

GAHC010061632021



**THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)**

Case No. : Crl.A./94/2021

MITHUN RAJBONGSHI
S/O- SRI GAMBHIR RAJBONGSHI, R/O- VILL.- KALBARI, P.O. AND P.S.
GORESWAR, DIST.- BAKSA, ASSAM, PIN- 781366.

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM AND ANR.
REP. BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, ASSAM

2:MANESWAR RAJBONGSHI
S/O SRI RAMESH RAJBONGSHI
R/O VILLAGE KOLBARI
PO AND PS GORESWAR
DIST. BAKSA
ASSAM
PIN-78136

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. A PAUL

Advocate for the Respondent : Mr. K.K. Parasar, Additional Public Prosecutor

Date of judgment: 28.02.2024

BEFORE

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MRIDUL KUMAR KALITA

JUDGMENT & ORDER (CAV)

1. Heard Mr. A. Paul, learned counsel for the appellant. Also heard Mr. K.K. Parasar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the State of Assam.

2. This appeal under Section 374(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 has been filed by the appellant, Sri Mithun Rajbongshi impugning the judgment and order dated 30.01. 2021 passed by learned Special Judge (POCSO), Baksa, Mushalpur in Spl. (POCSO) Case No. 08 of 2018, whereby the appellant was convicted under Section 4 of the POCSO Act, 2012 and was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 10 years and to pay a fine of Rs. 10,000/- only and in default of payment of fine to suffer further simple imprisonment for a period of one month.

3. The facts relevant for consideration of the instant appeal, in brief, are as follows:-

i. On 29.01.2017, one Maneswar Rajbongshi had lodged an FIR (First Information Report) before the In-charge of Suagpur Police Outpost under Goreswar Police Station, *inter-alia*, alleging that on 23.01.2017, at about 7.00 PM, his minor daughter 'X' (real name not disclosed to protect the identity of the victim) was at the house of the neighbour of the first informant sitting by the side of the fire and at that time the appellant went there and enticed and lured her to go to the homestead of one Kamleswar Rajbongshi and thereafter, subjected her to forceful sexual intercourse at that place. It is also stated in the FIR that in connection with the incident, a village meeting (*Bichar*) was convened on 24.01.2017, wherein the appellant denied the commission of the alleged offence.

- ii.** Upon receipt of the said FIR, the In-charge of Suagpur Police Outpost made a General Diary Entry, namely GD Entry No. 393 dated 29.01.2017 and forwarded the FIR to the Officer-In-Charge of Goreswar Police Station for registration of a case.
- iii.** Upon receipt of said FIR, the Officer-In-Charge of Goreswar Police Station registered Goreswar P.S. Case No. 8/2017 under Section 4 of the POCSO Act, 2012 and initiated the investigation.
- iv.** Upon completion of the investigation, the charge sheet was laid against the present appellant under Section 4 of the POCSO Act, 2012.
- v.** The case being triable by the Court of Special Judge, it was ultimately transferred to the court of learned Special Judge (POCSO), Baksa, who by order dated 04.02.2019 framed formal charge under Section 4 of the POCSO Act, 2012 against the present appellant. When the said charge was read over and explained to the appellant, he pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.
- vi.** For bringing home the charge framed against the present appellant, the prosecution side examined as many as 8(eight) prosecution witnesses. The appellant was examined under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 during which he pleaded his innocence and denied the truthfulness of the testimony of prosecution witnesses. The appellant declined to

adduce any evidence in his defence. However, by the judgement which has been impugned in this appeal, the trial court convicted and sentenced the appellant in the manner as already described in paragraph No.2 hereinbefore.

4. Before considering the rival submissions made by learned counsel for both the sides, let me go through the evidence of prosecution witnesses which is available on record.

5. PW-1, Sri Maneswar Rajbongshi, who is also the first informant in this case has deposed that on the fateful day at about 7:30 PM the appellant went to his house asking for his handcart and on being refused, he went to the house of Suren Rajbongshi where the victim girl was sitting. PW-1 has further stated that by means of inducement, the appellant took the victim girl to the back side of the house of one Kamleswar Rajbongshi and forcefully committed penetrative sexual assault upon the victim girl and that this incident was witnessed by Suren Rajbongshi in the light of his torch, when the appellant fled away therefrom. PW-1 further stated that the victim girl returned home crying and reported the incident to him, whereupon he reported the matter to the village President and Secretary who assured him of a settlement but as no settlement could be arrived at, despite calling of '*bichars*' (*village meeting*) twice, he filed the '*ejahar*'. PW-1 exhibited the '*ejahar*' as Ext. 1 and his signature thereon as Ext. 1(1). PW-1 stated that the victim girl was sixteen and a half years old, at the time of the occurrence.

5.1. During cross examination PW-1, stated that he had not submitted any documents in respect of the local '*bichaar*' called by him or any documents in proof of the victim's age. He further stated that nobody resides in the house of Kamleswar Rajbongshi. PW-1 denied the defence suggestion that he wished to

marry off his daughter to the appellant and when the appellant refused the proposal he filed a false case against the appellant. PW-1 denied having omitted to state before the police that Suren Rajbongshi saw the alleged occurrence in the light of a torch and that appellant fled away from the place of occurrence while the victim returned home crying and reported the occurrence to him. He also denied having omitted to state before the police that he reported about the alleged incident to the president and secretary of the village immediately and they had called local '*bichars*' twice but no settlement could be arrived at. Several suggestive questions were asked to the PW-1 by the learned defence counsel, which were all answered in negative by him.

