

IN THE COURT OF THE SESSIONS JUDGE,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

PRESENT : SRI. P. KRISHNA KUMAR, SESSIONS JUDGE

Tuesday the 24th day of August, 2021/2nd Bhadra, 1943

CRIMINAL M.C.No.1226/2021

(Crime No. RC7(S)/2021/SC II, New Delhi)

PETITIONER/4th ACCUSED :-

Dr. Siby Mathews, aged 69 years,
S/o. Joseph Mathews, residing at 95/275,
Silver Hills, Anayara PO.,
Thiruvananthapuram -695 059.

***By Advs. V. Ajakumar, Sidharth A. Menon &
Thejan Raj***

RESPONDENTS:-

1. Central Bureau of Investigation,
represented by the Public Prosecutor,
Central Bureau of Investigation,
Office of the Public Prosecutor C.B.I,
Thiruvananthapuram.
2. Head of the Branch
Central Bureau of Investigation,
SC II, New Delhi.

Sri. T. P. Manoj Kumar, Sr. Public Prosecutor, CBI

This Crl.M.C. coming on for hearing on **24..08..2021** and
the court on the same day passed the following:

ORDER

This is an application filed u/s.438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (for short 'the Cr.P.C.') by the 4th accused in Crime No.RC:07 (S)/2021-SCII/C.B.I, New Delhi, which is registered for the offences punishable U/Ss.120B, 167, 195, 218, 323, 330, 348, 365, 477A and 506 of Indian Penal Code (for short 'the I.P.C.')

History of the case

2. On 20.10.1994, the Inspector of Special Branch of Kerala Police (1st accused) had registered a case u/s.14 of the Foreigners Act, 1946, against one Mariyam Rashida, a Maldivian national, alleging that she overstayed in India after the expiry of Visa period. On 13.11.1994, another crime was also registered against herself and another Maldivian national named Foausiya Hasan, for the offences punishable U/Ss. 3 and 4 of the Official Secrets Act. As it was alleged in the subsequent case that the Maldivian ladies had indulged in espionage activities affecting the sovereignty and integrity of India, the Director General of Kerala Police constituted a

Special Investigation Team (SIT) headed by the D.I.G. of Crimes, the petitioner herein (accused No.4).

3. Later, the petitioner arrested Sri.Nambi Narayanan and few other scientists of Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO) and took them in Police custody. On 03.12.1994, on the recommendation made by the petitioner, the Government of Kerala handed over the investigation of both the cases to the Central Bureau of Investigation (for short 'C.B.I') After conducting a detailed investigation, C.B.I submitted a negative report in the jurisdictional Magistrate by observing that the allegation of espionage was false. C.B.I. filed separate reports to the Government of India and Government of Kerala requesting them to take departmental action against the erring officials, including the petitioner. The refer report submitted by the C.B.I. was accepted by the jurisdictional Magistrate.

4. But later, the Government of Kerala decided not to initiate any disciplinary action against the erring officials, on the ground that 1½ decades were already elapsed. The

Government further ordered reopening of investigation by the State investigating agency. This decision of the Government of Kerala was challenged by Sri.Nambi Narayanan and ultimately, when the matter reached before the Hon'ble Apex Court, the decision of the Government was quashed and the Hon'ble Apex Court constituted a committee to find out the ways and means to take appropriate steps against the erring officials.

5. On 25.5.2021, the Committee headed by a former Judge of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India submitted a report recommending an impartial and in depth investigation by a Central investigating agency, to unearth the motive behind the entire conspiracy/nexus for falsely implicating Sri.Nambi Narayanan and other eminent scientists. The Committee observed that, *prima facie*, the petitioner and 17 other persons named in the report have apparent involvement in the false implication. Based on the report, the Hon'ble Apex Court has ordered the present investigation and accordingly, the F.I.R. was registered.

