IN THE COURT OF THE SPECIAL JUDGE AT JORHAT

Present: Sri Vinod Kumar Chandak, M.A., M.Com, LL.B., AJS

Special Judge, Jorhat

JUDGMENT IN SPECIAL CASE NO. 19 OF 2018

(G.R. Case No. 789 of 2018) Pulibar P.S. Case No. 77 of 2018

Transmitting Magistrate:-

Smt. Rani Boro, Chief Judicial Magistrate, Jorhat District

State of Assam

-Versus-

Sri Tezen Das,
Son of Sri Girish Das,
Resident of Kakodonga Majukuchi Koiborta Gaon,
P.S. Dergaon,
District-Golaghat. Accused

APPEARANCES:

For the State : Sri Muhidhar Dutta, Learned Special P.P., Jorhat

For the Accused: Sri Rintu Goswami, Learned Defence Advocate, Jorhat

CHARGE FRAMED UNDER SECTIONS 366 [A]/376 [i] OF INDIAN PENAL CODE READ WITH SECTION 6 OF THE PROTECTION OF CHILDREN FROM SEXUAL OFFENCES ACT, 2012

Date of Charge : 01-06-2018

Date of prosecution evidence: 27-06-2018; 13-07-2018; 08-08-2018

& 07-09-2018

Statement of Accused

 Recorded on
 : 07-12-2018

 Date of Argument
 : 21-01-2019

 Date of Judgment
 : 25-01-2019

<u>JUDGMENT</u>

1). The prosecution story, in brief, is that Pulibar P.S. Case No. 77/2018 under Sections 366/376 [i] of IPC read with Section 6 of The Protection of Children From Sexual Offences Act, 2012, was registered on the basis of a F.I.R. lodged by Smt. Niru Das, the mother of the victim girl [hereinafter referred to as 'X'].

In the aforesaid F.I.R. dated 23/03/2018 **[Exhibit-2]**, the mother of the victim girl [herein referred to as 'X'], alleged, *inter-alia*, that on the same day at about 6.00 P.M., while her minor daughter was present in the courtyard of their house at that time the accused arrived near the house of informant in his motorcycle and thereafter kidnapped her daughter. It is further alleged by the informant that accused took the minor daughter of the informant towards Sangsowa T.E. where the later committed rape upon her and left her at the said place. Later on, she was recovered by the family members of the informant.

On receipt of the aforesaid F.I.R. by the Officer-in-charge, Pulibar P.S., the same was registered as Pulibar P.S. Case No. 77/2018 under Sections 366/376 [i] of IPC read with Section 6 of The Protection of Children From Sexual Offences Act, 2012.

During the course of investigation, the victim girl was medically examined by the doctor, her statement under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. was recorded with the aid of learned Magistrate. Police on completion of investigation filed charge-sheet, in the case, against the above named accused Tezen Das u/Ss. 366 [A]/376 [i] of IPC vide Charge-sheet No. 23/2018 dated 31-03-2018.

- **2).** The learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Jorhat, transmitted the case to this Court for trial after furnishing the copies under Section 207 Cr.P.C.
- **3).** Upon consideration of the record of the case and the documents submitted therewith and after hearing the submissions of the accused and the prosecution in this behalf, I found sufficient ground for presuming that the accused has committed offences under Sections 366 [A]/376 [i] of IPC read with Section 6 of The Protection of Children From Sexual Offences Act, 2012.

Accordingly, charges were framed by me, which were read over and explained to the accused, to which, the accused pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

4). During the course of trial, **08 [eight]** witnesses including the victim, her parent, Medical Officer and the I.O. were examined, on behalf of the prosecution, to prove the charge u/Ss. 366 [A]/376 [i] of IPC read with Section 6 of The Protection of Children From Sexual Offences Act, 2012.

On completion of prosecution evidence, statement of above named accused was recorded u/S. 313 of Cr.P.C. The accused stated that he had been falsely implicated in the case. The accused further stated that he does not know why this false case has been instituted against him. The accused pleaded innocence. No witness was adduced by the accused in his defence.

