. 2 of 2021 for several consequential reliefs thereto including *interalia* declarations that the said partnership is dissolved, accounts be drawn, cancellation and setting aside of the sale transactions in respect of the said 36 premises/units, a declaration that they have 75% share in the said 36 premises/units fraudulently sold, and various compensatory and

other injunctive reliefs including disclosure and appointment of a Court Receiver, etc.

4. Prior to the passing of the two impugned orders on 5th September 2023, several earlier orders were passed in the said Commercial Suit, but since they have no bearing on this order, no reference is being made to them. However, before we discuss the two impugned orders, it would be advantageous to set out a few facts, which are not in dispute and admitted by both parties before us during oral arguments :

i) Sunil has alone sold/alienated 36 premises/units to Tharwani Construction and other third-parties impleaded as Respondent Nos. 3 to 7 herein.

ii) Prior to this transfer, no consent of his father late Mr. Hardasmal Tharwani or his brothers, Anil and Mohan was taken by Sunil.

iii) Sunil did not give any share of profit from the said transfer of the 36 premises/units to his father and brothers.

iv) Save and except none, there are no unsold premises in the Tharwani Residency project of the Partnership Firm or in the other two projects of the Partnership Firm (Tharwani Krupa Project and Tharwani Riviera Project).

5. After filing the said Commercial Suit No. 2 of 2021, the original Plaintiffs preferred two interim applications, the first of which was one under Order 39 Rule 1 and 2 of the CPC - being Exhibit 11 which *interalia* sought several injunctive and other reliefs. The said application was vehemently contested by Sunil and the other original Defendants. Ultimately, by the impugned order passed below Exhibit 11, the same came to be partly allowed. Neither Sunil nor any of the other original Defendants have challenged this order and therefore the same is binding upon them. In a detailed 31 page order, the District Judge has recorded several findings including *interalia* that a commercial dispute had arisen between the parties thereto and therefore, the commercial suit was maintainable at the hands of the original Plaintiffs. The District Judge then analyzed and arrived at a finding that, the commercial suit was correctly instituted in the said Court which had territorial jurisdiction to try and entertain it. Next, the District Judge rejected the contention raised by Sunil that the Partnership Firm was also required to be separately impleaded as a party to the suit and *prima facie* held that its non-joinder, at the interim stage, would not affect the rights of the parties.

6. On the plea of limitation raised by Sunil, by asserting that the Tharwani Residency Project was completed way back in 2017 or thereabouts, the District Judge held that, having regard to Section 42 of the Indian

Partnership Act, 1932, since there was no settlement of accounts of the Partnership Firm, no finding on limitation could be recorded at the interim stage, since it involved a mixed question of fact and law, which could not be decided at that stage whilst considering the application for injunctive reliefs.

7. On the plea of fraud and mismanagement of funds and accounts raised by the original Plaintiffs, the District Judge, after noting detailed submissions of both parties, recorded a *prima facie* finding in their favour that Sunil had not accounted for the amounts received by him as consideration towards sale of the 36 premises/units, and that the original Plaintiffs had made out a *prima facie* case that Sunil had committed irregularities, as well as illegalities in transferring the monies of the Partnership Firm to his sole benefit¹. The District Judge has also held that the transfer of amount from the account of the Partnership Firm to that of Tharwani Construction, was without the consent of the original Plaintiffs and *prima facie* amounted to siphoning of the monies by Sunil. He further held that such conduct was in breach of the agreement relating to management of affairs of the Partnership Firm and that Sunil was *prima facie* guilty of conduct which prejudicially affected the business of the Partnership Firm².

8. However, despite recording these express findings, the District Judge recorded a *prima facie* finding that since the 36 premises/units have

1 In paragraph 44 of the Impugned Order passed below Exhibit 11

2 In paragraph 45 of the Impugned Order passed below Exhibit 11

already been transferred, albeit without the consent of original Plaintiffs, to third-parties by registered instruments and that consideration was paid by such third-parties, such purchases were *bonafide*³. Thus, the District Judge was of the opinion that since some consideration was paid for this transfer, the third-party purchasers ought not to be dragged into the dispute between the partners of the Partnership Firm. The District Judge also held that the original Plaintiffs had not been able to establish that the said third-party purchasers were “*dummy purchasers*” and/or that they were hand-in-glove with either Sunil, Anisha or Tharwani Construction and thereafter, a *prima facie* finding has been recorded that the original Plaintiffs had failed to make out a case against the said third-party purchasers from further alienating and/or creating third-party rights in the said 36 premises/units.

