CAUSE TITLE POCSO Case No. 6/17

Informant: 'Y'.

Accused: Sri Moina Gohain @ Dibyajyoti,

S/o- Sri Pulen Gohain, R/o- Jopora Konwar Gaon,

PS- Rahmaria, District- Dibrugarh.

ADVOCATES:-

For the State: Mrs. Runumi Devi, learned Public Prosecutor.

Mrs. Shahnaz Akhtar, learned Addl. Public Prosecutor. For the Defence: Sri MK Singh, learned Advocate.

IN THE COURT OF THE SESSIONS JUDGE: DIBRUGARH

Present: Smti. SP Khaund, (MA Economics, LLB),

Sessions Judge, Dibrugarh.

> POCSO Case No. 6/17 G.R. Case No. 3591/16

> > State of Assam

-Vs-

Sri Moina Gohain @ Dibyajyoti

Charges: Under Section 376 IPC, read with Section 4 POCSO Act.

Date of evidence on : 16-07-18, 25-09-18, 08-11-18, 17-12-18.

Date of argument : 06-04-19. Date of Judgment : 28-05-19.

JUDGMENT

- 1) The prosecution case in a narrow compass is that on 06-12-16, at about 4:00 pm, the victim 'X' went with her friend Smt. Tutumomi Orang towards the bank of the Brahmaputra River for a stroll. At that time, Sri Moina Gohain @ Dibyajyoti (hereinafter the accused person) committed rape on the victim near Maghua Senapati's house. An ejahar regarding this incident was lodged by the victim's father 'Y' which was registered as Rahmaria PS Case No. 38/16 under Sections 376 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC for short), read with Section 4 of the Protection of Children From Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (POCSO Act for short) and Sri Debeswar Dowari embarked upon the investigation.
- 2) The investigating officer (IO for short) recorded the statement of the victim and forwarded her to the Magistrate who recorded her statement under Section 164 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC for short). The victim was also forwarded for medical examination. The IO went to the place of

- occurrence and prepared the Sketch-Map and recorded the statements of the witnesses. On finding prima facie materials, the IO submitted Charge-Sheet against the accused under Section 376 IPC, read with Section 4 POCSO Act.
- 3) On appearance of the accused person, copies were furnished and a formal charge under Section 376 IPC, read with Section 4 POCSO Act was framed, read over and explained to the accused. The accused abjured his guilt and claimed innocence.
- 4) To substantiate the stance, the prosecution adduced the evidence of ten witnesses including the medical officer (MO for short) and the IO and exhibited several documents, while the defence cross-examined the witnesses to refute the charges. The accused did not tender any evidence in defence. On the inculpatory circumstances arising against him, the answers of the accused person under Section 313(1)(b) CrPC depicts a plea of total denial.

Submissions:

5) The learned Public Prosecutor (PP for short) Smt. Runumi Devi and the learned Addl. PP Mrs. Sahnaz Akhtar emphasized through their arguments that this is an open and shut case. There is clinching evidence against the accused and the accused deserves stringent punishment, considering the gravity of the allegations against him. On the contrary, the learned defence counsel emphasized through his argument that there is no eye-witness to this incident. There are contradictions between the statement of the victim and the other witnesses which casts a shadow of doubt over the veracity of the prosecution case. No injuries were detected on the medical examination of the victim. The Medico-legal Report depicts that no injury was detected on her private parts. The learned defence counsel had prayed for acquittal of the accused person.

Points for determinations:

- i. Whether on 06-12-16, at about 4:00 pm, near Brahmaputra River, the accused committed rape on the victim?
- ii. Whether at the same time and place, the accused committed penetrative sexual assault on the victim 'X'?

