

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on : 16.11.2016

Delivered on : 30.11.2016

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE PUSHPA SATHYANARAYANA  
and  
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SUBRAMANIAN

C.M.A No.1377 of 2007

K.J.Suriyanarayanan ... Appellant/Petitioner

Versus

Poornima S.Narayanan ... Respondent/Respondent

Prayer: Appeal filed under section 19 of the Family Courts Act against the Judgment and Decree made in O.P.No.963 of 2003 dated 30.06.2006 on the file of II Additional Family Court, Chennai.

For Petitioner : Ms.Geetha Ramaseshan

For Respondent : Mr.S.Kalyanaraman

JUDGMENT

R.SUBRAMANIAN, J.,

The husband whose petition in O.P.No.963 of 2003 on the file of the II Additional Principal Family Court, Chennai on the ground of cruelty and unsoundness of mind, was dismissed, is the appellant before us.

2.The case of the petitioner in O.P.No.963 of 2003 is that the marriage took place on 20.11.1994 at Raja Annamalaipuram, Chennai-28. The male child was born out of the said marriage.

3.According to the petitioner, the respondent was irresponsible and arrogant. She refused to do any domestic work and she gets up only at 9.00 a.m. in the morning. The petitioner was thus, forced to have his breakfast in a hotel almost everyday. He would further claim the respondent would unnecessarily insult him and taunt him for no fault of his. It

is his further case that the respondent would suddenly disappear from the marital home without informing the petitioner. On one occasion, she called his office from the Railway Station to inform him that she is proceeding to Kumbakonam along with her brother. The petitioner would also claim that she used to stay away for long duration during summer vacation and other holidays without reasonable cause. He would claim that she even beat him up in the Railway Station causing embarrassment to him. According to the petitioner, the respondent with a view to harass the petitioner, indulged in extraordinary expenses and she engaged two servants for a three member family. She was also responsible for hiking up the telephone bill by making unwanted calls. As a consequence of this, the petitioner had suffered loss of face and reputation. It is further stated that the respondent indulged in deliberate acts ; intended to lower the dignity and esteem of the petitioner and she made false complaints to his superiors which had caused him severe mental depression.

4. During September 2000, it is claimed, that the respondent left the matrimonial house and went to Coimbatore for over one month on the pretext of learning yoga. In fact, she had to be practically dragged back to Chennai, because of that she suffered mental setback for more than one year. To sum up, the petitioner had claimed that the respondent had a sadistic nature and by her conduct, she had caused severe mental agony and trauma to the petitioner. Claiming that this abnormal behavior of the respondent caused mental cruelty, the petitioner had sought for divorce.

Though unsoundness of mind was made a ground for divorce Mrs. Geetha Ramaseshan, learned counsel appearing for appellant fairly states that she is not pressing the said ground

5. The respondent/wife resisted the claim for divorce contending that the allegations relating to mental cruelty are false and that it has been raised by the petitioner only with the view to obtain divorce so as to enable him to contract second marriage with another woman. She would also claim that the brothers and sisters of the petitioner ill treated her and forced her to get out of the house. She would claim she is a dutiful wife and that her son Jayasurya knows that she is the key pin and the petitioner's role is zero. She would also state that she used to take tuitions and used to prepare lunch and breakfast at 7 a.m. She would also claim that she was a Mathematics Teacher in Sivaswamy Kalalaya before the child was born and she quit the job after the child birth. She would further claim that she had been taking home tuitions and earned reasonably to run the family, contributing entire income to the family. The only domestic work done by the petitioner was,

according to her, to drop the child in the school only in the morning.

6.The respondent would further claim that the petitioner would use all costly perfumes, cosmetics and purchased several dress items for his use. She would claim that the petitioner's earnings was spent for his personal make up only. The respondent would further contend that the petitioner had compelled her to sign in blank papers and sometime later, he forced her to write that she was not interested in married life. She had also stated that she received anonymous calls from well wishers who warned her stating that the petitioner is roaming with another lady which made her upset. She would claim that on so many occasions, the petitioner devised methods to drive her and the child from the matrimonial home but they were saved by the divine power. The respondent would also contend that the petitioner would return home very late, at times, even 2 a.m, or 3 a.m. Once when the respondent and the child were away, the petitioner locked the front door with a different lock and left the house. She and the child could not enter the house. After having waited till 3 a.m, in the morning, she had to request the neighbour to call her brother over phone and they went to her brother's house. The respondent would aver in the counter that there were rumors and gossip that the petitioner is going about in the streets with a lady named 'Kripa'.