- I have heard Sri Muhidhar Dutta, learned Special Public Prosecutor for the State as well as Sri Rintu Goswami, learned Defence Counsel for the accused, who is facing trial for commission of offence u/Ss. 366 [A]/376 [i] of IPC read with Section 6 of The Protection of Children From Sexual Offences Act, 2012.
- **6).** Now the points for determination before this Court are as follows:-
 - 1) Whether on or about 22/03/2018 at about 6.00 P.M. at Eratoli Gaon under Pulibar P.S., the accused named-above, induced the minor victim girl, to come out from her house or to do any act or acts with the intent that she may be or knowing that it is likely that she will be forced [or seduced] to illicit intercourse with him and thereby committed an offence punishable under Section 366 [A] of IPC?
 - 2) Whether on or about the same day, time and place, the accused named above committed rape on the victim girl and thereby committed an offence punishable under Section 376 [1] of IPC?
 - 3) Whether during the same period and time the accused named above committed sexual assault upon the victim girl aged above sixteen years but below eighteen years and thereby committed

an offence punishable under Section 6 of The Protection of Children From Sexual Offences Act, 2012?

DISCUSSION, DECISIONS AND REASONS THEREOF:

7). To decide the above points against accused, let us examine, analyze and appreciate the evidence of the witnesses alongwith the relevant documents.

PW-1 is the victim girl who during her deposition in Court stated that on 22/03/2018, at about 6.00 P.M., she came towards the house of her uncle which is located near her residence. After, visiting the house of her uncle she returned back home and on the way she found the accused in a motorcycle. The victim stated that the accused took her forcibly in his motorcycle. It is further version of the victim that, prior to the date of incident, the later gave proposal to her but she refused. In turn, the accused disclosed before her that if she does not accompany him then he will die. Further, the victim stated that the accused took her towards Sangsowa T.E. and tried to have physical relationship with her forcibly but when she protested against the act of accused, the later gave slap to her and thereafter had physical relationship with her forcibly. Further version of the victim is that the accused then dropped her at Mohbondha Tini-Ali from his motorcycle and left the said place. After sometime, she met one Dulan Das near Mohbondha Tini-Ali who agreed to drop her at her house. However, in the midway she met her father and brother who were searching for her. She alongwith her family members went to the police station where her mother lodged ejahar before police. She was medically examined by a doctor, produced before a Magistrate for recording her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. which she exhibited as Exhibit-1 and her signatures thereon as Exhibit-1 [1] to Exhibit-1 [3].

During cross-examination by defence side, the victim stated that she came to the police station on the same day of incident and she was examined by doctor at 12.00 A.M. midnight; that she came to the police station without changing her wearing apparel/cloths and she also did not change her dress before going to the doctor. She denied defence suggestions that she did not state before police that Dulan Das took her from Mohbandha Tini-Ali; that on the midway she found her brother and father who took her to their home; that while

returning from her home to her uncle's house accused took her forcibly; that prior to the incident accused told her that he loves her and that accused told her that he will die if she rejects her proposal.

8). PW-2 is Smt. Niru Das who is the mother of the victim girl-cuminformant of the case. This witness during her deposition stated that on the date of incident her daughter went missing from the courtyard of their house. She searched for her daughter but she was found untraceable. It is further version of the victim that, on the relevant day, she was preparing food and victim went to her uncle's house at about 7 P.M. After sometime, her husband and son went to search for the victim and found her with one person named Dulan Das. When her daughter returned back home she asked her daughter about the incident. To her query, her daughter divulged to her that the accused took her towards Sangsowa T.E. where the later did bad work with her and assaulted her with a slap. She also noticed sign of assault on the cheek of victim. Thereafter, she lodged ejahar before police vide Exhibit-2 wherein Exhibit-2 [1] is her signature. Police recorded statement of the victim, sent her before a doctor for medico legal check-up. The victim was also produced before the Magistrate who recorded statement of the victim as per provision of Section 164 Cr.P.C.

During cross-examination, she denied defence suggestion that she did not state before police that she noticed sign of injury at her daughter's face and that accused used to visit their house as he used to reside near the house of her daughter-in-law. The name of the scribe of the ejahar is not mentioned in the ejahar [Exhibit-2].

9). Dr. Ritu Saikia [**PW-3**] who was Lady Medical Officer on Duty at Jorhat Medical College & Hospital examined the victim girl on 23/09/2018 and opined that the victim is above eighteen years and below twenty years; evidence of recent sexual intercourse was not detected on her person and there was no violence mark on her body at the time of examination. This witness exhibited her medical report [Exhibit-3] and his signatures thereon as Exhibit-3 [1] to Exhibit-3 [3].