Decision thereon and the reasons for the decision:

- 6) To decide the case in its proper perspective, it is necessary to delve into the evidence.
- 7) The victim 'X' testified as PW-1 that she met the accused for the first time, on the day of occurrence, which occurred about 1 ½ years ago. On that day, she along with Bogen Murah and Tutumoni Orang went towards Brahmaputra River bank for a stroll. Bogen was fishing and she and Tutumoni were waiting. At that time, two boys were also fishing in the same river and they were in the water. Then the boys had a discussion with Bogen Murah. The accused Moina then came towards her and asked her name and her father's name and her mobile number. She refused to give him her mobile number, but she gave him her name. Then the accused Moina caught her and pulled her towards another area and threatened Bogen and Tutumoni stay away from the area, lest they will be killed. The accused then groped her breasts and removed her skirt and panty and committed rape on her. The accused tried to commit carnal sex (sodomy) with her and she experienced pain. He inserted his penis into her vagina, but could not insert completely, because she resisted. She pushed him and resisted. Then Moina's friend came and called him and alerted him that he will be noticed by the public. They called him 'O Moina aah' and then she came to know that the accused person's

name is Moina. The accused released her. Meanwhile Bogen and Tutumoni fled. Then she returned home and entered into Maghua's house and his wife asked her what had happened, but she was ashamed and she told her that the accused caught her hand. Then she met her younger brother Junus Orang on the road. As she was crying, her brother informed her mother that she was crying. Then she informed her mother about the incident. Her mother informed her father about the incident. As it was 8:00 pm, her father did not go to the police station that night. On the next day, she along with her parents went to the police station and then her father lodged the FIR. As she experienced pain and burning sensation in her vagina, she was sent to the doctor for examination. She was also forwarded to the Magistrate who recorded her statement. Ext. 1 is her statement and Ext. 1(1) upto Ext. 1(3) are her signatures.

- 8) This witness was cross-examined on a later date, but no contradiction could be elicited through her cross-examination. She testified in her cross-examination that Bogen Murah is her nephew and his house is half a kilometer away from her house. She could not identify the other boys who were also present with the accused person. She denied the suggestion by the defence that she has given false evidence due to an acrimonious relationship with the accused.
- 9) Her evidence is supported and corroborated by the evidence of Ms. Tutumoni Orang. This witness is below ten years of age and after ascertaining her intelligence, her evidence was recorded. Tutumoni Orang has stated as PW-5 that the incident occurred about 1 ½ years ago. At that time, she was a student of Class-V. On the day of the incident, 'X' went to gaze at the river, and she was standing near 'X'. Bogen and his friend also went fishing. 'X'

- asked her to accompany her to the river bank. She heard a shriek and then 'X' returned.
- 10) It is clear from the evidence of Tutumoni Orang that she and Bogen accompanied the victim 'X' on the day of the incident to the Brahmaputra River bank. Tutumoni Orang stated that she heard 'X's shrieks, but she did not know why 'X' raised alarm. Her evidence depicts that after she heard 'X' screaming, she also noticed that 'X' had returned. This is the time when 'X' was already assaulted by the accused, but PW-5 did not witness the incident of assault. Her evidence is similar to the evidence of PW-1.
- 11) The other child who accompanied the victim 'X' and PW-5 was Sri Bogel Murah who testified as PW-4 that he noticed the accused, but he did not know his name. 'X' is his distant relative. The incident occurred about a year ago. At the time of the incident, he, Rahul and Tutumoni went for fishing at the Brahmaputra River. 'X' was already present at the spot, because 'X' went along with Tutumoni to the same place and they were playing in the place of occurrence. Five other boys were also present at the place of occurrence, where they went for fishing. One of the boys came and caught the victim's hand. He and Rahul tried to save 'X', but the accused chased them away and so they ran homewards. They also informed at home about the victim and then meanwhile, the miscreants fled. 'X' returned home alone after some time. The police recorded his name and address, but did not ask him anything.
- 12) In his cross-examination, he testified that he did not know which boy caught 'X''s hand. He also did not know what happened at the place of occurrence, because they were chased away.
- 13) It is clear from the cross-examination of the PWs-4 and 5 that the police did

not record their statements, but noted down their names and address. PW-4 is sixteen years of age and he was a student of Class-VIII. He did not identify the accused, but his evidence supports the evidence of PWs-1 and 5. It is clear from the evidence of PWs-1, 4 and 5 that, three of them went towards the river bank and then one miscreant caught the victim 'X'. PWs-4 and 5 failed to identify the accused, but it is clear from the evidence that when 'X' was with them, the incident occurred and the police recorded their names and addresses after the incident. Thus, it is clear that the prior to the incident, PW-1 was with PWs-4 and 5. Thus, PW-1 cannot be dubbed as unreliable. It has to be borne in mind that 'X' identified the accused. She also heard his name being called. 'Moina' is the nickname of the accused. PWs-1, 4 and 5 are all minor witnesses and are innocent. They cannot withstand the shrewd cross-examination of an astute lawyer. The nuances of cross-examination have to be taken into consideration while analyzing the evidence of child witnesses.