7.According to the respondent, the petitioner and the said Kripa had met in a place called Hindu Social Welfare Centre. She would also claim that the said Kripa is a divorcee. She had in fact alleged that the parents of Kripa were waiting for her to come and discuss the issue with them as they felt ashamed about their daughter's association with the petitioner. She would also claim that the higher authorities in the Hindu were also expecting her complaint and the petitioner was transferred to Trivandrum to prevent any further mishaps, since it is claimed by the respondent that the lady by name Kripa belongs to the family of the employer of the petitioner. It is also stated in the counter statement that the grand mother of Kripa had cursed the character of the petitioner and the respondent was even informed that the petitioner and the said Kripa were living together in a rented house after sunset. The respondent would also claim that both the petitioner and the respondent attended yoga classes and as disciple of Sri Jaggi Vasudev, she had to go to Coimbatore to learn Yoga. At some point of time, according to the respondent she did not get proper sleep resulting in her being treated by a psychiatrist. She would claim that there was no prolonged treatment and denied the allegations that she is mentally unsound. With a view to drive the respondent out of the house, the petitioner had disconnected the telephone and has stopped paying the rent for



the house. On the aforesaid contentions, the respondent sought dismissal of the divorce petition before the Family Court.

8.The petitioner had examined himself as PW-1 and marked as Ex.P-1 to P-10. The respondent had examined herself as RW-1 and had examined four other witnesses. She also filed Ex.R-1 to R-18. On consideration of the oral and documentary evidence, the Learned Family Judge had concluded that the petitioner had not made any of the allegations of cruelty and had dismissed the petition for divorce.

9.The Petitioner had also filed O.P.No.967 of 2003 seeking custody of the child. The same has also been dismissed by a common order. It is now stated that the child attained majority. Therefore, the question of custody does not survive and there is no appeal against the dismissal of the petition for custody in O.P.No.967 of 2003 before us.

10.We heard Ms.Geetha Ramaseshan, learned counsel for the appellant, Mr.S.Kalyanaraman, learned counsel for the respondent. Perused the pleadings and the evidence on record.

The following points emerge for consideration in the appeal.

1)Whether the petitioner has made out the case of cruelty so as to enable him to get a decree of divorce on the ground of mental cruelty.

2)Whether the subsequent events namely, the allegations made in the counter affidavit by the respondent against the petitioner and the oral evidence in the form of RW's 1 to 5 would enable the petitioner to obtain a decree for divorce on the ground of the mental cruelty.

11.Ms.Geetha Ramaseshan, learned counsel for the appellant, would strenuously contend that the statements made in the counter as well as the evidence tendered by RWs 1 to 5 who had, made an unsubstantiated allegations of immorality against the petitioner, claiming that he was in fact living in adultery with one Kripa would by itself amount to mental cruelty. The learned counsel drawing support from the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in [2014] 7 SCC 640 [Malathi Ravi,M.D.-vs- B.V.Ravi,M.D], would submit that the allegations in the counter statement which are to the effect that the petitioner was transferred to Trivandrum and was eventually forced to resign from his job because of the complaints made by the respondent and the oral evidence of the respondent herself and the four witnesses examined on her side would by itself constitute enough mental cruelty to enable him to seek divorce.

12.Ms.Geetha Ramaseshan, learned counsel for the appellant would draw our attention to the observations of the Supreme Court made in paragraph 28 of the said judgment, which run as follows:

"28. The learned counsel for the appellant has urged with vehemence that when dissolution of marriage was sought on the ground of desertion alone, the issue of mental cruelty can neither be raised nor can be addressed to. Regard being had to the said submission, we are constrained to pose the question whether in a case of the present nature we should require the respondent husband to amend the petition and direct the learned Family Judge to consider the issue of mental cruelty or should we ignore the fetter of technicality and consider the pleadings and evidence brought on record as well as the subsequent facts which are incontrovertible so that the lis is put to rest. In our considered opinion the issue of mental cruelty should be addressed to by this Court for the sake of doing complete justice. We think, it is the bounden duty of this Court to do so and not to leave the parties to fight the battle afresh after expiry of thirteen years of litigation. Dealing with the plea of mental cruelty which is perceptible from the material on record would not affect any substantive right of the appellant. It would be only condoning a minor technical aspect. Administration of justice provokes our judicial conscience that it is a fit case where the plenitude of power conferred on this Court under Article 142 deserves to be invoked, more so, when the ground is statutorily permissible. By such exercise we are certain that it would neither be supplanting the substantive law nor would it be building a structure which does not exist. It would be logical to do so and illogical to refrain from doing so."

