

# **Mangaru And Others vs State Of U.P. on 30 May, 2025**

**Author: Vivek Kumar Birla**

**Bench: Vivek Kumar Birla**

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

Neutral Citation No. - 2025:AHC:93159-DB

Reserved on - 13.05.2025

Delivered on - 30.05.2025

Court No. - 43

Case :- CRIMINAL APPEAL No. - 1340 of 1983

Appellant :- Mangaru And Others

Respondent :- State of U.P.

Counsel for Appellant :- A.K. Verma,A.K.Varma,Manoj Prasad,Mohd Imran Siddiqui

Counsel for Respondent :- A.G.A.

With

Case :- CRIMINAL APPEAL No. - 1281 of 1983

Appellant :- Narain Singh

Respondent :- State of U.P.

Counsel for Appellant :- A.K. Verma,Anil Kumar,Dharmendra Singh,Mohd Imran Siddiqui

Counsel for Respondent :- A.G.A.

Hon'ble Vivek Kumar Birla,J.

Hon'ble Jitendra Kumar Sinha,J.

(Per: Hon'ble Vivek Kumar Birla, J.)

1. Leading appeal as well as connected appeal have been filed against the judgment and order dated 25.05.1983, passed by Special Judge (Additional Sessions Judge), Ballia, in S.T. No. 227 of 1982 (State Vs. Chand Govind and Others) convicting all appellants in the leading appeal as well as in the connected appeal under section 302/149 and 307/149 IPC and sentencing them to undergo R.I. for life and 7 years respectively, and further convicting appellants in the leading appeal, namely Mahendra, Dhaneshwar, Chand Kishor and Sugriva and appellant Narayan in the connected appeal under section 148 IPC and appellants Mangaru and Phuleshwar in the leading appeal under section 147 IPC and sentencing them to undergo rigorous imprisonment for two years and one year respectively. The sentences on all the counts shall run concurrently.

2. On 13.05.2025 while reserving the judgment in the present case following order was passed:-

"1. List revised.

2. No one is present to press this appeal.

3. We find that vide order dated 03.01.2025 bailable warrants were issued against the appellants and as per office report dated 05.03.2025, the bailable warrants have been executed on surviving appellants nos.3,4 & 6 (Phuleshwar, Dhaneshwar and Sugreev @ Genda Bhar) and they have been released on bail.

4. Today, when the case is called out in the revised list, no one is present on their behalf.

5. On the last date i.e. 03.01.2025, Shri Mohd. Imran Siddiqui, learned Amicus Curiae was present in the Court but he is not present in the Court today.

6. Shri Dharmendra Singh, learned counsel for the appellant in the connected Appeal No.1281 of 1983 (Narain Singh Vs. State of U.P. ) is present.

7. We proceed to hear Shri Dharmendra Singh along with Shri Anil Kumar, learned counsel for the appellant and Shri Rahul Asthana, learned AGA for the State.

8. In so far as the appellant in the leading appeal is concerned, we proceed to consider the leading appeal on merits in the light of the judgement of Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Surya Baksh Singh Vs. State of U.P. (2014), 14 SCC 222.

9. Judgement reserved."

3. In *Surya Baksh Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh*, (2014) 14 SCC 222, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that it is always not necessary to adjourn the matter in case both, the appellant or his counsel/lawyer are absent and that the Court can decide the appeal on merits after perusal of the record and the judgement of the trial Court. It has further been observed that if the case is decided on merits in the absence of the appellant, the higher court can remedy the situation. It has also been observed that appointment of Amicus Curiae is also on the discretion of the court. In paragraph 26 of the said judgement, it was held that it is always not essential for the High Court to appoint Amicus Curiae, paragraphs 24 and 26 of the said judgement whereof are quoted as under:

"24. It seems to us that it is necessary for the Appellate Court which is confronted with the absence of the convict as well as his Counsel, to immediately proceed against the persons who stood surety at the time when the convict was granted bail, as this may lead to his discovery and production in Court. If even this exercise fails to locate and bring forth the convict, the Appellate Court is empowered to dismiss the appeal. We fully and respectfully concur with the recent elucidation of the law, profound yet perspicuous, in *K.S. Panduranga v. State of Karnataka*, (2013) 3 SCC 721. After a comprehensive analysis of previous decisions our learned Brother had distilled the legal position into six propositions:

"19.1. that the High Court cannot dismiss an appeal for non-prosecution simpliciter without examining the merits;

19.2. that the Court is not bound to adjourn the matter if both the Appellant or his Counsel/lawyer are absent;

19.3. that the court may, as a matter of prudence or indulgence, adjourn the matter but it is not bound to do so;

19.4. that it can dispose of the appeal after perusing the record and judgment of the trial court.