14) The evidence of PW-1 is supported and corroborated by the evidence of her mother 'Z', who testified as PW-2 that she had seen the accused person, but did not know him very well. Her daughter is at present seventeen years of age. The incident occurred more than a year ago. At the time of the incident, she was at home, while her daughter went towards the river bank. Her daughter did not return home till 12:00 O' clock noon. Her husband went to the bazaar. After some time, her younger son Junus Orang came and told her that her daughter was crying. Then her son also informed her that Moina caught hold of her daughter. Then she ran towards her daughter. Her daughter came running and entered into a neighbour's house. When her daughter returned, she informed her that the accused caught her and groped

her. The accused also asked her phone number. Her husband returned home in the evening and she informed him about the incident. Her husband went to the VDP member's house. On the next day, she along with her husband and daughter went to the police station and her husband lodged the ejahar. Her daughter was sent for medical examination and her daughter was also forwarded to the Magistrate who recorded her statement.

- 15) This witness was also cross-examined on a later date. The defence failed to elicit any contradiction through her cross-examination. It is clear from her testimony that her evidence fits in like hand in glove with the evidence of her daughter. PW-1 also testified that when she returned home, her younger brother Junus saw her crying and then he went and informed her mother. This has been affirmed by her mother through her testimony as PW-2. The sole contradiction between the evidence of PW's-1 and 2 is that PW-2 did not implicate that the accused committed penetrative sexual assault on her daughter.
- 16) In sync with the evidence of PWs-1 and 2, the informant 'Y' testified as PW-3 that he came to know the accused person after the incident. His daughter 'X' is about seventeen years of age at present. She has passed HSLC examination. The alleged incident occurred more than a year ago. On the day of the incident, he went to the market and when he returned home in the evening, his wife informed him that when his daughter went to the river bank along with her friends, some boys were present at the river bank. The accused Moina caught his daughter's hand and sent away the other boys who were present at the river bank. When he caught his daughter's hand, the other children also fled from the river bank. The accused also misbehaved with his daughter. His daughter somehow managed to escape and returned

home. She informed his wife about the incident and his wife informed him about the incident. As it was already late at night, he did not go to the police station. On the next morning, he along with his wife and daughter went to the police station and lodged the ejahar with the police. The FIR was written by a person near the police station. Ext. 1 is the FIR and Ext. 1(1) is his signature. The FIR was written according to his narrative. The police recorded his statement and the statement of his daughter and forwarded her to the Magistrate who recorded her statement. His daughter was also forwarded to the doctor. The cross-examination of PW-3 also does not depict any contradiction. It is hereby held that PWs-1, 2 and 3 came across the accused only after the incident. They correctly identified the accused although.

- 17) It is true that the victim's parents did not testify that the accused committed penetrative sexual assault on the victim, but at the same time, it is also true that the victim testified that the accused committed penetrative sexual assault. As she resisted, the accused could not completely insert his penis into her vagina. Moreover, he tried to commit sodomy. The testimony of the victim is consistent to her statement under Section 164 CrPC.
- 18) At this juncture, it is pertinent to mention that the MO's evidence does not depict any evidence of recent sexual intercourse. Now, the poignant question is whether the accused committed penetrative sexual intercourse on the victim? The other question is whether the accused gets the benefit of doubt due to the lack of corroborative evidence regarding the penetrative sexual assault and also due to lack of medical evidence. There is not even an iota of doubt that the accused forcefully committed sexual assault upon the victim. The reluctance of the victim has given the scope to the accused to defend himself properly. Earlier, the victim was reluctant to inform Maghua's wife

about the incident, as she was ashamed and it appears that the victim also did not disclose the entire incident to her parents, may be out of fear. The prosecution also failed to produce Mahua's wife as a witness. However, the failure to examine Mahua's wife does not cause a dent in the evidence.

19) The MO Dr. Nibedita Shyam testified as PW-10 that on 08-12-16, she was posted as MO in the Department of Forensic Medicine, Assam Medical College & Hospital at Dibrugarh and she examined the victim in connection with this case and found the following:

On genital examination: Genital organs are healthy. Vulva is healthy. Labia minora exposed on abduction of thighs. Hymen intact. Vagina and cervix healthy. Vaginal smears take on glass slides from posterior fornix and around cervix, the result of which does not show any spermatozoa.