The doctor was not cross-examined by the defence side.

10). Smt. Purnima Das [PW-4] who is neighbour of victim divulged during her testimony that on the date of incident she heard from the mother of victim that victim was found missing from their residence. This witness further stated that she heard that the victim girl was recovered on the same day but she did not meet the victim after her recovery.

During cross-examination, she stated that she cannot say with whom the victim girl went on the date of incident and she does not have any personal knowledge about the incident.

11). The evidence of **Sri Pinku Das [PW-5]** who is the elder brother of victim [PW-1] is to the effect that on the date of incident in the evening hours his sister [PW-1] went to the house of her aunt but did not return back home. Thereafter, his mother went in search of her daughter to the house of his aunt but they divulged before his mother that victim had left their place before arrival of his mother. Thereupon, all of them searched for the victim but she was found untraceable. At about 8.30 P.M., his mother found the victim girl on the road and thereafter she was brought to her house. It is further version of this witness that his mother disclosed before him that victim was slapped by the accused and the later tried to commit bad work with her.

This witness during cross-examination by defence side stated that he did not state before police that at about 6.30 P.M., on the date of incident, his victim sister went to the house of her aunt; that at that time it started raining for more than half hour; that as she did not return home his mother went to the house of his aunt but they told that the victim left their house before arrival of his mother; that her mother came back to their house and all of them searched for the victim but could not find her; that at about 8.30 P.M. her mother found the victim girl who narrated that accused took her from the doorsteps of her aunt's house on the date of incident and dropped her near Kakodonga bridge and further the victim told his mother that accused slapped her as he tried to commit bad work with his younger sister [PW-1].

12). Smt. Sewali Das [PW-6] who is the sister-in-law of victim [PW-1] stated that on the date of incident, in the evening hours, her sister-in-law

[victim] went to the house of her uncle in search of lemon and thereafter did not return back home. She then telephoned the victim but she did not receive the call. For the second time when she telephoned the victim then the victim received the call and stated before her that she had eloped with the accused. Later on, the victim was found alongwith the accused at Mohbandha area by her father-in-law, husband Sri Pinku Das and her uncle. Victim was brought back to the house and therefrom she was taken to the police station by their family members.

Prosecution side declared this witness <u>hostile</u> and during crossexamination by prosecution she denied to have stated before police that "accused had physical relationship with the victim; that the victim was taken forcefully by the accused in his motorcycle and that accused committed rape upon the victim at Sangsowa T.E".

During cross-examination by defence side, she testified that on the date of incident she was sleeping in the bed alongwith her minor son and she did not come out of the house; that she does not know anything about the incident and later on she did not heard anything from the victim regarding the incident. This witness categorically stated that victim had love affair with the accused. It is further version of this witness that she did not state before police that when she telephoned the victim the later stated before her that she had eloped with the accused on her own consent. She admitted that she did not give any statement before police regarding kidnapping of the victim by the accused.

13). The evidence of Smt. Jyotishna Hazarika [PW-7] is to the effect that on the date of incident she came to know from the villagers that victim went missing from her residence. Later on, she came to know that victim was recovered by her family members in the night hour. She then went to the house of victim and questioned the victim after taking her to another room where the victim stated before her that the accused took her forcibly towards Sangsowan T.E. in his motorcycle and thereafter committed rape upon her in the said T.E. Further, the victim disclosed to her that she asked the accused to marry her but the later did not pay any heed to her request. Inspite of that, the accused went away riding his motorcycle leaving the victim at the place of

occurrence. Further version of this witness is that police seized one school certificate of the victim from her parent vide seizure-list [Exhibit-4] wherein Exhibit-4 [1] is her signature.

This witness denied defence suggestion that she did not state before police that "she went to the house of victim on her arrival at her house; that the victim was found in wet condition as it was raining at that time; that she took the victim to another room and questioned her about the incident after she came to know that something had happened to her; that the victim disclosed before her that she was forcibly taken by the accused in his motorcycle towards Sangsowa T.E. where the accused committed rape upon her and when the victim requested the accused to marry her he did not pay any heed to her request and thereafter left her at the place of occurrence by driving his motorcycle".