Prosecution case

6. The allegations in the F.I.R. are based on the findings of the above said Committee. The main allegations made by C.B.I. against the petitioner are as follows: There was a conspiracy to implicate eminent scientists like Sri.Nambi Narayanan, Sri.K.Chandrasekharan etc. in the espionage case even when there was no material on record. The accused persons deliberately leaked information to the press to create a narrative implicating the scientists of Liquid Propulsion Systems Centre (L.P.S.C.). They arrested the scientists, tortured them, suppressed material facts and tampered records of investigation. They further permitted unauthorized interrogation of Smt.Mariyam Rashida and the scientists by the officials of the Intelligence Bureau (I.B.), without making any records for this exercise. The F.I.R. further refers to the observation made by the Committee as regards to the statement of Sri.Nambi Narayanan that there was a deliberate attempt to remove him from the project of cryogenic technology, for defeating that prestigious mission of ISRO.

The gist of the contentions of the petitioner

7. Sri.V.Aja Kumar, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, has elaborately argued about the background of the criminal case registered against Sri.Nambi Narayanan and other accused persons by the local Police, the circumstances under which SIT was constituted under the leadership of the petitioner and how the investigation was finally terminated. It is argued that Sri.D.Sasikumaran, Sri.K.Chandrasekhar and Sri.Nambi Narayanan, who are all scientists in the field of Rocket Engineering, were arrested on valid grounds and there were sufficient materials to suspect their involvement in the alleged espionage case. There is no basis for the contention that the arrest of Sri.Nambi Narayanan was for defeating the Nation's strive for indigenous cryogenic technology, as Annexure-8 would show that immediately after the arrest of Smt.Mariyam Rashida, he submitted resignation letter to the ISRO, even by requesting to waive the notice period of 3 months. Annexure-13 makes it clear that Sri.Nambi Narayanan had no role in the development of cryogenic engineering.

Annexure-14 report of the Vigilance Wing of the Vikram Sarabhai Space Centre reveals that Sri.Nambi Narayanan and Sri.D.Sasikumaran were under the scanner of the Vigilance team for corruption and misconduct. After handing over Sri.Nambi Narayanan and other accused persons to the custody of C.B.I., C.B.I. has submitted various remand reports to the jurisdictional Magistrate and got their remand extended for a very longer period, and thus C.B.I could not contend now that the scientists were in wrongful custody. The proceedings before the Special Court for SPE/CBI-II, Ernakulam proves that C.B.I. themselves had registered a criminal case against Sri.Nambi Narayanan and other scientists for obtaining disproportionate assets as part of the espionage.

8. It is further argued that Sri.Nambi Narayanan was arrested on 30.11.1994 and he was handed over to the C.B.I. two days thereafter and hence, there was no occasion for any ill-treatment, humiliation or harassment at the instance of the petitioner. The I.B. officials had interrogated the said persons as they are also notified to be the competent Police Officials to

investigate the offences mentioned in the Official Secrets Act, as per SO.228 dated 20.1.1987 of the Ministry of Home Affairs. Sub-section (1) of Section 13 of the Official Secrets Act declares that only a Magistrate of 1st Class specially empowered in this behalf by the Government or a District or Presidency Magistrate alone is competent to accept the closure report filed by the C.B.I. and hence, the subject-matter of that investigation could not be considered as legally terminated, even though the Chief Judicial Magistrate had accepted the negative report. Referring to the decisions in Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia and another v. State of Punjab : 1980 KHC 665, Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra and Others : 2010 KHC 4952, Shobhan Singh Khanka v. State of Jharkhand : 2012 KHC 4198, Sumit Mehta v. State of NCT of Delhi : 2013 KHC 4730, Sindhu Paul and Another v. State of Kerala and Others : 2017(5) KHC 543, Vishnu Gopalakrishnan v. State of Kerala and Another : 2020(4) KHC 422 and Sushila Aggarwal and Others v. State (NCT of Delhi) and Another : 2020(1) KHC 663, the learned counsel further contended that the jurisdiction of the Sessions

Court u/s.438 of Cr.P.C has to be liberally exercised, especially when the petitioner is now being prosecuted in respect of the bonafide official acts which were discharged nearly 3 decades ago. It is also submitted that the petitioner, who is aged 69 years, has been suffering from various severe physical ailments.

9. The petitioner has also filed an application for leave to produce certain documents (including electronic records) in a sealed cover and requested the Court to inspect the same for the disposal of this case. According to the petitioner, if those documents are looked into, it would be evident that how Sri. Nambi Narayanan has managed to topple the CBI investigation, as he had allegedly transferred properties in favour of CBI Officials then in power.