On the basis of physical examination, radiological examination and laboratory examination done of the victim 'X', the MO was of the opinion that:-

- i. Her age was above fourteen years and below sixteen years;
- ii. Evidence of recent sexual intercourse not detected on her person or body;
- Evidence of recent injury not detected on her body or private part.
- Ext. 5 is the Medico-legal Report and Ext. 1(1) upto Ext. 1(3) are the signatures of the MO.
- 20) It has already been discussed in my foregoing discussions that there is lack of medical evidence.
- 21) The evidence of Sri Rahul Orang also fortified the evidence of PWs-1, 2, 3, 4

and 5. He testified as PW-6 that the accused person is known to him, but he does not know the name of the accused. He saw the accused near the bank of the river. The victim 'X' is his elder sister. About 1 ½ years ago, Bogel Murah, Tutumoni and 'X' went for fishing at the Brahmaputra river. While they were fishing, 'X' was sitting. At that time, the accused was also standing on the bank. He caught 'X' and took her towards the sand. Then he ran homewards to inform his family about the incident. After some time, 'X' also reached home. On the next day, 'X' went to the police station along with his father.

- 22) It is apt to mention at this juncture that no contradiction could be elicited through the cross-examination of this witness. It is clear from his evidence that his testimony is consistent to his testimony under Section 161 CrPC. It has to be borne in mind that these are four child witnesses in this case and their evidence is corroborative.
- 23) Another witness Sri Phanidhar Saikia testified as PW-7 that the accused person's father is his friend. The informant and the victim are from his village. The incident occurred in the year 2017. On the night of the incident, 'Y' came to his house and informed his family members that when his daughter went for fishing by the ride of the river, she was raped by a person belonging to Konwar Gaon. Then his family members informed him about the incident of rape. On the next day, the police came and as he was the member of the VDP, he went to show the direction of 'Y''s house to the police. He did not find 'Y' in his house and went ahead and found 'Y' along with the victim's friends who accompanied her for fishing. The victim 'X's friends informed him that the victim was raped by one person who is the son of Sri Pulen Gohain. The police interrogated the victim's friends. Later, he learnt that the

- police arrested the accused in connection with this case.
- 24) It is apt to mention that the accused person has given the name of his father as Pulen Gohain when his statement was recorded under Section 313 CrPC. Moreover, on the Charge-Sheet, the accused person is charge sheeted as the son of Pulen Gohain. Thus, it is clear that the VDP member Sri Phanidhar Saikia learnt from the victim's friends that Pulen Gohain's son committed penetrative sexual assault on the victim X.
- 25) It has already been held in my foregoing discussions that there is clinching evidence against the accused person. The victim has clearly testified that the accused committed penetrative sexual assault on her. Her evidence is corroborated and supported by the evidence of PWs-2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.
- 26) In sync with the evidence of other witnesses, Sri Prakash Kerketa testified as PW-8 that the victim resides in his village. The incident occurred in the year 2017. On the following day of the incident, he was informed by Sri Phanidhar Saikia (PW-7) that an incident of rape occurred with the victim. Later, he learnt that 'Y' lodged an ejahar.
- 27) In his cross-examination, he testified that the police did not record his statement.
- 28) The IO is a formal witness. Sri Debeswar Dowari is the IO and he testified as PW-9 that on 07-12-16, he was posted as Officer-in-charge (OC for short) at Rahmaria Police Station and on that day, an FIR was lodged by 'Y' which was registered as Rahmaria PS Case No. 38/16 under Section 376 IPC, read with Section 4 POCSO Act and he embarked upon the investigation. Ext. 2 is the FIR and Ext. 2(1) is his signature. He met the informant 'Y' and recorded his statement in the police station. He met the victim 'X' and her father in the police station and recorded their statements. Thereafter, he proceeded to the

place of occurrence and prepared the Sketch-Map as shown by the complainant and the victim, wherein Ext. 3(1) is his signature. He forwarded the victim for medical examination and also forwarded her to the Magistrate who recorded her statement. He collected the statement and Medico-legal Report of the victim and submitted Charge-Sheet against the accused person. Ext. 4 is the Charge-Sheet and Ext. 4(1) is his signature.