19.5. that if the accused is in jail and cannot, on his own, come to court, it would be advisable to adjourn the case and fix another date to facilitate the appearance of the Appellant-accused if his lawyer is not present, and if the lawyer is absent and the court deems it appropriate to appoint a lawyer at the State expense to assist it, nothing in law would preclude the court from doing so; and 19.6. that if the case is decided on merits in the absence of the Appellant, the higher court can remedy the situation.

25.....

26. Reverting back to the facts of the present case a perusal of the impugned order makes it abundantly evident that the High Court has considered the case in all its complexities. The argument that the High Court was duty-bound to appoint an

amicus curiae is not legally sound. Panduranga correctly considers Mohd. Sukur Ali v. State of Assam (1996) 4 SCC 729 as per incuriam, inasmuch as the latter mandates the appointment of an amicus curiae and is thus irreconcilable with Bani Singh vs. State of U.P. (1996) 4 SCC 720. In the case in hand the High Court has manifestly discussed the evidence that have been led, and finding it of probative value, has come to the conclusion that the conviction is above Appellate reproach correction and interference. In view of the analysis of the law the contention raised before us that it was essential for the High Court to have appointed an amicus curiae is wholly untenable. The High Court has duly undertaken the curial responsibility that fastens upon the Appellate Court, and cannot be faulted on the approach adopted by it. In this respect, we find no error."

(Emphasis supplied)

4. The aforesaid view has been followed by the Hon'ble Full Bench in Criminal Reference No.1 of 2024, In Re-Procedure To Be Followed In Hearing Of Criminal Appeals vs. State of U.P., decided on 22.01.2025, paragraph Nos. 151 and 152 whereof are quoted as under:

"151. The crux of the aforesaid observations of the three celebrated judgments rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Bani Singh and others Vs. State of U.P. 11, Surya Baksh Singh Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh 12 and K.S. Panduranga Vs. State of Karnataka 13, thus, covers the entire length and breadth of Question No. 5 formulated by the Division Bench at Lucknow for consideration by this Bench and no fresh exercise, in our considered opinion, is required to be undertaken by this Bench, including on one point which has been highlighted by the Division Bench at Lucknow i.e. whether the amicus curiae may be appointed even when the presence of the convict, appellant or accused-respondent may be secured and without his consent.

152. The aforesaid legal precedents would evidently canvass that the emphasis of the Apex Court has been on providing opportunity of being heard to the appellant who is willing to cooperate with the appellate court or his counsel and in this regard a process to cause his presence for the purpose of giving opportunity of being heard is required to be issued to him and when the court is satisfied that such appellant is deliberately avoiding his presence before the court, in such a situation, the court may dispose of the appeal in the manner approved by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Bani Singh and others Vs. State of U.P. 11, Surya Baksh Singh Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh 12 and K.S. Panduranga Vs. State of Karnataka 13 (i.e. after perusing the record/evidence vis-a-vis judgment of the trial court with the assistance of prosecutor and Amicus, if appointed) and we do not have any reason to deviate from the settled proposition laid down by the Apex Court in the above mentioned cases, moreover, the appointment of amicus is only for the purpose to provide fair trail to the appellant and also for rendering the assistance to the Court."

5. We, therefore, proceed to hear the leading appeal on merits with the help of Shri Rahul Asthana, learned AGA appearing for the State respondents. We have also heard Shri Dharmendra Singh alongwith Shri Anil Kumar, learned counsel for the appellant in the connected appeal.