Contentions made by the prosecution

10. Sri.Manoj Kumar, the learned Senior Public Prosecutor of the C.B.I., submitted that the report made by Justice Jain Committee has given sufficient materials to proceed against the petitioner. In order to unearth the real magnitude of the

conspiracy, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is unavoidable. The act of the petitioner that he took the Scientists in the Police custody and subjected them to severe torture and that he fabricated statements and records to make it appear that a grave spy work had been undertaken by the officials of the ISRO, is a very serious crime. Sri.Nambi Narayanan sustained physical injuries while he was in the custody of the petitioner and then the Police unofficially sought for the assistance of a Doctor, whose statement has already been recorded by the C.B.I., and thus there is clearcut evidence that the petitioner committed the offence of custodial torture. Custodial torture is a crime against humanity and civilized society and the policy of all the constitutional courts is not to show any mercy in the case of custodial violence.

11. It is further argued that the count of non bailable offence is not the criteria for granting bail, but the nature and gravity of the offence should be the guiding factor. In a case of the above nature, the status of the petitioner that he retired from

the service in the post of Additional Director General of Police, should not be taken into account, especially when the Hon'ble Supreme Court itself has felt that there are sufficient materials to provide compensation to the victims and when the Apex Court constituted a committee for enquiring into the above said aspects, it is contended.

12. Sri. Manoj Kumar further argued that the sealed cover produced by the petitioner should not be taken into account, as those documents are not produced from proper custody and the genuineness of the documents, especially the electronic document, is in doubt and they do not even otherwise come within the ambit of a privileged communication. He further submitted that, it does not bear any relevance in the present enquiry, as it amounts to challenging the closure report filed by C.B.I. through an application under section 438 of the Cr.P.C.

13. Sri. S.V. Raju, the learned Additional Solicitor General of India, who also appeared for C.B.I., further contended that when prominent scientists, including Sri. Nambi Narayanan,

who were engaged in the important project of cryogenic engineering, were arrested for no reasons and the case records were manipulated, C.B.I expects that there might be some intervention by foreign agencies like ISS. As the investigation has just begun, there is no material to rule out that possibility. The act of permitting I.B. officials to interrogate Sri.Nambi Narayanan, without creating any legal document, also points out the culpable role of the petitioner in framing up such a false case. Learned Additional Solicitor General further contended that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has recently clarified that the report of Justice Jain Committee could be the basis of the investigation by C.B.I., though it should not be the sole basis, and thus, the observations of the said Committee should be taken note of very seriously.

14. Sri.Nambi Narayanan, Smt.Mariyam Rashida and Smt.Foausiya Hasan have made applications to get impleaded in the present proceedings through their counsel. The learned counsel appearing for them were permitted to address the court.

Contentions raised by Sri. C.Unnikrishnan, the learned counsel for Sri.Nambi Narayanan

15. Sri.Nambi Narayanan and Sri.D.Sasikumaran were the Project Director and Deputy Project Director in the Cryogenic Development Programme, I.S.R.O. Sri.Nambi Narayanan was widely considered as a prominent scientist having pivotal role in the development of cryogenic engineering in India and this is certified by legendary persons and eminent scientists like Shri.S.Dhawan, Shri.T.N.Seshan, Shri.U.R.Rao, Prof.Yashpal, Shri.R.Narasimhan and Shri.S.Chandrasekhar in an open letter jointly written by them on 26.12.1996. In the said letter, it is certified that he was the leader of the team of Engineers sent to France for acquisition of Liquid Rocket Technology and also for a while, he was the leader of the Cryogenic Engine Project.