9. The District Judge also recorded a *prima facie* finding in favour of the original Plaintiffs that they had made out a ground for dissolution of the Partnership Firm, which position was also conceded to by Sunil, during the course of arguments. Accordingly, the District Judge held that full and complete accounts of income and expenditure, including the details of sale proceeds from the sale of premises of all the three projects of the Partnership Firm were required to be made and accordingly, granted the relief sought in prayer clause (c) of Exhibit 11 and directed Sunil to render/furnish such full

3 In paragraph 46 of the Impugned Order passed below Exhibit 11

and complete disclosure of accounts⁴.

10. The District Judge whilst considering the reliefs sought in prayer clause (a) therein, which sought an injunction, restraining Sunil or any one claiming through or under him, from alienating, transferring or creating third-party rights in respect of any of the unsold premises in the three projects of the Partnership Firm namely Tharwani Residency, Tharwani Krupa and Tharwani Riviera and upon any other assets of the Partnership Firm till the disposal of the suit, recorded the categorical statement of Sunil that there were no unsold premises in any of the projects of the Partnership Firm⁵. The District Judge then noted his earlier finding that Sunil had alienated the Partnership Firm's property to the extent of 36 premises/units without the consent of the original Plaintiffs and thereby deprived them of a share in its profits. The District Judge held that such amount could always be the subject matter of settlement of accounts between the partners and as a result, the original Plaintiffs had an efficacious remedy available, in accordance with Section 41(h) of the Specific Relief Act, 1963 and therefore, the third-party purchasers could not be injuncted. On this ground, the District Judge denied the reliefs sought in prayer clause (b) therein. However, relying on his earlier finding that Sunil had in fact mismanaged the assets of the Partnership Firm and thereby deprived the original Plaintiffs of the fruits of profit, the District

4 In paragraph 55 of the Impugned Order passed below Exhibit 11

5 In paragraph 51 of the Impugned Order passed below Exhibit 11

Judge curiously held that the original Plaintiffs were entitled to an order of interim injunction restraining Sunil from alienating or creating third-party rights in any unsold premises in the three projects of the Partnership Firm till the disposal of the suit and on that basis, granted the reliefs sought in prayer clause (a) therein.

11. Thereafter, whilst passing the impugned order dated 5th September 2023 below Exhibit 13, the District Judge has recorded a finding that the original Plaintiffs had not made out any case for an order of attachment before judgment or to deposit the amounts in court as security or for a bank guarantee to be furnished, as sought therein. However, in arriving at this finding, after setting out the submissions of the parties, including the caselaw cited by them, the District Judge held that the power to order attachment of property should not be exercised mechanically but instead, used sparingly⁶ and relying on this proposition, observed that he had already passed the order below Exhibit 11 granting an interim injunction restraining Sunil from alienating unsold premises in the three projects of the Partnership Firm.

12. A further finding was also recorded that the original Plaintiffs had not made out/satisfied the pre-conditions that were required in order to grant the reliefs sought below Exhibit 13⁷. The District Judge also recorded

⁶ In paragraph 14 of the Impugned Order passed below Exhibit 13

⁷ *Ibid*

that the said order of injunction restraining Sunil from alienating unsold premises in the three projects of the Partnership Firm passed below Exhibit 11 would also take care of reliefs sought by the original Plaintiffs in Exhibit 13. Accordingly, the District Judge held that the original Plaintiffs had not made out any exceptional circumstances for being granted an order of attachment before judgment or for a direction directing Sunil to furnish security and accordingly, rejected the reliefs sought under Exhibit 13.

13. Mr. Dhond, learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of original Plaintiffs has strenuously argued that despite noting Sunil's submission that the Partnership Firm had no unsold inventory in any of its three projects, the District Judge, after recording a finding in favour of the original Plaintiffs that they were entitled to protection in the form of injunctive relief against Sunil, has proceeded to erroneously grant the relief sought by his client and restrained Sunil from alienating and creating third-party rights in respect of the *purported* unsold inventory of the three projects when there was none. He further submits that this error is compounded inasmuch as the District Judge then proceeded and rejected the other reliefs sought by his clients by erroneously taking into consideration that such injunctive relief provided adequate security to the original Plaintiffs at the time of settlement of accounts of the Partnership Firm.