- 29) It has been held in my foregoing discussions that there is clinching evidence against the accused person. According to the evidence of the IO and the victim's parents and the FIR, the incident occurred on 06-12-16 at about 4:00 pm and the case was registered on that day and the victim was examined on the next day, i.e., on 08-12-16. The victim testified that as it was late at night, when her father was informed, her father did not go to the police station and he went to the police station on the next day. The victim's mother testified as PW-2 that her daughter did not return home till 12:00 O' clock. Thus, it is apparent that the incident occurred on 06-12-16 and after 12:00 O' clock. The PW-1 has testified in her evidence-in-chief as well as in her crossexamination which was recorded on a later date that as it was late at night at about 8:00 pm, her parents did not go to the police station to lodge the FIR and the FIR was lodged on the next day. The victim's evidence-in-chief was recorded on 16-07-18 and her cross-examination was recorded on 25-09-18, i.e., after a year. As the victim was truthful, her evidence-in-chief and crossexamination remained consistent. Her statement under Section 161 CrPC was also held to be consistent. Her statement under Section 164 CrPC is also consistent to her testimony in the Court.
- 30) The learned defence counsel laid stress in his argument that the MO's evidence belies the victim's testimony. It is argued that the MO did not detect

- any injuries on the victim's private part.
- 31) After considering the testimony of the victim and argument of the learned defence counsel, it is held that the argument of the learned defence counsel can be safely brushed aside. No sound reason prevailed to disbelieve the evidence of a child witness. Even though, there is lack of medical evidence, it is held that the accused committed penetrative sexual assault on the victim. He tried to insert his penis into her vagina and also into her anus. The victim was indeed brutally assaulted. Most of the witnesses are minor child witnesses including the victim herself.
- 32) It has been held by Hon'ble the Gauhati High Court in *Arun Tanti Vs. State*of *Assam* [2018 (4) GLT 1002] that:-
 - 20. The accused being a matured man has indulged himself in such affairs knowing fully well that the victim is a minor one which clearly established that the accused/appellant has culpable mental state to have sexual intercourse with a minor girl, which has rendered him liable for the offence u/s 4 of the POCSO Act. The Ld. Trial Court has properly appreciated all the matters on record and has taken note of non compliance of provision of POCSO Act mentioned above and also the legal pronouncement that the child witness is a competent witness to depose before the Court and conviction can be rest upon such evidence of child witness if found reliable, as has been held in *Dattu Ramarao Sakhre Vs. State of Maharastra* (1997) 5 SCC 341, *Ratansingh D. Nayak Vs. State of Gujarat* (2004) 1 SCC 64.

- 33) Reverting back to this case, it is held that the victim's testimony and her statement under Section 164 CrPC clearly depicts that the accused committed sexual assault on her. The accused is thereby held guilty of the offence under Section 4 POCSO Act.
- 34) Apart from presumption of culpable mental state, the POCSO Act embodies presumption regarding certain offences under Section 29 of POCSO Act which read as follows:
 - 29. Where a person is prosecuted for committing or abetting or attempting to commit any offence under sections 3, 5, 7 and section 9 of this Act, the Special Court shall presume, that such person has committed the offence, unless the contrary is proved.
- 35) Thus, there is no hesitation to hold that the accused committed penetrative sexual assault on the victim. Moreover, since the FIR was lodged soon after the crime, there was least possibility of the victim and her family of concocting a false story implicating the accused in a short interval. The police machinery was set in motion promptly without any delay.
- 36) Regarding the lack of medical evidence, I would like to rely on the decision of Hon'ble the High Court of the Judicature at Bombay in *Sunil Atmaram More vs. State and others* [2011 SCC Online BOM 622], wherein it has been observed that:-
 - 28. Explanation to Section 376 clarifies that penetration is sufficient to constitute sexual intercourse necessary to the offence of rape. In [Wahid Khan v. State of MP (2010) 2 SCC 9], the Supreme Court reiterated the consistent view that even the slightest penetration is sufficient to make

out an offence of rape and depth of penetration is immaterial. The Hon'ble Supreme Court made reference to the opinion expressed by Dr. Mody in his Medical Jurisprudence and Toxicology (22nd Edition) at Page 495 as well as to Dr. Parikh's Textbook of Medical Jurisprudence and Toxicology. Dr. Parikh defined the term "sexual intercourse" as under:

"In law, this term is held to mean the slightest degree of penetration of the vulva by the penis with or without emission of semen. It is therefore quite possible to commit legally the offence of rape without producing any injury to the genitals or leaving any seminal stains."