Observing so, the Hon'ble Supreme Court proceeded to deal with mental cruelty in the said case after referring to Vinita Saxena .v. Pankaj Pandit reported in (2006)3 SCC 778 observed as follows:-

"31. It is settled by a catena of decisions that mental cruelty can cause even more serious injury than the physical harm and create in the mind of the injured appellant such apprehension as is contemplated in the section. It is to be determined on whole facts of the case and the matrimonial relations between the spouses. To amount to cruelty, there must be such wilful treatment of the party which caused suffering in body or mind either as an actual fact or by way of apprehension in such a manner as to render the continued living together of spouses harmful or injurious having regard to the circumstances of the case.

In Samar Ghosh -vs- Jaya Ghosh, reported in (2007) 4 SCC 511, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had given certain illustrations from which an interference of mental cruelty could be drawn. The said examples are as follows:

"(i) On consideration of complete matrimonial life of the parties, acute mental pain, agony and suffering as would not make possible for the parties to live with each other could come within the broad parameters of mental cruelty.

(ii) On comprehensive appraisal of the entire matrimonial life of the parties, it becomes abundantly clear that situation is such that the wronged party cannot reasonably be asked to put up with such conduct and continue to live with other party.

(iv) Mental cruelty is a state of mind. The feeling of deep anguish, disappointment, frustration in one spouse caused by the conduct of other for a long time may lead to mental cruelty.

(vii) Sustained reprehensible conduct, studied neglect, indifference or total departure from the normal standard of conjugal kindness causing injury to mental health or deriving sadistic pleasure can also amount to mental cruelty.

(x) The married life should be reviewed as a whole and a few isolated instances over a period of years will not amount to cruelty. The ill conduct must be persistent for a

fairly lengthy period, where the relationship has deteriorated to an extent that because of the acts and behaviour of a spouse, the wronged party finds it extremely difficult to live with the other party any longer, may amount to mental cruelty.

(xiv) Where there has been a long period of continuous separation, it may fairly be concluded that the matrimonial bond is beyond repair. The marriage becomes a fiction though supported by a legal tie. By refusing to sever that tie, the law in such cases, does not serve the sanctity of marriage; on the contrary, it shows scant regard for the feelings and emotions of the parties. In such like situations, it may lead to mental cruelty."

Again in para 99 and 100 of the said judgments, the Supreme Court has observed as follows:

"99. The human mind is extremely complex and human behaviour is equally complicated. Similarly human ingenuity has no bound, therefore, to assimilate the entire human behaviour in one definition is almost impossible. What is cruelty in one case may not amount to cruelty in other case. The concept of cruelty differs from person to person depending upon his upbringing, level of sensitivity, educational, family and cultural background, financial position, social status, customs, traditions, religious beliefs, human values and their value system.

100. Apart from this, the concept of mental cruelty cannot remain static; it is bound to change with the passage of time, impact of modern culture through print and electronic media and value system, etc. etc. What may be mental cruelty now may not remain a mental cruelty after a passage of time or vice versa. There can never be any straitjacket formula or fixed parameters for determining mental cruelty in matrimonial matters. The prudent and appropriate way to adjudicate the case would be to evaluate it on its peculiar facts and circumstances...."



13. From the above decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the following principles could be deduced. The expression cruelty has a inseparable nexus with the human conduct or human behaviour. The decree of conduct which may amount to cruelty will vary according to the social strata or the milieu to which the parties belong. At times their ways of life, relationships temperaments and emotions that have been conditioned by their social status also play a very important role.