Md. Samsuddin [PW-8] is the investigating officer of the case who deposed about the routine steps taken by him during investigation of the case. It is stated by the I.O. that he visited the place of occurrence and drew Sketch Map of the place of occurrence with index vide Exhibit-5 wherein Exhibit-5 [1] is his signature. Further version of this witness is that on 28/03/2018 he brought the accused from Mohbandha Tini-Ali to the police station and thereafter recording his statement arrested him in connection with the case. During investigation, he seized the school certificate of the victim vide Exhibit-4 wherein Exhibit-4 [2] is his signature. After collecting the medical report of the victim from the concerned doctor he submitted charge-sheet against the accused vide Exhibit-6 wherein Exhibit-6 [1] is his signature.

The I.O. confirmed that witness **Smt. Sewali Das [PW-6]** during her statement under Section 161 Cr.P.C. divulged before him that "accused had physical relationship with the victim; that the victim was taken forcefully by the accused in his motorcycle and that accused committed rape upon the victim at Sangsowa T.E.

During cross-examination by defence side, the I.O. stated that he has not prepared Sketch Map pertaining to Sangsowa T.E.; that he did not visit

the place where the alleged incident of rape took place; that he did not seize the wearing apparel of the victim girl; that he did not visit the school to prove the genuineness of the school certificate which was seized by him on being produced by the victim; that he has not seized the motorcycle driven by the accused on the date of incident.

The I.O. confirmed that **victim [PW-1]** during her statement under Section 161 Cr.P.C. did not state before him that "**Dulon Das took her from Mohbandha Tini-Ali and in the midway she met her brother and her father who took her to their house"**.

Witness Smt. Niru Das [PW-2] during her statement under Section 161 Cr.P.C. did not state before him that "when her victim daughter went missing her husband and her son went in search of the victim; that Dulan Das found her daughter at Mohbandha Tini-Ali and that she noticed sign of injury on her daughter's face".

The I.O. further confirmed that witness Sri Pinku Das [PW-5] during his statement under Section 161 Cr.P.C. did not state before him that "at about 6.30 P.M., on the date of incident, his victim sister went to the house of her aunt; that at that time it started raining for more than half hour; that as she did not return home his mother went to the house of his aunt but they told that the victim left their house before arrival of his mother; that her mother came back to their house and all of them searched for the victim but could not find her; that at about 8.30 P.M. her mother found the victim girl who narrated that accused took her from the doorsteps of her aunt's house on the date of incident and dropped her near Kakodonga bridge and further the victim told his mother that accused slapped her as he tried to commit bad work with his younger sister [PW-1]".

Witness Smt. Jyotismita Hazarika [PW-7] during her statement under Section 161 Cr.P.C. did not state before him that "she went to the house of victim on her arrival at her house; that the victim was found in wet condition as it was raining at that time; that she took the victim to another room and questioned her about the incident after she came to know that something had happened to her; that the victim disclosed

before her that she was forcibly taken by the accused in his motorcycle towards Sangsowa T.E. where the accused committed rape upon her and when the victim requested the accused to marry her he did not pay any heed to her request and thereafter left her at the place of occurrence by driving his motorcycle".

15). From a close perusal of the evidence on record it is seen that the victim [PW-1] knew the accused before the incident which she has divulged during her 164 Cr.P.C. statement recorded by the learned Magistrate on 27/03/2018.

It is seen from the evidence of victim [PW-1] that on 22/03/2018, at about 6.00 P.M., she came towards the house of her uncle which is located near her residence. After, visiting the house of her uncle she returned back home and on the way she found the accused in a motorcycle. The victim stated that the accused took her forcibly in his motorcycle. It is further version of the victim that, prior to the date of incident, the later gave proposal to her but she refused. In turn, the accused disclosed before her that if she does not accompany him then he will die. Further, the victim stated that the accused took her towards Sangsowa T.E. and tried to have physical relationship with her forcibly but when she protested against the act of accused, the later gave slap to her and thereafter had physical relationship with her forcibly. Further version of the victim is that the accused then dropped her at Mohbondha Tini-Ali from his motorcycle and left the said place. After sometime, she met one Dulan Das near Mohbondha Tini-Ali who agreed to drop her at her house. However, in the midway she met her father and brother who were searching for her. She alongwith her family members went to the police station where her mother lodged ejahar before police. She was medically examined by a doctor, produced before a Magistrate for recording her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. which she exhibited as Exhibit-1 and her signatures thereon as Exhibit-1 [1] to Exhibit-1 [3].