In K.Chandrasekhar and Others v. State of Kerala and Others : 1998 (1) KLT 835, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has accepted the investigation findings made by the C.B.I. and has also adversely commented upon the investigation conducted by the petitioner and later the Apex Court has awarded Rs.50

Lakhs as compensation to Sri.Nambi Narayanan for the mental and physical torture, wrongful custody and the ignominy suffered by him owing to all the said incidents. Referring to the decisions rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in

P.Chidambaram v. Directorate of Enforcement : AIR 2019 (SC) 4198 and **Hyderali v. State of Kerala : 2008**

(3) KHC 743, the learned counsel further contended that the relevance of custodial interrogation could not be downplayed for the reason that the petitioner is a senior citizen and he is suffering from some diseases. As per the latest direction of the Hon'ble Apex Court, the C.B.I. is now duty bound to collect materials to substantiate the findings in the Justice Jain Committee report, and this could be done only if the petitioner is questioned in custody. Refuting the contentions of the learned counsel for the petitioner, Shri.Unnikrishnan further argued that the decision of the Constitutional Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Sushila Aggarwal's** case (supra) does not take away the ratio of **Chidambaram's** case or **Hyder Ali's** case (supra).

The contentions raised by Sri. B.S.Prasad Gandhi, the learned counsel appearing for Smt.Foausiya Hasan and Smt.Mariyam Rashida

16. The Maldivian nationals who were arrested and tortured by the local Police, suffered untold hardships and agony at the hands of the petitioner. Smt.Foausiya Hasan had voluntarily visited the Superintendent of Police, Thiruvananthapuram, in relation to her stay in Thiruvananthapuram and this conduct does not fit in for a spy from abroad. Smt.Mariyam Rashida was prepared to go back within the time permitted in her Visa, but she was illegally taken into custody by the 1st accused herein, and later framed for the alleged overstaying. Both of them were detained in prison for 3 years and 6 months and were tortured like animals, but they were not able to approach the National Human Rights Commission or other authorities for compensation, as they could not stay in India for any longer. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has already found that the arrest was illegal, the custody was unlawful and everything done by the Special Investigation Team lacks bonafides, it is

contended.

17. The Maldivian nationals reached Kerala for medical treatment and for providing better education to the daughter of one of them. Both of them are from very poor financial background and they do not even know English language or Malayalam and this is evident from the report of the 1st accused himself, wherein he stated that they knew only Dhivehi, the native language of Maldives and thus, it is unthinkable that such persons had indulged in spy work relating to the rocket science. Referring to Annexure-13 document produced by the petitioner, it is contended that the petitioner had got information from I.S.R.O. that no document was missing from there and thus he was aware that there was no scope for any espionage, and hence it is evident that the petitioner had intentionally framed such a case. There was a larger conspiracy to defame the victims and to defeat the advancement of rocket engineering program of India, it is argued by Shri.Gandhi.

Evaluation

18. In spite of the diverse contentions raised by both sides, the scope of judicial evaluation in this proceeding is very limited, as it is basically in the nature of analyzing the materials available on record for deciding whether the relief is to be granted or not. In the above circumstance, I am not persuaded to accept the documents produced by the learned counsel for the petitioner in a sealed cover, as its purpose is only to show that there was some unholy nexus between the former CBI officials and Shri. Nambi Narayanan.

19. To deny the remedy of pre-arrest bail to a person accused of certain non bailable offences, the Investigating Agency is expected to show that there are some materials which would prima facie show that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is utmost necessary for moving further or that if the person accused of is released on bail, he would flee from justice or that he would interfere with the course of investigation or at least that such an exercise will be against the larger public interest. Taking note of the career trajectory

of the petitioner and also his age and ailments, it could safely be concluded that he may not flee from justice. The investigation being conducted by higher officials of the premier Central Agency, the chance of interference with the course of investigation by the petitioner, who has retired from the service nearly a decade back, is also little. Nevertheless, if there are materials on records which *prima facie* make the accusation well-founded and it warrants his custodial interrogation for successfully forging ahead with investigation, the petitioner is undoubtedly not entitled to get the discretionary relief of pre-arrest bail. Thus, the gamut of this evaluation must be centered around on that aspect.

20. Out of the ten heads of offences invoked against the petitioner, the offences punishable U/Ss.195 and 365 of I.P.C. are the only non bailable provisions. Depends upon the nature of the principal offence, Section 120B of I.P.C. also may become a non bailable offence. In order to get a clear idea as to the materials found out by the C.B.I. during the present investigation for showing that the said offences might have

committed by the petitioner, the Agency was asked to produce the case diary by marking such evidence which would prima facie lead to the offences U/Ss.120B, 195 and 365 of I.P.C. The C.B.I. was also asked to produce the report of the Committee appointed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The Investigating Officer has produced the said records in sealed covers and he has flagged the relevant pages of the Case Diary so as to help the Court to find such materials.