6. Briefly put the facts giving rise to the prosecution of the above named accused persons may be narrated according to the written F.I.R. (Ext.Ka-1) lodged by Barmeshwar Singh s/o deceased Rama Shanker Singh soonafter the incident, as follows:- According to the informant- Barmeshwar Singh, Rama Shanker Singh was his father. Accused Sugriv alias Genda Bhar, Gopal Singh, Narayan Singh, Brahma Singh, residents of his village i.e. Village-Khanpur, Police Station Bansdeeh Road, District Ballia, had made murderous attack by gandasa before the present incident regarding which a case was going on in the court. Accused Sugriv Bhar was not appearing in the court in the former case. Consequently, non-bailable warrants were issued in the previous case. In that connection his father Rama Shanker Singh had gone to District Court at Ballia. Besides this, there was litigation between the accused persons and his father regarding the land before the present incident. Feeling aggrieved with said litigation accused Chand Govind, Sugriv alias Genda, Mangaru, Dhaneshwar, Phuleshwar and Mahendra, resident of his village, and accused Narayan Singh resident of village Sahatwar, having all formed an unlawful assembly in the night between 19/20-8-1982 at about 11-30 P.M., appeared at his house. Accused Narayan Singh, Sugriv alias Genda, Dhaneshwar and Chand Govind were armed with country-made pistols; accused Mangaru was armed with lathi and accused Mahendra was armed with spear and accused Phuleshwar was armless. It is further said that they had come with exhortation that whosoever met kill them. Thereafter they pounced upon his father Rama Shanker Singh, at the door and in the osara, a lantern was burning. On raising alarm from his father, informant woke up, who was sleeping inside the Kothari of the osara and came out. His grandfather Ram Nagina Singh was also sleeping by the side of his father and his uncle Sheo Ji Singh was also sleeping there. His other uncle Bharat Singh was sleeping on the roof who also come. Thereafter accused Chand Govind and Dhaneshwar caught- hold of his father and pressed him and accused Sugriv alias Genda Bhar fired at the chest of his father by countrymade pistol. Accused Narayan Singh fired at his uncle Sheo Ji Singh by country-made pistol. Thereafter his grandfather tried to make alarm. Then the accused persons threatened with dire consequences to him and the informant. Thereafter his mother came out from inside the house. Then accused Chand Govind fired at her arm by country made pistol, which badly injured her. All the accused persons were duly identified by the informant, his mother, his aunt, his grandfather-Ram Nagina Singh, his uncle Bharat Singh and Sheo Ji Singh and cousin Anil Kumar in the light of lantern by face and name. It is also said that the informant had run away by crossing the boundary wall in the East and his uncle Bharat Singh also ran away towards West and then they made alarm and on their alarm several villagers came and by that time the accused had made their escape good. Thereafter, informant returned to his house along with Subhash Singh, Sudama Singh and others and found that his father was dead due to firearm injury. His mother and his uncle Sheo Ji Singh, due to the injuries caused by fire-arms, were groaning. His cousin Anil Kumar had also sustained injuries. Soonafter the incident the police of police station Sahatwar had come at the place of occurrence by Jeep and in the same night all the three injured persons sent to the District Hospital Ballia for medical examination. The dead body of his father was on the spot. FIR (Ext.Ka-1), as stated above, was lodged to the police station on 20/8/1982 at about 3-30 a.m. On the basis of the written F.I.R. (Ext.Ka-1), chik F.I.R. (Ext.Ka-2) was prepared. The case was entered into G.D., copy of which is Ext.Ka-3. The case was