During cross-examination by defence side, the victim stated that she came to the police station on the same day of incident and she was examined by doctor at 12.00 A.M. midnight; that she came to the police station without changing her wearing apparel/cloths and she also did not change her dress

before going to the doctor. She denied defence suggestions that she did not state before police that Dulan Das took her from Mohbandha Tini-Ali; that on the midway she found her brother and father who took her to their home; that while returning from her home to her uncle's house accused took her forcibly; that prior to the incident accused told her that he loves her and that accused told her that he will die if she rejects her proposal.

- **16).** The I.O. [PW-7] during his evidence before the court during his cross-examination categorically stated that that he did not seize the wearing apparel of the victim girl; that he did not visit the school to prove the genuineness of the school certificate which was seized by him on being produced by the victim; that he has not seized the motorcycle driven by the accused on the date of incident.
- **17).** Now let us see what the ejahar [Exhibit-2] filed by the informant Smt. Niru Das [PW-2] reflects:

On 22/03/2018 at about 6.00 P.M., while her minor daughter was present in the courtyard of their house at that time the accused arrived near the house of informant in his motorcycle and thereafter kidnapped her daughter. It is further alleged by the informant that accused took the minor daughter of the informant towards Sangsowa T.E. where the later committed rape upon her and left her at the said place. Later on, she was recovered by the family members of the informant.

Smt. Niru Das [PW-2] who is the mother of the victim girl-cuminformant of the case during her evidence has stated that on the date of incident her daughter went missing from the courtyard of their house. She searched for her daughter but she was found untraceable. It is further version of the victim that, on the relevant day, she was preparing food and victim went to her uncle's house at about 7 P.M. After sometime, her husband and son went to search for the victim and found her with one person named Dulan Das. When her daughter returned back home she asked her daughter about the incident. To her query, her daughter divulged to her that the accused took her towards Sangsowa T.E.

where the later did bad work with her and assaulted her with a slap. She also noticed sign of assault on the cheek of victim. Thereafter, she lodged ejahar before police vide Exhibit-2 wherein Exhibit-2 [1] is her signature. Police recorded statement of the victim, sent her before a doctor for medico legal check-up. The victim was also produced before the Magistrate who recorded statement of the victim as per provision of Section 164 Cr.P.C.

During cross-examination, she denied defence suggestion that she did not state before police that she noticed sign of injury at her daughter's face and that accused used to visit their house as he used to reside near the house of her daughter-in-law. The name of the scribe of the ejahar is not mentioned in the ejahar [Exhibit-2].

- 19). It is interesting to note herein that the father of victim has not been examined by the I.O. of the case during investigation. Furthermore, it was the duty of the prosecution to call the aforesaid witness to the dock of the court as Court Witness. But the prosecution side failed to do so for the reasons best known to it.
- 20). The evidence of Sri Pinku Das [PW-5] who is the elder brother of victim [PW-1] is of different tune. This witness stated that on the date of incident in the evening hours his sister [PW-1] went to the house of her aunt but did not return back home. Thereafter, his mother went in search of her daughter to the house of his aunt but they divulged before his mother that victim had left their place before arrival of his mother. Thereupon, all of them searched for the victim but she was found untraceable. At about 8.30 P.M., his mother found the victim girl on the road and thereafter she was brought to her house. It is further version of this witness that his mother disclosed before him that victim was slapped by the accused and the later tried to commit bad work with her.

This witness during cross-examination by defence side stated that he did not state before police that at about 6.30 P.M., on the date of incident, his victim sister went to the house of her aunt; that at that time it started raining for more than half hour; that as she did not return home his mother went to the house of his aunt but they told that the victim left their house before arrival of

his mother; that her mother came back to their house and all of them searched for the victim but could not find her; that at about 8.30 P.M. her mother found the victim girl who narrated that accused took her from the doorsteps of her aunt's house on the date of incident and dropped her near Kakodonga bridge and further the victim told his mother that accused slapped her as he tried to commit bad work with his younger sister [PW-1].