21. When the entire Case Diary and the said report were carefully perused, I find no materials which would prima facie indicate the ingredients of the offence u/s.365 of I.P.C. There is also no materials to show that there was any conspiracy in respect of the said offences. There is no dispute that all the accused persons in the crime registered by the local police have been produced before the jurisdictional Magistrate within a period of 24 hours and at that time or even thereafter, any of them raised a complaint that they were wrongfully confined or were kidnapped or abducted by the Investigation Agency. But it is then argued that when those accused persons were

taken into custody without any grounds and were wrongfully confined in the Police Station for a while, it amounts to kidnapping or abduction within the meaning of Section 365 of I.P.C., even when they were later produced before the Magistrate.

22. I find no merit in the said submission for the obvious reason that the present Case Diary itself reveals some materials which had compelled the Police to arrest the accused persons, though those reasons were ultimately found to be baseless. The statement of one of the witnesses, which is seen recorded on 04.07.2021 by the C.B.I., shows that Sri.Sasikumaran and Sri.K.Chandrasekharan had contacted each other for helping Smt.Mariyam Rashida, who was staying in a particular hotel at Thiruvananthapuram, and as per the request of Sri.Chandrasekharan, Sri.Sasikumaran had met her. It also appears from the records that Sri.Nambi Narayanan was arrested on the basis of a suspicion that he had attempted to resign from I.S.R.O, just after the arrest of one of the Maldivian ladies, and also in the background that those ladies

had contacted two Scientists from his own institution. No doubt, the statement does not reveal anything about espionage or any other offence whatsoever alleged by the Special Investigation Team. But, when there are materials on record to show that those Scientists had repeatedly contacted a Maldivian national, it is difficult to say that the arrest of those persons in the said circumstance would *prima facie* amount to the offence of 365 of I.P.C.

23. Indeed, the records *prima facie* show that Sri. Nambi Narayanan was subjected to physical and psychological torture while he was in the custody of Special Investigation Team and the Officials under the petitioner even sought for the assistance of a Doctor for treating the swelling in the legs of Sri. Nambi Narayanan. But that allegation does not *prima facie* reveal a non-bailable offence.

24. The justification of the C.B.I. to invoke the provisions U/Ss.195 and 477A of I.P.C., is that there were suppression of facts during the said investigation and certain statements were falsely recorded intending thereby to cause innocent

persons to be convicted for grave offences. It is also their submission that certain prosecution records are falsified so as to show that the accused persons had met at a hotel, but it was not even opened at the relevant time. If that be so, the Case Diary, at the best, indicates only that the petitioner might have manipulated the statements of those accused persons or some other witnesses. Then, the issue boils down to a narrow compass, viz., whether the relief of pre-arrest bail should be declined to the petitioner owing to the alleged infliction of custodial torture and preparation of statements of witnesses or accused persons in the above said manner, before 27 years.

25. It is indisputable that the Hon'ble Apex Court and the Justice Jain Committee had adversely commented upon the conduct of the petitioner as to the said investigation. C.B.I. had also submitted a closure report opining that the allegations of espionage was false. Nevertheless, while considering the propriety of granting pre-arrest bail to the petitioner for the aforesaid allegations, this court feels that it

should not be guided by those observations of the Apex Court, as they were made while awarding a public law remedy to those Scientists for groundless arrest and consequential sufferings. The parameters which are to be followed while disposing of an application u/s.438 of the Cr.P.C. are entirely different. The foundation for such an evaluation will be the evidence collected by the Investigating Agency in the course of that investigation. As regards to the probative value of the observations made in the Justice Jain Committee report, the Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court itself is very clear. It should be treated only as a preliminary enquiry report, and that the C.B.I. has to collect materials on its own, rather than basing on the said report. If that be so, the Case Diary produced by the C.B.I. does not compel this court to reject the application for pre-arrest bail on any of the grounds canvassed by the prosecution or the learned counsel for the victims. Even if the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in the decisions referred to by Sri.C.Unnikrishnan is followed, the above factual premises do not justify the plea for rejection of the relief.

