IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

CRL.A. No. 164 of 2009

Reserved on: May 27, 2014
Decision on: May 30, 2014

JOGINDER SINGH MALIK ..... Appellant

Through: Mr. Dayan Krishnan, Senior Advocate with Mohd. Faraz and Ms. Swati Goswami, Advocates.

versus

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Narender Mann, Spl. PP with Mr. Manoj Pant and Ms. Uttkarsha Kohli, Advocates

CORAM: JUSTICE S. MURALIDHAR

J U D G M E N T

30.5.2014

1. This appeal is directed against the impugned judgment dated 13th February 2009 passed by the learned Special Judge, CBI (PC Act), in CC No. 92/08 convicting the Appellant for the offences under Section 7 and 13 (1) (d) read with Section 13(2) of the PC Act and the Order on Sentence dated 17th February 2009 whereby, for the offence under Section 13 (2) read with 13 (1) (d), the Appellant was sentenced to

three years' rigorous imprisonment ('RI') with a fine of Rs. 50,000 and, in default thereof, to undergo simple imprisonment ('SI') for a period of three months. For the offence under Section 7, an identical sentence was passed. Both the sentences were directed to run concurrently.

Case of the prosecution

2. The case of the prosecution is that the Appellant was a Sub-Inspector posted at Police Station ('PS') Mayapuri, New Delhi. The Complainant, Shamsher Singh (PW2), was manufacturing *chokhats* under the name and style of M/s. Royal Safe Works at Mayapuri, New Delhi. A cheque had been stolen from his office, and according to him, a sum of Rs. 25,000 was withdrawn by Mr. Baljeet Singh, who was working in the said firm, in connivance with Ms. Manju Sharma, who was working there as a receptionist. PW-2 lodged a complaint and consequently First Information Report ('FIR') No. 110/01 was registered at PS:Mayapuri. The Investigation Officer ('IO') of the said case was the Appellant.

3. A cross-case was filed by Mr. Baljeet against PW-2 under Sections 342 and 323 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code ('IPC') and this was registered as FIR No.111/01 at PS:Mayapuri. The Appellant was not the IO in the said case.

4. On 10th July 2001, PW2 gave a handwritten complaint (PW2/A) to the Superintendent of Police ('SP'), Anti Corruption Branch ('ACB')

of the Central Bureau of Investigation ('CBI') stating, inter alia, that the Appellant was asking for a bribe of Rs. 20,000 for arresting the accused persons in FIR No.110/01 and for recovery of the sum defalcated by them. PW-2 made a second separate allegation that the Appellant was also threatening that he would arrest PW2 in FIR No.110/01 if he was not paid a bribe of Rs. 8,000. PW2 further alleged in his complaint that the Appellant had called him on his mobile phone No.9810140835 at 2:30 pm on 9th July 2001 asking him to pay the bribe by 3:00 pm on the following day, i.e., 10th July 2001, failing which the Appellant would be arrested. The complaint further stated that the Appellant told PW2 that he would come to the office of PW2 to collect the bribe money.

Pre-raid proceedings

5. The complaint was assigned to Inspector R.S. Bedi (PW8) by the then SP, Mr. Kamal Pant. PW8 then verified the complaint and learnt from his sources that the Appellant was in the habit of accepting bribes for doing favours. He directed the duty officer to arrange for two witnesses. Mr. P.K. Gupta (PW4) and Mr. P.K. Bhaskar (PW5), both working as Junior Engineers with the Delhi Development Authority, were asked to report at the CBI office. The written complaint of PW2 was given to them to read and to satisfy themselves about its genuineness. PW8 produced eight government currency ('GC') notes of Rs. 500 each, which were treated with the phenolphthalein powder. A demonstration of the effect of the treated notes being touched was given. Thereafter, the treated GC notes were

given to PW2 who kept them in his left side shirt pocket. PW2 was directed to give the treated GC notes to the Appellant only upon specific demand. PW4 was asked to act as a shadow witness; to remain as close as possible to PW2 to overhear the conversation between PW2 and the Appellant and to give a signal by scratching his head with both his hands when the transaction of payment of bribe amount was concluded. The pre-trap proceedings were recorded in the handing-over memo (PW4/A) and the serial numbers of the GC notes were noted.