investigated by P.W.6-Shri Raja Ram Yadav, the then Station House Officer of Police Station Bansdih Road. The case was entered into G.D. in his presence and the case was investigated by him. The statement of informant Barmeshwar Singh, Bharat Singh were recorded at the police station. Thereafter, he proceeded to the place of occurrence. On the spot he prepared inquest report of the dead body of Rama Shanker Singh. The inquest report is Ext. Ka-7. Form No.13 is Ext. Ka-8, specimen of seal is Ext.Ka-9, photo-nash is Ext. Ka-10, report for post-mortem is Ext.Ka-11 and copy of the F.I.R. is Ext. Ka-12. Thereafter the dead body of Rama Shanker Singh was entrusted to two constables viz. Nikhiddi Ram and Ambika Yadav for taking the same for post-mortem. Thereafter, he recorded the statement of the witnesses of inquest report. He has also recorded the statement of Ram Nagina Singh, father of the deceased, Indravati aunt of the informant and Anil Kumar, cousin of the informant. Thereafter he inspected the site and prepared site-plan which has been proved as Ext.Ka-13. He has also collected five empty cartridges from the place of occurrence and prepared its Fard which is Ext.Ka-14. Empty cartridges were sealed on the spot. They were proved in the court as material Exts.II to VI and the lantern is material Ext.I. He has also taken the plain and bloodstains soil from the spot and sealed it and prepared Fard which is Ext. Ka-15. Thereafter he has also cut away the bloodstains clothes (bed on which deceased Rama Shanker Singh was sleeping on the Chauki), cut away the blood stained portion of pillow and other clothes and sealed them on the spot and the same were given in the supurdagi of Bharat Singh and others. Its Fard was prepared as Ext. Ka-16. He has also inspected the lantern which was burning at the time of the incident and prepared its Fard which is Ext. Ka-17. The bloodstains clothes and soil etc. were sent for chemical examiner. He has also recorded the statement of other witnesses. Accused Chand Govind was also arrested on the same day. On 23.08.1982 accused Dhaneshwar and Phuleshwar were arrested. On 24.08.1982 accused Mangaru and Mahendra were arrested. On 26-3-1982 accused Sugriv alias Genda had surrendered in the court on 20.08.1982. On 27.08.1982 accused Narayan Singh surrendered in the court in this very case. On 07.09.1982 he visited Shri Sheo Prasad Gupt Hospital at Varanasi to record the statement of injured Sheo Ji and Smt Lakheshwari where he recorded the statement of Sheo Ji. The statement of Smt. Lakheshwari could not be recorded as she was unconscious. On the receipt of the injury report and post-mortem report and on the basis of other evidence collected, he submitted charge sheet against all the accused persons on 8-9-1982 which has been proved as Ext.Ka-8. All the accused persons pleaded not guilty.

7. The prosecution in support of his case has examined P.W.1-Barmeshwar Singh, P.W.2-Lakheshwari injured, P.W.3-Sheo Ji Singh another injured, P.W.4-Shri Bhrigunath Singh H.C. who has proved the G.D. etc., P.W.5 Dr.Kailash Singh, who has conducted post-mortem and has proved the report as Ext.Ka-4, P.W.6-Rajaram Yadav is the Investigating Officer, P.W.7-Dr. B.K.Shukla, who had medically examined Smt.Lakheshwari and Sheo Ji Singh and P.W.8-Constable Ambika Yadav, who had carried the dead body of Rama Shanker Singh for post-mortem along with other constables.

8. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that as per first information report enmity between the prosecution side and the accused is admitted and due to this enmity the appellant Narain Singh has been implicated in this case. Learned counsel for the appellants further submits that the so called injured witnesses are not the eye-witnesses as they were sleeping inside the house, whereas the deceased was sleeping outside the house, therefore, the testimony of the injured witnesses are of

no avail to the prosecution. He further submitted that there is no mention of source of light and the incident took place in the darkness of night, therefore, it is highly unbelievable that the witnesses could have identified the real assailants and the appellants have simply been implicated, as already submitted, due to enmity. He further submits that the place of occurrence is doubtful and the site plan prepared is also highly doubtful even in the site plan there is no mention of source of light. Learned counsel further submits that when the large number of persons are making noise then the number of persons receiving injuries cannot be as much which are shown in the prosecution case, therefore, on this count the prosecution case becomes doubtful.

9. Further contention of learned counsel for the appellants is that PW-3 received fire arm injuries in his back then it is highly doubtful that he could have identified the person assaulting him by fire arm. Learned counsel further submits that there are material contradiction in the statement of PW-1 and PW-3 which erodes the credibility of the prosecution case. Learned counsel for the appellant further submits that the deceased has died in an incident of dacoity committed by unidentified dacoits and the same has been proved by defence witnesses DW-1, DW-2, DW-3 and DW-4.

10. Per contra, learned A.G.A. submits that PW-1, PW-2 and PW-3 are natural eye-witnesses and their presence at the place of occurrence is worth believable. Learned A.G.A. further submits that PW-2 and PW-3 are injured eye-witnesses. PW-2, who is wife of the deceased received fire arm injuries in her arm and her arm has to be amputated.