14. Keeping the above guiding factors in mind, let us now analyze the case on hand. The averments in the counter already extracted would show that the respondent/wife had made very serious allegations of adultery against the petitioner. Though she would claim in her evidence that she came to know of it from various sources including the employer of the petitioner, the fact that she had made those allegations and has also supported the same in her evidence as RW-1. She would claim that the petitioner would dress extravagantly and use perfumes. That domestic electronic items like Fridge, Television were purchased by her. She would depose that she received anonymous calls stating that the petitioner has got illicit intimacy with another women. She would further claim that several other people on their own, came and told her that the petitioner has got illicit relationship with one Kripa. The following are the extracts of the evidence relating to the said allegations:-

RW1-wife of the petitioner :-

- "1) அவரது நடவடிக்கைகளை நான் விசாரித்த போது பலர் தாமதம் வந்து கிருபா என்ற பெண்ணோடு உன் கணவருக்கு தொடர்பு இருக்கிறது என்று போன் மூலமும் அந்த செய்தியை சொன்னார்கள்.
- 2) என் சகோதரி கௌரி இன்னொரு சகோதரி காமாட்சி, ஏன் அண்ணன் அனந்தநாராயணன் இவர்கள் சென்று கிருபா வீட்டில் சென்று என் கணவரை பற்றி பேசினார்கள்.
- 3) கிருபாவின் பாட்டி கிருபா செய்தது சரியில்லை என்று சொன்னார்கள் பணத்திற்காக ஆசைபட்டு செய்கிறார் என்று என்னிடமே சொன்னார்கள். மேலும் அந்த பாட்டி என் கணவரும் கிருபாவும் இரவு நேரத்தில் தனியாக வேறு ஒரு வீடு பார்த்து இருப்பதாகவும் அதில் தங்கி இருப்பதாகவும் சொன்னார்கள்.

RW-2 Kamatchi, sister of the respondent had deposed as follows:

- "1) என் தம்பியின் மனைவி சுதா வேலை செய்யும் அலுவலகத்தில் ஒரு பெண் லாவண்யா என்பவர் வேலை செய்தார். அவருக்கு மனுதாரர் அசிங்கமான வார்த்தைகளால் ஒரு இமெயில் அனுப்பி உள்ளார். அந்த லாவண்யா அந்த தகவலை கொண்டு வந்து என் தம்பி மனைவியிடம் காண்பித்தார்.



2) இந்து பத்திரிகையில் வேலை செய்யும் கிருபா என்ற பெண்ணுடன் மனுதாரருக்கு தொடர்பு இருப்பதாக கேள்விப்பட்டோம். கிருபா இந்து வெலப் செண்டரில் வேலை செய்தார்.

RW-3, who claims to be the father-in-law of the elder sister of the respondent, had deposed as follows:

- 1) 2002-ஆம் ஆண்டின் இறுதியில் ஒருநாள் நான் அவர்கள் வீட்டுக்கு சென்றபோது சூரியநாராயணன் பூர்ணிமாவை ஒரு வெற்றுதாளில் கையெழுத்து போடும்படி கேட்டார். அவர் வேறு ஒரு பெண்ணோடு தொடர்பு இருப்பதாகவும் அதனால் நாம் சுழகமாக விலகி கொள்வதற்காக கையெழுத்து கேட்டார்.
- 2) என் வீட்டிற்கு பக்கத்தில் வசிக்கும் கிருபா என்ற பெண் இந்து பத்திரிகையில் வேலை செய்வார் சூரியநாராயணனுக்கு தொடர்பு இருந்தது. அதை நான் பார்த்து இருக்கிறேன். இரண்டு பேரும் ஒன்றாக சேர்ந்து பேசிக் கொண்டு சென்றதை நான் பார்த்து உள்ளேன். சூரியநாராயணனும் சமீபகாலம் செய்வார். எனது மருமகள் சூரியநாராயணனின் நடவடிக்கை சரியில்லை என்று சொல்லி உள்ளார்.