The raid proceedings

6. A trap team along with PWs 2, 4 and 5 left for the CBI Office around 2:40 pm in a government vehicle and reached the factory of PW2 after about 40 minutes. PW4 was asked to follow PW2. Both of them entered the office of PW2 and sat on chairs. Meanwhile, Mr. Mahendra Singh (PW6), a friend of PW2, arrived there. He was also permitted to sit on a chair in the office room of PW2. The window panes were covered with a newspaper and a small hole was made in it so that the trap team could peep into the room. PW8 along with PW5 sat outside the office room of PW2 and were able to see the movement inside the room.

7. According to the prosecution, at around 4 pm, PW5 told PW8 that he had seen the Appellant accepting the bunch of notes and had seen PW4 flashing a signal. On receipt of the signal, PWs 5 and 8 moved towards the office room of PW2.

8. PW8 stated in his evidence that when he entered the office room of PW2, he saw the Appellant counting the notes. PW8 then disclosed his identity and asked the Appellant whether he had accepted the bribe of Rs. 8,000. The Appellant then kept the money on the table. Inspector Vivek Dhir and Inspector U.K. Goswami caught hold of the wrists of the Appellant. PW8 directed PW5 to pick up the bunch of notes. The right hand wash of the Appellant turned pink. The hand wash was transferred to an empty bottle, which was sealed and labeled. Likewise, the left hand wash of the Appellant also turned pink and was preserved in the same way. The notes recovered from the Appellant were tallied with those noted in the pre-raid memo. Thereafter, the Appellant was searched and a memo (Ex.PW4/C) drawn up. Since a computer was available in the office of PW2, the recovery memo (Ex. PW2/B) was prepared at the spot. The Appellant was arrested and charged with the offences aforementioned.

Statement of the accused under Section 313 Cr PC

9. The prosecution examined nine witnesses. In his statement under Section 313 Cr.PC, when confronted with the evidence against him, the Appellant, *inter alia*, stated that he had visited the factory of PW2 "as he had told me on 8.7.2001 that he will provide his specimen signatures on 10.7.2001 in presence of his 2-3 friends after consulting the same. He had also assured me on 8.7.2001 that he will manage to produce Ms. Manju, the other co-accused of case FIR No. 110/2001." He further maintained that he was fairly investigating FIR No. 110/01 and in that connection had been asking PW2 to provide his specimen

signatures. He stated that the said facts were noted in the case diary ('CD') of FIR No. 110/01. He further stated that before investigating FIR No. 110/01, he had arrested Mr. Baljeet Singh and obtained his signatures. As regards the FSL report prepared by Mr. K.S. Chhabra (PW1), he submitted that PW1 had not given a fair report and it was also against scientific principles and that the report was biased. He contended that PWs 2, 4 and 5 had not supported the case of the CBI and further that the GC notes had been recovered from the table and not from the hands of the Appellant as noted in the recovery memo (Ex. PW2/B). Further statements of the Appellant under Section 313 Cr PC were recorded by the learned trial Court on 27th May 2005 and 8th March 2006.

10. The Appellant examined Mr. Vinod Kumar, an Assistant Ahlmad in the Court of the learned Metropolitan Magistrate at Patiala House Courts as DW1, who brought the case files of FIR Nos. 110/01 and 111/01 registered at PS:Mayapuri, New Delhi.

The judgment of the trial Court

11. On an analysis of the evidence, the learned trial Court concluded that three key prosecution witnesses, who had turned hostile, had nevertheless supported the case of the prosecution in part. Even from the depositions of these hostile witnesses, it was clear that the Appellant had demanded Rs. 8,000 as bribe from PW2 for not arresting him in FIR No. 111/01. Therefore, the demand of the bribe money made by Appellant from PW2 was proved. It is further held

that the omission of learned counsel for the accused to put a question to PW2 to the effect that no bribe money had been accepted or demanded by the Appellant on 10th July 2001 did tantamount to an admission by the Appellant that on 10th July 2001 a demand for bribe of Rs. 8,000 had been made. The fact that the hand washes turned pink and the FSL report corroborated the evidence of the prosecution was sufficient to bring home the guilt of the Appellant. Portions of the evidences of PWs 4 and 5 supported the case of the prosecution regarding the washes of the Appellant turning pink.