11. Learned A.G.A. further contends that the first information report has been lodged promptly and this gives additional credence to the prosecution story. The enmity is double edged sword, which cuts both ways, whereas it can be the basis of false implication and also it can be the basis of commission of the offence.

12. Learned A.G.A. further submits that in this case the enmity has resulted in the commission of offence by the accused. Learned A.G.A. further submits that empty cartridges and splinters have been recovered by the Investigating Officer and blood has been taken from the place of occurrence.

13. Learned A.G.A. further submits that the theory of the defence that the deceased died in an incident of dacoity is not worth believable as none of the defence witnesses DW-1, DW-2, DW-3 and DW-4 have stated that they had seen the dacoits committing the offence. DW-4 is a Journalist who has deposed to the effect that he published the news of dacoity as he had heard about the same from crowd assembled there. Learned A.G.A. further submits that DW-4 is thus a hear say witness.

14. This Court has to re-appreciate the evidence available on record of the learned trial court and come to the conclusion whether the prosecution has been able to bring home charges against the appellants beyond the shadow of reasonable doubt and whether the learned trial court has appreciated the evidence in the right perspective?

15. As per the first information report, the genesis of the incident is enmity between the deceased and the accused. The genesis of the enmity is due to criminal case lodged by deceased Rama Shanker Singh against accused persons Sugriv @ Genda Bhar, Gopal Singh, Narayan Singh and

Brahma Singh for an incident in which the deceased was assaulted by the above accused persons by 'gandasa'. The accused Sugriv @ Genda Bhar was absconding and warrant was issued by the Court. The deceased was doing pairvi for getting the accused-Sugriv @ Genda Bhar arrested in that case. It is well settled that enmity is a double edged weapon which cuts both ways. The enmity can be basis of false implication and is also can be basis of commission of offence.

16. The incident took place in the night. The prosecution witnesses PW-1, PW-2 and PW-3 have supported the prosecution case in categorical terms. The witnesses PW-1 and PW-3 have stated that the accused persons were having torch and they identified them in the torch light. Further a lantern was also burning in the 'verandah' of the house of the deceased. Accused persons and witnesses were already known to each other, therefore, it was not difficult for the witnesses to identify the accused persons even in the light of lantern or torch.

17. PW-2 and PW-3 are injured witnesses and their presence at the place of occurrence is natural. PW-2 is wife of the deceased, who received gunshot wound in her left arm and PW-3 is brother of the deceased, who received gunshot wound in his back.

The defence has not been able to extract any material contradiction in the cross-examination of PW-2 and PW-3.

18. The contention of learned counsel for the appellant is that the eye-witnesses were sleeping inside the house so it was impossible for them to identify assailants in this regard. The testimony of PW-2 and PW-3 are very important where PW-2 has stated that on hearing noise she came out and saw the incident, whereas, PW-3 has stated that he was sleeping in the 'sahan' out side the house near 'verandah'.

19. PW-3 has also stated that on hearing the noise his Bhabhi PW-2 came out of her house and pleaded with the assailants to spare her husband but the assailants did not pay heed to her pleadings.

20. PW-1 Barmeshwar Singh was sleeping inside his house and on hearing the noise he came out and he also saw the incident. The defence has failed to extract any material contradiction in the statement of PW-1 also.

21. The witnesses PW-1, PW-2 and PW-3 are wholly reliable and their presence at the place of occurrence is wholly natural. Their testimonies are corroborated by medical evidence of PW-5 and PW-7. PW-5 has conducted the post mortem of the deceased and has found following injuries:-

"Ante-mortem injury- Fire arm wound in an area of 10cm \* 10cm chest cavity deep on left side front of chest above left nipple with fracture of ribs II to V below it, margins inverted, blackening, tatooing, singing in of skin present around the wound with one wound wide enough 2cm \* 1cm diameter into chest cavity deep on 4th and 5th intrecoastal space, 6cm above left nipple.



Thorax:- Left side II to V ribs fractured.

Plura:- Lacerated on left side with 10 pellets at one wound recovered from left plura cavity and one liter blood present in it. Left lung lacerated by innury No.1 and four pellets found inside it.

Pericordian:- Lacerated.

Heart:- Lacerated (Punctured), two pellets recovered from heart.

Stomach- semi-digested food 4 oz. Present.

Small Intestine- semi-digested and gas present.