14. In fact, Mr. Dhond is at pains to point out that relying on such an *ex-facie* erroneous and illusory relief granted below Exhibit 11, the District Judge did not grant any of the other reliefs sought by his clients below Exhibit 13 on a flawed premise that the original Plaintiffs were adequately protected. He submits that considering that in view of there being an obvious error made by the District Judge, which is apparent of the face of the record, both the impugned orders dated 5th September 2023 be set aside by this Court and the matters be remanded back to the District Judge with a direction to hear them afresh and pass fresh orders on the application's preferred by the original Plaintiffs below Exhibit 11 and Exhibit 13.

15. *Per contra*, Mr. Anil Sakhare, learned Senior Counsel who appears on behalf of Sunil, Anisha and Tharwani Construction submits that the District Judge has correctly exercised his discretion and granted the limited interim reliefs below Exhibit 11, on the basis of the findings recorded by him therein. He contends that besides the Partnership Firm, admittedly, the brothers and their late father had several other partnerships which are subsisting and in the circumstances, it could not be said that his client/s were removing themselves from the jurisdiction of the Court and/or transferring their properties to defeat any orders that may be passed against his client/s and therefore, the District Judge has rightly passed the order below Exhibit 13 rejecting the reliefs sought therein.

16. Mr. Sakhare points out that even though there may be no unsold inventory in any of the three projects of the Partnership Firm, its accounts are yet to be taken and drawn up (in furtherance of dissolution) and no case had been made out by original Plaintiffs that they would not be in a position to realize the monies from the Partnership Firm, upon dissolution thereof and finalization/settlement of its accounts. On this ground also, he submits that the original Plaintiffs are not entitled to the reliefs sought below Exhibit 13.

17. Mr. Sakhare relies on various judgments in *Herald Engineers Vs. Wonderpack Industries Pvt. Ltd.*⁸, *Premraj Mundra Vs. Md. Maneck Gazi & Ors.*⁹, *Raman Tech & Process engg. Co. & Anr. Vs. Solanki Traders.*¹⁰ and *SJJ Marine Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Pisces EXIM (INDIA) Pvt. Ltd.*¹¹ which prescribe and lay down the scope of an inquiry under Order 38 of the CPC and the test that is required to be met thereunder. By relying on these decisions, he submits that the District Judge has justifiably rejected the reliefs sought below Exhibit 13.

18. Mr. Sakhare also relies on the judgments in *Navneet Kaur Harbhajansingh Kundles Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.*¹², *Mohd. Yunus Vs. Mohd. Mustaqim*¹³ and *Shivchandrai Vs. Govindprasad*¹⁴ which prescribe the scope and parameters of the Court exercising extra-ordinary supervisory

8 (2013) 4 Mh.L.J. 217

9 1951 SCC Online Cal 20

10 (2008) 2 SCC 302

11 (2013) 3 Mh.L.J. 684

12 (2024) 12 SCC 264

13 (1983) 4 SCC 566

14 (2003) SCC Online Bom 462

jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. By relying on these decisions, Mr. Sakhare submits that no case has been made out by the original Plaintiffs for interference by this Court and accordingly, he seeks dismissal of the captioned proceedings.

19. Upon considering the submissions made by both parties and going through the record with their assistance, we are unable to agree with the submissions made by Mr. Sakhare. Instead, we are of the view that the peculiar facts of the present case warrant interference from this Court. The reasons for arriving at this conclusion is recorded hereunder.

20. A perusal of the impugned order passed below Exhibit 11 would reveal that the District Judge has recorded various findings including *interalia* that Sunil was *prima facie* guilty of misappropriation of funds since he had disposed of the said 36 premises/units without the consent of the other partners and that he had thereby deprived them of their share in profits of the remuneration arising from such sale. It is in furtherance of this finding, that the District Judge appears to have granted the injunctive relief of protection in favour of the original Plaintiffs by injuncting Sunil from alienating and/or disposing of the unsold inventory in the three projects of Partnership Firm, on the basis that by doing so, the original Plaintiffs' monetary claim towards loss caused to them (by the unilateral transfer of 36 premises/units done by Sunil) would be adequately protected and secured.