12. The trial Court held that inconsistencies and contradictions in the evidence of the prosecution witnesses were not material and did not give rise to the benefit of doubt in favour of the Appellant. The Appellant had been unable to rebut the statutory presumption under Section 20 of the PC Act. The explanation regarding the recovery of Rs. 40,000 from the Appellant in his office was not believed since the uncle of the Appellant was not examined. In the circumstances, the Court held that the Appellant was guilty of the offences under Sections 7 and 13 (1) (d) read with Section 20 of the PC Act. By a separate Order on Sentence dated 17th February 2009, the Appellant was sentenced in the manner indicated hereinbefore.

Submissions of Senior counsel for the Appellant

13. Mr. Dayan Krishnan, learned counsel for the Appellant, submitted that the prosecution had failed to prove the conscious demand and conscious acceptance by the Appellant of illegal gratification and,

therefore, the question of presumption under Section 20 of the PC Act being attracted did not arise. He submitted that the decisions in ***Banarasi Dass v. State of Haryana (2010) 4SCC 450*** and ***Suraj Mal v. State (Delhi Admn.) (1979) 4 SCC 725*** were not of any precedential value as the decisions themselves emphasised that they were peculiar to the facts and circumstances of those cases. The mere recovery of the treated GC notes from the Appellant, without proof of demand, did not amount to an offence under Sections 7 or 13 (1) (d) of the PC Act. Reliance was also placed on the decision in ***B. Jayaraj v. State of AP 2014 (4) SCALE 81***. Relying on the decisions in ***State of Maharashtra v. Dnyaneshwar Laxmanrao Wankhede (2009) 15 SCC 200*** and ***State of Punjab v. Madan Mohan Lal Verma (2013) 14 SCC 153***, Mr. Krishnan submitted that the presumption under Section 20 would be attracted only when the foundational facts of demand and acceptance were proved. He further submitted that the phenolphthalein test should was not conclusive proof and cannot form the sole basis for convicting the Appellant. Reliance was placed on the decision in ***Meena v. State of Maharashtra (2000) 5 SCC 21*** and the decision dated 22nd January 2014 of this Court in Crl. A. No. 111 of 2008 (***Mahavir Singh v. State***).

15. Mr. Krishnan submitted that merely because questions that were inconsistent with, or prejudicial to, the case of the accused were put by his counsel in the cross-examination of the prosecution witnesses would not, *ipso facto*, prejudice the case of the Appellant. Reliance in this context is placed on the decisions in ***Juwarsingh v. State of M.P.***

(1980) Supp SCC 417 and ***Chaturbhuj Pande v. Collector, Rajgarh (1969) 1 SCR 412***. Relying on the decisions in ***Rakesh Kapoor v. State of H.P. (2012) 13 SCC 552***, Mr. Krishnan submitted that although the case of the prosecution was that PW2 was contacted on his mobile phone by the Appellant at around 2:30 pm on 9th July 2007, no attempt was made to produce the call detail records ('CDR') of the said mobile phone and this was fatal to the case of the prosecution.

16. As regards the proving of demand, Mr. Krishnan repeatedly stressed that the Appellant was not the IO in FIR No. 111/01 as was evident from the deposition of PW7, Inspector K.S. Bhatnagar. The Appellant had gone to the shop of PW2 only for the purposes of taking his specimen signatures. This was proved by the entry in the CD and this was in the course of his duties. He referred to the evidence of PW2, who stated that the Appellant told him that he was only joking with him when he made a demand of bribe. Mr. Krishnan was critical of the impugned judgment of the learned trial Court to the extent that it overlooked the fact that on an application made by the uncle of the Appellant, a sum of Rs. 40,000 seized from the office of the Appellant was returned to the said uncle. Although PW2 spoke about a voice recording instrument being handed over, no such instrument was produced. Finally, it is submitted that the evidence regarding the demand of illegal gratification prior to the call made on the mobile phone of PW2 and the acceptance of the bribe money by the Appellant was not put to the Appellant when his statement under Section 313 Cr PC was recorded.