For the aforestated reason, we are not in agreement with the learned counsel for the defence that the testimony of the prosecutrix with the aid of the medical evidence, does not disclose an offence of rape. Even assuming that theory of use of condom is afterthought, absence of semen in the vaginal swab is not the evidence of absence of sexual intercourse absence of seminal stains on the clothes, vaginal swabs, etc. merely indicates that there was no discharge nevertheless, it is not evidence of absence of rape. This is what precisely Dr. Mody in his Medical Jurisprudence and Toxicology (22nd Edition) at page 495 clarified.

"Thus, to constitute the offence of rape, it is not necessary that there should be complete penetration of penis with emission of semen and rupture of hymen. Partial penetration of the penis within the Labia minora or the vulva or pudenda, with or without emission of semen, or even an attempt at penetration is quite sufficient for the purpose of the law. It is therefore quite possible to commit legally, the offence at rape with producing any injury to the genitals or leaving any seminal stains.

- 37) In the instant case, the victim's evidence clearly depicts that she resisted and did not allow the accused to insert his penis completely. This does not exonerate the accused from the offence of rape.
- 38) On the basis of Section 42 of POCSO Act, the accused is held guilty of the offence under Section 4 of POCSO Act, although he is charged under the both Sections of the penal code of POCSO Act.
- 39) The accused acted in a very aggressive manner. Although, he is a young lad, he assaulted the victim in the broad day light. Considering the facts and circumstances of this case and the age and antecedent of the accused, it appears that the minimum term of imprisonment provided for offences under Section 4 POCSO Act will meet the ends of justice.
- 40) I have heard the accused on the point of sentence.

SENTENCE:

41) I convict the accused Sri Moina Gohain @ Dibyajyoti under Section 4 POCSO Act and sentence him to undergo rigorous imprisonment (RI in short) for 7 (seven) years and to pay a fine of Rs. 1,000/- (Rupees One Thousand) only and in default of payment of fine, to undergo RI for 1 (one) month. The fine realized will be deposited in the costs fund of District Legal Services Authority, Dibrugarh (DLSA for short). The period of detention of the accused during

investigation and trial is set off with his custodial sentence.

42) Furnish free copies of judgment to the accused and to the District Magistrate.

43) This case is also recommended for compensation to the victim who deserves compensation under the Assam Victims Compensation Scheme, 2012.

44) Send a copy of this judgment to the Secretary, DLSA, Dibrugarh for

assessment of compensation.

Judgment is signed, sealed and delivered in the open Court on the 28th day of

May, 2019.

Sessions Judge, Dibrugarh

Certified that the judgment is typed to my dictation and corrected by me and each page bears my signature.

> Sessions Judge, Dibrugarh

> > Contd.

APPENDIX POCSO Case No. 6/17

List of witnesses for prosecution:

- 1. PW-1 The victim 'X';
- 2. PW-2 The mother of the victim 'X';
- 3. PW-3 The informant 'Y';
- 4. PW-4 Sri Bogel Murah;
- 5. PW-5 Smt. Tutumoni Orang;
- 6. PW-6 The younger brother of the victim 'X';
- 7. PW-7 Sri Phanidhar Saikia;
- 8. PW-8 Sri Prakash Kerketa;
- 9. PW-9 Sri Debeswar Dowari;
- 10. PW-10 Dr. Nibedita Shyam.

List of exhibits for prosecution:

- 1. Ext. 1 Statement of the victim 'X' recorded under Section 164 CrPC;
- 2. Ext. 2 Ejahar;
- 3. Ext. 3 Sketch-Map;
- 4. Ext. 4 Charge-Sheet; and
- 5. Ext. 5 Medico-legal Report.

List of material exhibits for prosecution: Nil.

List of witnesses for defence: Nil.

List of exhibits for defence: Nil.

Sessions Judge, Dibrugarh

Transcribed and typed by:-Bhaskar Jyoti Bora, Steno.