Rw-4, who is the cousin of the respondent had deposed as follows:

1. மனுதாரர் ஒரு பெண்ணோடு கிட்டத்தட்ட தினமும் காலை 7.45-8 மணி அளவில் பக்கத்தில் உள்ள ஆஞ்சநேயர் கோவிலுக்கு இருவரும் சேர்ந்து வந்ததை நான் பலமுறை பார்த்து உள்ளேன். நான் தினமும் சாமி கும்பிட செல்லும் போது நான் பார்த்து உள்ளேன். 2000 ஆண்டில் தான் அவர்கள் இருவரும் கோவிலுக்கு சேர்ந்து வந்ததை நான் பார்த்தேன்.
2. நம்பர் 6, தேவநாதன் தெருவில் உள்ள ஒரு வீட்டிற்கு 2001 வாக்கில் மனுதாரர் பலமுறை அந்த வீட்டுக்குள் சென்றதையும் மறுபடியும் வந்ததையும் கிருபா என்ற பெண்ணோடு சேர்ந்து தான் அவர் வந்ததையும் நான் பார்த்தேன். நான் பூர்ணிமாவைக் குதொலைபேசி மூலம் பேச முயற்சித்தபோது தொலைபேசி அவுட் ஆப் ஆர்டராக இருந்தது.
3. ஒரு நாள் நான் தேவநாதன் தெருவில் உள்ள மருத்துவரிடம் சிகிச்சைக்கு சென்றபோது அந்த 6-வது நம்பர் வீட்டில் சென்று, நான் இங்கு பூர்ணிமா, சூரியநாராயணன் என்பவர்கள் இங்கு இருக்கிறார்களா என்று நான் விசாரித்தேன். அதற்கு அவர் சூரியநாராயணன் என்பவர் ஒருவர் கோயம்புத்தூரிலிருந்து வந்து தங்கி இருக்கிறார் என்றும், கறுப்பு நிறமாக குள்ளமாக உள்ள ஒரு பெண் அவரோடு இருப்பதாக சொன்னார்கள். நான் சொன்னபடி ஆண் குழந்தையோடு உயரமான பெண் சூரியநாராயணன் என்பவரோடு இல்லை என்றும் சொன்னார்கள்.

4. மீண்டும் ஒருநாள் அதே 6-ஆம் நம்பர் வீட்டுக்கு ஒரு பெட்டை மோட்டார் சைக்கிளில் வைத்து கட்டி எடுத்துக்கொண்டு அந்த வீட்டுக்குள் சூரியநாராயணன் சென்றதை நான் பார்த்தேன்.
5. நான் கிருபா என்ற பெண்ணை நேரில் சென்று கேட்டபோது அவள் எனக்கு சூரியநாராயணனோடு எங்கு தொடர்பு இருக்கிறது என்று சொன்னார். அந்த விவரத்தை நான் பூர்ணிமாவிடம் சொன்னேன்.

In cross examination, the said witness has deposed as follows:-

6. “என் வீட்டிலிருந்து ஆஞ்சநேயர் கோவில் சுமார் 1.1/2 கி.மீ. தூரம் இருக்கும். எழும்பு, முறிவு, ஏற்பட்டபோது அடையாறில் உள்ள எம்.பார்த்தசாரதி என்பவரிடம் சிகிச்சை பெற்றேன். என் வீட்டிற்கு வந்தபொழுது தேவநாதன் தெருவில் உள்ள மருத்துவரிடம் தொடர்ந்து சிகிச்சைக்கு செல்வேன். அவர் இல்லாதபோது என் மாமியாரோடு ஆட்டோவில் செல்வேன்.

RW-5, one Rangasamy, who claims to be a family friend of the petitioner has deposed as follows:-