Large intestine- Faecal matter and gas present Liver- Gall bladder- half full.

Cause of death:- Death was due to shock and haemorrhage produced by above injuries."

Whereas, PW-7 has examined PW-2 and PW-3 and found following injuries:-

"Injuries of PW-2 Lakheshwari are as under:-

(i)- Gun shot injury present on left upper arm on upper part 6cm\*5cm bone deep. Fresh bleeding present. Advised X-Ray of arm tatooing present.

(ii) Lacerated gun shot injury present on left fore-arm lower part 7cm \* 5cm bone deep radius fractured. Advised X-Ray, blackening and tatooing present.

Opinion- Both injuries are kept under observation. Advised X-Ray of the part caused by gunshot and are fresh. Duration-fresh. Patient admitted for management.

Injuries of PW-3 Sheo Ji Singh are as under:-

(i)- Multiple gun shot injury of entrance in the area of 6cm \* 7cm size varying from 5cm to 3cm oval in shape. Probing not done. On right side at level of T8 vertebra, a pellet and a case extracted out from wound, preserved and sent to the S.P. under seal. Kept under observation. Advised X-Ray of chest.

(ii) Abrasion 3cm \* 2cm present on right shoulder.

Opinion- Injury No.1 kept under observation. Advised X-Ray of chest, caused by fire arm. It is fresh. Injury No.2 is simple and caused by hard and blunt object and is fresh."

22. PW-4, PW-6 and PW-8 are formal witnesses. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the incident was caused by some unidentified dacoits and to support the said fact four witnesses have been produced by the defence but DW-1 and DW-2 have stated nothing about the incident of dacoity being committed. DW-1 has stated that he was posted as S.H.O., P.S.- Bansdeeh Road and on 20.08.1983 he reached the place of occurrence on hearing hue and cry and found injured persons, out of which Shivjit Singh was grievously injured. This witness has nowhere stated regarding the incident of dacoity being committed in the house of informant on the alleged date. Similarly, DW-2 has also not stated regarding offence of dacoity being committed.

23. DW-3 has testified to the effect that the incident of dacoity had taken place in the house of Ram Shanker Singh and Panchanand etc., residents of the village had fired on the dacoits. But this witness has further stated that he had heard that some boxes of the deceased Rama Shanker were broken in the orchard. Further, this witness in his cross-examination stated that he reached at the place of occurrence after the dacoits had fled away. From the testimony of this witness it is proved that this witness is not an eye-witness of the incident of dacoity as he has tried to defend the theory of dacoity advanced by the defence. Similarly DW-4, who is journalist and had published the news of dacoity being committed in the house of the deceased on the alleged date. He has testified to the effect that whatever he published in the newspaper was based on hear say from the crowd assembled there. Further this witness stated whatever he has heard he got it published in the newspaper. Thus this witness is also not an eye-witness of the dacoity. This witness is also hear say witness.

24. On over all appreciation of evidence of DW-1, DW-2, DW-3 and DW-4, the defence has not been able to substantiate the theory of deceased dying in the incident of dacoity or create any doubt regarding the truthfulness of prosecution case.

25. On the above analysis of evidence, the prosecution has been able to prove its case against the accused persons beyond the reasonable doubt, as already discussed, the testimonies of PW-1, PW-2 and PW-3 are wholly reliable. PW-2 and PW-3 are injured witnesses and their testimonies are corroborated by the medical evidence of PW-5 and PW-7, who are Doctors.

26. In view of above, this appeal lacks merit and deserves to be dismissed. The appeal is dismissed. The judgement and order dated 25.05.1983 passed by learned Special Judge (Additional Sessions Judge), Ballia in S.T. No.- 227 of 1983 (State Vs. Chand Govind and others) is affirmed.

27. Since, the accused appellants are absconding in the leading appeal and both appeals having been dismissed, their bail bonds are cancelled and the sureties are discharged. They shall be taken into custody forthwith.

28. The Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ballia and Superintendent of Police, Ballia shall ensure the arrest of the accused/appellants.

29. Let a copy of this order be communicated by the Registrar (Compliance) to the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ballia concerned for compliance forthwith.

30. The Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ballia is also directed to send his compliance report within one month to Court from the date of receipt of this order.

Order Date :- 30.05.2025 Virendra