Purther, it is seen from the evidence of Smt. Sewali Das [PW-6] who is the sister-in-law of victim [PW-1] that on the date of incident, in the evening hours, her sister-in-law [victim] went to the house of her uncle in search of lemon and thereafter did not return back home. She then telephoned the victim but she did not receive the call. For the second time when she telephoned the victim then the victim received the call and stated before her that she had eloped with the accused. Later on, the victim was found alongwith the accused at Mohbandha area by her father-in-law, husband Sri Pinku Das and her uncle. Victim was brought back to the house and therefrom she was taken to the police station by their family members.

Prosecution side declared this witness <u>hostile</u> and during crossexamination by prosecution she denied to have stated before police that "accused had physical relationship with the victim; that the victim was taken forcefully by the accused in his motorcycle and that accused committed rape upon the victim at Sangsowa T.E".

During cross-examination by defence side, she testified that on the date of incident she was sleeping in the bed alongwith her minor son and she did not come out of the house; that she does not know anything about the incident and later on she did not heard anything from the victim regarding the incident. This witness categorically stated that victim had love affair with the accused. It is further version of this witness that she did not state before police that when she telephoned the victim the later stated before her that she had eloped with the accused on her own consent. She admitted that she did not give any statement before police regarding kidnapping of the victim by the accused.

- **22).** It is interesting to note herein that the I.O. [PW-8] seized the school certificate/birth certificate of the victim from the victim on being produced by her. But it is interesting to note herein that the I.O. during cross-examination by defence side stated that he did not visit the school to prove the genuineness of the school certificate of the victim.
- **23).** The accused during his statement under Section 313 Cr.P.C. had denied that he had physical contact with the victim.
- **24).** In the present case, since date of birth certificate or matriculation certificate from the school or birth certificate are not available, the prosecution has relied upon Exhibit-3, the report of Doctor Ritu Saikia [PW-3], according to which, the age of the victim is above eighteen years and below twenty years. There is nothing placed on record to create a doubt about the medical age of the victim child as determined by the Medical Officer.

From the examination of the doctor it is seen that the age of the victim given by her in her report is based on radiological report. In the instant case, the victim was a major girl at the time of incident.

- **25).** It is a cardinal principle of criminal law that the prosecution has to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt and that the prosecution case has to stand on its own leg.
- **26).** On scrutinizing the evidence on record, considering the entire aspect of the matter and the evidence, produced by the prosecution, I am of the considered opinion that the prosecution failed to establish that the accused kidnapped the victim or committed rape on the victim. Hence, accused is entitled to acquittal under benefit of doubt which I accordingly do.
- **27).** In the result, accused **Sri Tezen Das** is <u>acquitted</u> of the charges under Sections 366 [A]/376 [i] IPC read with Section 6 of The Protection of Children From Sexual Offences Act, 2012, levelled against him on benefit of doubt and he is set at liberty forthwith.

Accused is on bail. The bail bond of accused is extended for another **06** [six] months from today as per provision of Section 437-A Cr.P.C.

28). Given under my hand and seal of this Court on this **25th** day of **January 2019**.

Special Judge, Jorhat

Continued to Page No:-16

ANNEXURES:-

PROSECUTION WITNESSES:-

PW-1	Victim girl.
PW-2	Smt. Niru Das, mother of the victim-cum-informant
	of the case.
PW-3	Dr. Ritu Saikia who examined the victim.
PW-4	Smt. Purnima Das, housewife.
PW-5	Sri Pinku Das, elder brother of victim.
PW-6	Smt. Sewali Das, housewife.
PW-7	Smt. Jyotishna Hazarika, another housewife.
PW-8	Md. Samsuddin, S.I. of police.

COURT WITNESS:- NIL

EXHIBITS FOR THE PROSECUTION:-

Exhibit-1	Statement of the victim under Section 164 Cr.P.C.
Exhibit-2	Ejahar
Exhibit-3	Medical report of victim
Exhibit-4	Seizure-list
Exhibit-5	Sketch Map of the place of occurrence with index
Exhibit-6	Charge-sheet

MATERIAL EXHIBIT:- NIL

DEFENCE WITNESSES:- NONE

Special Judge, Jorhat.

Typed & transcribed by:

Sri Mrinal Jyoti Bora, (Stenographer Grade-I)