26. Nevertheless, as rightly pointed out by the learned Additional Solicitor General of India, the investigation in this case is in its early stage and it is thus difficult to expect that C.B.I. would be able to collect sufficient materials now itself to establish all the allegations made in the First Information Report. If the relief of pre-arrest bail is granted to the petitioner, who is said to have played a pivotal role in the above said crime, for an endless period, it may seriously prejudice the Investigating Agency, in case they are able to bring forth some valuable evidence suggestive of the involvement of some dark forces from abroad behind the arrest and detention of those scientists. In a case of the above nature, it is thus ideal to resort to the exception of the general course, which is to be followed by the Court's vested with the power u/s.438 of Cr.P.C. Though it is held by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Gurbaksh Singh Sibia and another v. State of Punjab : 1980 KHC 665*** that ordinarily the Court is expected to grant the relief without any restriction as to its duration, it was clarified that the Court is not powerless to make such fetters in its order. In this case, it would only strike a balance

between the personal liberty of the petitioner and the larger interest of the investigating agency.

27. It is significant to note that, though there are still no concrete material to establish the allegation of conspiracy, the Justice Jain Committee has made certain crucial observations, which are to be verified during investigation. While Smt. Mariyam Rashida was arrested for the alleged overstay, her Visa period was not technically expired at that time. She had a confirmed return flight ticket for 19/9/1994, but she was not able to go back because of plague scare. Smt. Foausiya Hasan had met the Superintendent of Police for extension of Visa period. In spite of the serious allegation that Smt. Mariyam Rashida has indulged in espionage affecting the integrity and sovereignty of India, she was never taken on Police custody by the local Police. Police also did not attempt to get anyone identified by her. All these facts may lead to a suspicion that whether these Maldivian ladies have been taken on remand by misleading the court to believe that the acts of these ladies related to the national security and integrity.

Indeed all such aspects pointed out in the Justice Jain Committee Report are to be subjected to a deep probe by C.B.I, for which utmost co-operation of the petitioner is required. For this purpose, it is not necessary that the petitioner should be remanded to Police custody or Judicial custody. If the petitioner wholeheartedly co-operates with the investigation, that itself might help the Agency to verify most of these matters. As the amended proviso brought into Section 161 of Cr.P.C enables the Agency to record the statements of the persons examined by them, which includes an accused person, now the Agency is in an advantageous position to convince the court that the accused person has not co-operated with the investigation, in compliance with the conditions imposed in the bail order, if such a situation has arisen later.

28. In this circumstance, I am compelled to restrict the duration of the relief of pre-arrest bail for a period of 60 days. If the Agency produces further materials in that time and makes a request for custodial interrogation of the petitioner,

the court concerned would be in a better position to ascertain that requirement, without being bound by the order of granting pre-arrest bail by this Court.

In the result, the petition stands allowed. In the event of arrest of the petitioner, the Investigating Officer is directed to enlarge him on bail for a period of 60 days, on executing bond for Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) with two solvent sureties, each for the like sum, on the following conditions:-

1. The petitioner shall not leave India without the permission of the jurisdictional court.
2. He shall report before the Investigating Officer for interrogation as and when required.
3. He shall not tamper with evidence or influence the witnesses.
4. He shall not get involved in any offence while on bail.
5. He shall fully co-operate with the investigation, including

subjecting himself to the deemed Police custody for the purpose of discovery, if any, or identification, as and when demanded.

6. After a period of 60 days from the date of this order, the petitioner has to resort to the remedies provided in Section 437 or 439 of the Cr.P.C., or such other remedies as are advised to him.

The sealed packet produced by the petitioner shall be returned to himself, as such. The Case Diary and the report of Justice Jain Committee are to be returned to C.B.I. in sealed cover. Though the C.B.I has produced the Case Diary of the cases investigated by them during 1994-1995, they were not opened and perused and they are returned as such.

Dictated to the Confidential Assistant, transcribed and typed by him, revised and corrected by me and pronounced on this the 24th day of August, 2021.

**Sd/-
P. KRISHNA KUMAR
SESSIONS JUDGE**

(True Copy) (By Order)

NGN/-4 Comp: F.C.S.

SHERISTADAR

Copy of Order in Crl.M.C.No.1226/2021
Dated: 24..08..2021