Submissions of the Special PP

17. Replying to the above submissions, Mr. Narendra Mann, the learned Spl. PP for CBI, explained that the reference to the 'accused' in FIR No. 110/01 in the complaint of PW2 was to the accused other than Baljeet Singh who had already been arrested by that date. Explaining the scope of Section 7 Explanation (d) of the PC Act, Mr. Mann submitted that, notwithstanding the fact that the Appellant was not the IO in FIR No. 111/01, it would not affect the prosecution case. Section 7 of the PC Act would apply even where the demand of bribe is for a task which was not capable of being performed in the course of the bribe demander's official duties. Mr. Mann pointed out that after the legal position was explained by the Supreme Court in ***Dhaneshwar Narain Saxena vs The Delhi Administration AIR 1962 SC 195***, the PC Act 1947 was amended in 1964 making it possible for the person to be charged with the offence under Section 7 of the PC Act even where the promised task was not in the course of his official duties.

18. Mr. Mann pointed out that the file of FIR No. 111/01 was also recovered from the office of the Appellant. He submitted that if indeed the Appellant was visiting the shop of PW2 as part of his official duty, there was no reason why he would not take the file and the CD along; further, if he wanted to arrest one of the accused named in FIR No. 111/01, viz., Ms. Manju Sharma, who was the receptionist, then he ought to have taken along a lady constable with him. His failure to do so, and the fact that there was no entry in the *roznamcha*,

proved the case of the prosecution that the Appellant had gone to the shop of PW2 for collecting the bribe amount.

19. As regards putting the incriminating circumstances to the Appellant under Section 313 Cr PC, Mr. Mann pointed out that the substance of the prosecution evidence was indeed put to him and in any event no prejudice was shown to have been caused by not putting the precise evidence of the prosecution witnesses. He submitted that even though three prosecution witnesses had turned hostile, portion of the statements made by them in their examinations-in-chief as well as the cross-examination did support the case of the prosecution.

Analysis of the evidence

20. In the present case, the Court is required to carefully scutinise the evidence of the Complainant/PW2, the shadow witness (PW4) and the recovery witness (PW5). While it is true that they have not supported the case of the prosecution in its entirety, their testimonies cannot be discarded on that score alone. As will be seen hereinafter, there are portions of the testimonies of these witnesses which do support the case of the prosecution.

21. PW2 stated that as regards the case against him on the complaint of Mr. Baljeet Singh, "the accused always told me to get anticipatory bail for myself otherwise he would arrest me." He stated that the Appellant had demanded Rs. 8,000 from me "towards expenses for bail." Clearly, therefore, the demand by the Appellant even before the

mobile phone conversation on 10th July 2001 was spoken to by PW2 himself.

22. PW2 also submitted that he had taken Rs. 8,000 in the GC notes of Rs.500 which were then treated with phenolphthalein powder. While it is true that PW2 does not mention the presence of PW4 when he returned to his office while awaiting the arrival of the Appellant, there is sufficient evidence to fix the presence of PW4 at the spot, when the trap was laid.

23. PW2 also has admitted that the treated GC notes were kept by him in his pocket; that while he was sitting in his factory, the Appellant came there at around 3:30 pm or 3:45 pm; that he had asked the Appellant whether he had arrested Ms. Manju Sharma. He then stated as under:

> "I offered money to the accused but accused refused to accept the money saying that he does not want to take any money from me and he was simply joking with me. Somebody gave a signal from outside that I should put the money in his pocket. When I was trying to put the money in his pocket, he threw the money away saying that he would do the work without taking any money from me. Thereafter CBI officials entered the room and apprehended the accused. I was asked to sit on one side."

24. PW2 nevertheless confirmed that when both the hand washes of the Appellant were taken, they turned pink. He confirmed his signatures on the recovery memo. As regards the treated GC notes, he identified them in Court and stated that "these are the same GC notes

which were given by me to the accused in my factory. The GC notes were recovered from my office table."

25. At the above stage, PW2 was cross-examined by the learned APP. While he denied that on 4th July 2001 the Appellant demanded Rs. 20,000 from him for arresting the persons involved in FIR No.110/01, he admitted that "It is correct that accused was demanding bribe from me for not arresting me. It is correct that accused directed me on my mobile phone on 9.7.2001 to pay demanded bribe amount of Rs. 8,000 to him by 3:00 pm on 10.7.2001 failing which he would arrest me." He confirmed that one witness was stationed at the window to witness what was happening in his office room. In his further cross-examination by the learned Sr. PP, PW2 denied any conversation between him and the Appellant during which the Appellant sought confirmation as to whether PW2 had brought the bribe amount of Rs. 8,000. However, he reiterated that both the hand washes of the Appellant turned pink and that "the contents of my complaint (PW2/A) are correct." A suggestion was put to learned counsel for PW2 by learned counsel for the accused as to whether, in fact, the Appellant and PW2 were sitting together in the factory of PW2 and consuming liquor. The answer given by him reads as under:

> "I know the accused for last five-six years prior to the date of incident. The day on which money was demanded we were sitting together in my factory and were consuming liquor, then he told me that money has to be spent for preventing my arrest. At that point of time we both had consumed about a bottle of alcohol (sharab). We used to take liquor as friends in routine and it was not the first time that we were taking liquor. I do not

remember as to whether on the day when we were taking liquor and this issue of money had cropped in, in connection with anticipatory bail to be obtained for me discussion about a lawyer and engage of lawyer to do the respective job had also come in."

26. PW2 cannot therefore be said to have completely destroyed the case of the prosecution. The above portions of his evidence do support its case to some extent on the material aspect of proof of demand and the fact of the hand washes turning pink.

27. As far as PW4 is concerned, he began by saying that, one day prior to his going over to the CBI, he was asked to report there. However, this has not been supported by PW5, a colleague of his, who states that he along with PW4 went to the CBI office on 10th July 2001. That apart, PWs 4 and 5 have spoken about the GC notes produced by PW2 being treated with phenolphthalein powder; the demonstration given; their numbers being noted in the pre-raid proceedings and the instructions to PWs 4 and 5 regarding the raid proceedings. Both PWs 4 and 5 correctly identified the Appellant as being the person who was arrested at the time of the trap proceedings. While PW4 claimed not to have heard the conversation that took place between PW2 and the Appellant, he stated as under:

"The Complainant asked from the accused '*tumhare kitne paise dene hain*' but he did not demand and he kept mum. The complainant then said '*tumhare itne paise dene hain*' thereafter the complainant proceeded towards almirah, took out the money and gave to the accused. The accused kept the money for a while and then placed the same on a table. Thereafter I gave the

signal by scratching my head and the CBI team entered in the office."

28. PW4 then stated that the CBI Inspector proceeded towards the Appellant and when he tried to say something, he was beaten and the GC notes were picked up by the CBI Inspector. Therefore, the fact of the Appellant taking the money from PW2, keeping it for a while and then placing it on the table has been spoken to by PW4. PW4 has also confirmed that the hand washes of the Appellant turned pink.

29. PW5, on the other hand, stated that when they entered the room, they found PW2 coming out of his office and that when the Appellant was caught hold of by the CBI Officer, he started crying and stated that he had done nothing; that some money was lying on the table and then it was counted by the CBI officer. However, he too confirmed that the hand washes of the Appellant turned pink.

30. Interestingly, in the cross-examination of PW4, he was asked whether PW2 and his companion (which is a reference to Mr. Mahendra Singh [PW7]), were consuming liquor. PW4 then responded as under:

"I was sitting in the car of the complainant while proceeding from the CBI office to the spot. His companion was also with us. It is also correct that both i.e. the complainant and his companion were consuming liquor during their entire travel from CBI office to factory. I do not remember whether they had purchased any "namkeen" during their journey from CBI office to the factory. It is correct that complainant had made some telephonic call from his office but I do not recollect whether he

was calling someone to his office saying '*aap aa kyon nahi rahe ho*.' It is correct that while sitting in their office, both i.e. the complainant and his companion were taking heavy doses of liquor. They were going in an adjoining office turn by turn to take liquor and might be eating something with the liquor in that room. Accused was not offered liquor by the complainant. The complainant had also not offered the liquor to the CBI official. None of the CBI official checked the complainant or his companion as to why they were taking liquor."

31. The question really boils down to whether the above evidence is sufficient to show the conscious demand and acceptance of the bribe amount by the Appellant. The Court is of the view that PW2 himself has confirmed even in his cross-examination by learned APP that "It is correct that the accused was demanding the bribe from me for not arresting me." Although in his cross-examination, PW-2 stated that the Appellant again directed him on the mobile phone on 9th July 2001 to pay the demanded bribe, the prosecution has not produced the CDR of the said mobile phone to confirm this fact. However, this, by itself, will not make much of a difference in view of the earlier statement by PW2 that the demand was made even prior to the said demand made on the mobile phone. At this juncture, it requires to be noted that in ***Rakesh Kapoor v. State of H.P.*** the demand was made only on the mobile phone and it was in those circumstances it was held that the non-production of the CDR of the said mobile phone was fatal to the case of the prosecution.