However, in the bargain, the District Judge, importantly lost sight of the fact that there was infact no unsold inventory in any of the three projects of the Partnership Firm. This is an admitted position, both then and even now. In fact, in the impugned order passed below Exhibit 11, the District Judge has also recorded an express statement to that effect made by Sunil and despite this position, he has thereafter proceeded to grant the injunctive reliefs against the unsold inventory¹⁵. In our considered view, this is an obvious error and oversight on his part. We fail to understand how the District Judge could have protected the original Plaintiffs by granting such an injunction in respect of unsold flats when admittedly, none existed on that date. Accordingly, this Court would be wholly entitled to exercise its appellate jurisdiction and set aside the impugned order passed below Exhibit 11.

21. Insofar as the impugned order passed below Exhibit 13 is concerned, we note that though the District Judge has recorded findings to the effect that, from the record available before him, the original Plaintiffs had failed to make out a case warranting the reliefs under Order 38 of the CPC. However, the District Judge has rejected the said reliefs by also relying on the fact that the original Plaintiffs were adequately protected by the injunctive reliefs granted in the earlier order passed below Exhibit 11 under which Sunil had been restrained from creating any third-party rights in respect of the unsold inventory. In the circumstances, since the impugned

¹⁵ In paragraph 51 of the Impugned Order passed below Exhibit 11

order passed below Exhibit 13 is based on the said finding of injunctive reliefs being granted in the earlier order passed below Exhibit 11, which we have already held to be illusory and an obvious error and oversight on the part of the District Judge, the impugned order passed below Exhibit 13 also cannot be sustained.

22. We are conscious of the limited scope exercised by this Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. In *Shivchandra Rai Jhunjhunwala* (supra), it was held that the power under Article 227 should be invoked only where it is genuinely required and such interference should not defeat the intention of the legislation or frustrate its object. In *Satyanarayan Laxminarayana Hegde v. Mallikarajun Bhavanappa Tirumale*¹⁶, which decision is referred to therein, it is held that courts can exercise their discretion under Article 227 of the Constitution when the error of law is apparent on the face of the record. Applying such ratio, we are of the opinion that this is a fit and appropriate case for this Court to interfere in the matter. As is evident, the reliefs sought below Exhibit 13 have been rejected on various grounds, including one that the original Plaintiffs were adequately protected by the injunctive relief granted in the earlier order passed below Exhibit 11 under which Sunil had been restrained from creating any third-party rights in respect of the unsold inventory. Since, we have already held

16 AIR 1960 SC 137

this injunctive relief to be illusory and an obvious error and oversight on the part of the District Judge, there is clearly an error apparent on the face of the record and which entitles interference from this Court exercising extraordinary supervisory jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

23. Accordingly, the following order is passed :

:: ORDER ::

- i) The Impugned Order dated 5th September 2023 passed by the District Judge-2, Panvel-Raigad below Exhibit 11 in Commercial Suit No. 2 of 2021 is hereby quashed and set aside.
- ii) The Impugned Order dated 5th September 2023 passed by the District Judge-2, Panvel-Raigad below Exhibit 13 in Commercial Suit No. 2 of 2021 is also hereby quashed and set aside.
- iii) Both matters are remanded back to the District Judge-2, Panvel-Raigad who is directed to hear and decide Exhibit 11 and 13 afresh on the basis of the same pleadings and pass orders thereon after hearing the parties, on or before 31st January 2026.
- iv) The captioned Commercial Appeal from Order No. 28 of 2023

and Writ Petition No. 14485 of 2023 are hereby disposed of in
the above terms, there shall be no order as to costs.

(FARHAN P. DUBASH, J.)

(R.I. CHAGLA J.)

24. After the order is pronounced, learned Counsel for Respondent No. 1 seeks a stay of this order for a period of four weeks. However, considering that we have set aside the impugned orders dated 5th September 2025 and remanded the matters back to the District Judge-2, Panvel-Raigad to hear and decide the Applications under Exhibit 11 and 13 afresh before 31st January 2026, no stay can be granted.

(FARHAN P. DUBASH, J.)

(R.I. CHAGLA J.)

JYOTI
PRAKASH
PAWAR

Digitally signed
by JYOTI
PRAKASH
PAWAR
Date:
2025.11.27
16:52:53 +0530