1. சூரியநாராயணன் இந்து பத்திரிக்கையில் என் மூலம் சேர்க்கை சப் எடிட்டர் ராமச்சந்திரன் என்னிடம் சூரியநாராயணன் ஒரு பெண்ணோடு தொடர்பு கொண்டு அவளோடு சுற்றி வருவதாக சொன்னார். அதுபற்றி நான் பூர்ணிமாவிடம் விசாரித்த போது அப்படி ஒன்றும் இல்லை என்றார். நானும் சூரியநாராயணனை அந்த பெண்ணையும் பார்த்து இருக்கிறேன். சூரியநாராயணனிடம் அந்த பெண்ணோடு ஏன் சுற்றுகிறார் என்று நான் கேட்கவில்லை. அதற்கு எனக்கு வாய்ப்பு கிடைக்கவில்லை.
2. பூர்ணிமா இந்து அலுவலகம் சென்று சூரியநாராயணனை பற்றி புகார் சொல்லி உதவி செய்ய சொன்னார் அதன் பிறகு அவரை திருவனந்தபுரம் மாற்றிவிட்டார்கள். இந்து அலுவலகத்திலிருந்து பூர்ணிமா வீட்டுக்கு சென்று நிலவரம் பார்த்து வர சொன்னார்கள். பூர்ணிமா இந்து அலுவலகத்திற்கு சென்ற உடன் சூரியநாராயணனை மாற்றி விட்டார்கள். அக்காடாமியில் உள்ள மற்றும் பலர் சூரியநாராயணனை பற்றி என்னிடம் சொன்னார்கள். சூரியநாராயணன் உடன் சுற்றிய பெண் வீட்டுக்கு சென்று அவர் பெற்றோர்களிடம் கேட்டேன். அவர்கள் அந்த பெண் பிடிவாதக்காரி, விவாகரத்து ஆனவர் நாங்கள் ஒன்றும் சொல்ல முடியாது என்றும் சொன்னார்கள்.

15. Relying upon the above evidence tendered by the witnesses examined by the respondent, Ms. Geetha Ramaseshan, learned counsel for the appellant would contend that if not for anything else, the petitioner would be entitled for a decree for divorce on the ground of mental cruelty just only on the

statements made by her in the counter affidavit and the evidence of her witnesses extracted above. A reading of the entire evidence of the witnesses examined on the side of the respondent would definitely show that they were examined only to damage the character of the petitioner/husband before the Court. The respondent would claim that she did not give any complaint to the employers of the petitioner. It is clear from the evidence of RW-5, namely Rangasami, that he had helped the respondent to lodge a complaint against her husband with his employers and on the basis of the said complaint, the petitioner was transferred to Trivandrum. The said witness goes on to state that many people had told him about the conduct of the petitioner and he himself had gone to the house of the said Kripa and spoken to her parents. A cumulative effect of all these allegations leads us to believe that the priority of the respondent was to somehow damage the character of the petitioner. The petitioner deposed that he was made to quit his job forcibly, on the basis of the complaint made by the respondent connecting him with one Kripa. The witnesses examined on the side of the respondent are those who are more loyal to the respondent and all of them are either related very closely or known to the respondent.

16. Therefore, we are of the considered opinion that the allegations in the counter statement as well as the evidence tendered would undoubtedly amount to mental cruelty and the petitioner has been put to severe mental agony which would undoubtedly amount to mental cruelty on the part of the respondent.

17. The learned Family Judge had not take a note of the subsequent events and the allegations. He has confined himself to the allegations in the petition and had come to the conclusion that the case of cruelty has not been made out. We are unable to subscribe to the findings of the learned Family Judge. As already stated the question of mental cruelty is a matter of substantive satisfaction and the degree would vary from case to case depending upon the social and economic status of the parties. Mr. S. Kalyanaraman learned counsel appearing for the respondent would strenuously contend that the deposition of the witnesses extracted above, would not amount, to cruelty and they have only spoken the truth. We are unable to agree with him. A Combined reading of the depositions of RW's 1 to 5 as well as the cross examination of the petitioner would undoubtedly lead to the conclusion that the object of the respondent was not only to defend claim for divorce, but also to malign the petitioner to the maximum possible extent. This according to us would certainly amount to mental cruelty entitling the petitioner to a decree for divorce dissolving the marriage between the petitioner and the respondent on the said ground.



18.In view of the above discussion we are constrained to set aside the judgment and decree of the Trial Court, viz., learned II Additional Judge, Family Court, Chennai, dated 30.06.2006 made in O.P.No.963 of 2003.

19.Accordingly, the Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is allowed and the order passed by the Court below, in OP.No.963/2003 dated 30.06.2006, is hereby set aside. No costs.

Sd/-  
Assistant Registrar(CS II)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

KP

To

1.The Judge,  
II Additional Family Court,  
Chennai.

2.The Section Officer,  
V.R.Section,  
High Court, Madras 104.

+1cc to Ms.Geetha Ramaseshan, Advocate, S.R.No.71127  
+1cc to Mr.S.Kalyanaraman, Advocate, S.R.No.70338

C.M.A. No.1377 of 2007

CNR(CO)  
CA(02/03/2017)

सत्यमेव जयते

WEB COPY