32. As regards the acceptance of the bribe amount, much reliance has been placed by Mr. Krishnan on the answers given by PW2 in his

examination-in-chief that the Appellant had refused to accept the money stating that "he was simply joking with him." However, when PW2 was cross-examined by the learned Senior PP, he confirmed that both the hand washes of the Appellant turned pink. However, the evidence of PW4 is more critical when he states that PW2 gave the money to the Appellant and the Appellant "kept the money for a while and then placed the same on a table." In his cross-examination, he stated as under:

> "It is correct that the money was taken out by Shamsher Singh from his left shirt pocket and given to the accused. It is correct that when the money still in the hands of the accused, I gave the signal. Vol. But within 15-20 seconds accused kept the money on the table."

33. The Court is of the view that a collective reading of the evidence of PWs 2 and 4 is sufficient to draw the conclusion regarding the conscious acceptance of the bribe amount by the Appellant. With both the elements i.e. conscious demand and conscious acceptance being proved by the prosecution in the above manner beyond reasonable doubt, the presumption under Section 20 of the PC Act was certainly attracted in the present case. In other words, this is not an instance where the entire case of the prosecution turns on the sole evidence of the hand washes of the accused turning pink, and being corroborated by the report of FSL. The evidence of PW-2 and PW-4, to the extent salvaged in the portions of their respective depositions as noted earlier, corroborated by the FSL report of the hand washes, proves the demand and acceptance of illegal gratification by the Appellant beyond reasonable doubt.

34. Regarding the submission that the evidence as recorded ought to have been put to the Appellant under Section 313 Cr PC, the Court finds that questions 3, 4 and 5 pertained to the two FIRs. However, it cannot be said that the substance of the evidence concerning demand of bribe was not put to the Appellant. Question No.17 is about the demand made at the time of trap proceedings and question No.18 is about what the Appellant told PW2. In fact, in response to question No.17, the Appellant seeks to explain why he went to the office of PW2. According to Appellant himself, PW2 had stated that he would provide his specimen signatures and also produce Ms. Manju Sharma, the other co-accused in FIR No. 110/01. Question No.19 specifically is about PW2 taking out the money from his left shirt pocket and giving it to the Appellant and when the money was in his hands, PW4 gave a signal to the trap team. The Court is, therefore, unable to accept the submission of Mr. Krishnan that the evidence regarding the demand and acceptance of the illegal gratification was not put to the Appellant.

35. The above discussion is sufficient for the Court to concur with the main reasoning of the learned trial Court for finding the Appellant to be guilty of offences with which he was charged. In that view of the matter, the Court does not consider it necessary to deal with the other submissions regarding the deemed admission by the Appellant on account of the questions put to the prosecution witnesses in their cross-examination. On this point, the Court would accept the submission of Mr. Krishnan that in light of the law explained by the

Supreme Court in ***Chaturbhuj Pande v. Collector, Rajgarh*** and the High Court of Gujarat in ***Koli Trikam Jivraj v. The State of Gujarat, AIR 1969 Guj 69***, such questions by themselves can hardly be prejudicial to the case of the Appellant. Nevertheless, the Court is satisfied that no error has been committed by the learned trial Court as far as its main reasoning and conclusion regarding the demand and acceptance of the illegal gratification by the Appellant is concerned.

36. For the aforementioned reasons, the Court finds no grounds having been made out for interference with the impugned judgment dated 13th February 2009 of the learned trial Court. Even on the question of sentence, the Court does not find it to be disproportionate and therefore the order on sentence also does not call for interference. The appeal is accordingly dismissed, but, in the circumstances, with no order as to costs.

37. The bail bonds are cancelled. The Appellant will surrender forthwith failing which he will be taken into custody forthwith to serve out the sentence.

38. A copy of this order be given *dasti* under the signature of Court Master. A certified copy of this order along with trial Court record be sent to the trial Court concerned forthwith.

S. MURALIDHAR, J.

May 30, 2014
tp