6. PW-2, Smt. Sonali Rajbongshi, has deposed that on the fateful day at about 7:30 PM, when the victim girl was sitting near the fire in the house of one Suren Rajbongshi, the appellant went to the said place and on the pretext of discussing some matter, brought out the victim girl to the road from the house of Suren Rajbongshi and took her to the backyard of the house of one Kamleswar Rajbongshi. PW-2 stated that one Soneswar Rajbongshi reported to her about the act of the appellant taking away the victim girl and requiring her to go to the spot with him, whereupon she, along with Soneswar, went to the place of occurrence where she could see the appellant with the victim girl by means of a torch light and that the appellant fled away therefrom. PW-2 has also stated that the victim girl returned home crying and narrated the incident, learning which the informant reported the matter to the President and Secretary of the village and thereafter '*bichars*' on three dates were called, but as no solution could be found out, the informant filed the ejahar. PW-2 stated that she accompanied the victim girl to the hospital for her medical

examination and that the victim girl was 16 and a half years of age at the time of occurrence. She exhibited the victim's medical report as Exhibit-2 and her signature thereon as Exhibit-2(1).

6.1. During cross examination, the PW-2 has deposed that she had stated the age of the victim girl based on estimation only and that she had not seen the victim's birth certificate. She clarified that she had not seen the appellant taking away the victim girl from the house of Suren Rajbongshi. She denied the defence suggestion of having omitted to state before the police that the informant reported about the incident on the same night to the President and Secretary of the village or that '*bichars*' were called in connection with the occurrence. Several suggestive questions were asked to the PW-2 by the learned defence counsel, which were all answered in negative by her.

7. PW-3, Sri Suren Rajbongshi, has deposed that on the fateful day at about 8:00 PM, the victim girl and some villagers were sitting by the fire in his courtyard to warm themselves, when the appellant came to his house and smeared some liquid lime on the victim's body and the victim retaliated by giving the appellant a slap and leaving his house. PW-3 also stated that after about 10 minutes of the victim's exit the appellant also left his place and after sometime he heard a hue and cry outside his house and could learn that one Soneswar had seen the appellant and victim girl running away from the backside of the house of Kamleswar in the torch light and that the victim girl had reported to him that the appellant had established physical relations with her and that '*bichar*' was called and as no result was yielded, so the informant filed the case.

7.1. During cross-examination, the PW-3 denied the defence suggestion of his omitting to state before the police that Soneswar had seen the appellant and

the victim running away or that a local '*bichar*' was called in connection with the occurrence.

8. PW-4, Smt. Jamini Rajbongshi, deposed similarly to that of PW-3, however, during cross-examination she stated that she had not seen the victim and the appellant leaving her place or for that matter the alleged occurrence.

9. PW-5, Soneswar Rajbongshi, has deposed that on the fateful night at about 8:00 PM, when he was standing on the road, he saw the appellant and the victim going towards the house of Kamleswar. He along with Sonali Rajbongshi went to the house of Kamleswar and saw the appellant and the victim in a compromising position in the torch light and that both of them fled away therefrom and that thereafter he and Sonali raised hue and cry. The victim went to the house of Khargeswar and reported the incident to him. PW-5 stated that on the next day a local '*bichar*' was called but as no settlement could be found out and the informant filed the case.

9.1. During his cross-examination PW-5 denied having withholding the information from the police that he had seen the appellant and the victim in a compromising position in the torch light or that a local '*bichar*' was held.

10. PW-6, Dr. Dipti Baishya, has deposed that she examined the victim girl at the SMK Civil Hospital, Nalbari on 01.02.2017 at 12.45 PM. on being escorted by WPC 51 Chandana Boro and found the following on examination of the victim:

Examination of external genitalia:

Labia Majora: Healthy

Labia Minora: Healthy

Fourchette: Healthy

Vulva: Healthy

Perineum: Healthy.

Hymen: Torn old tear.

Vagina and cervix: Healthy. Vaginal swab was sent for microscopic test. No sperm was seen.

Opinion: the victim is above 16 years and below 18 years of age (from X-ray finding) X-Ray No. R.756.

Beta HCG test-Negative.

Ultrasonography of lower abdomen also shows no significance.

Hence she is not pregnant till date.

Vaginal swabs shows: no spermatozoa.

10.1. PW-6-exhibited the victim's medical report as Exhibit-2, her signatures thereon as Exhibit-2(2), Exhibit-2(3) and Exhibit-2(4), the victim's ultrasonography report as Exhibit-3. Victim's X-Ray report as Exhibit-4, signatures of Dr. Prabudh Kumar Sarma which she knew as Exhibit-3(1) and Exhibit-4(1).

10.2. During cross-examination PW-6 stated that she had not found any mark of violence or recent sexual intercourse in the victim's private part or body nor did she find any injury on the victim's person. In response to a query of defence she stated that old hymen tear could have been due to the activity of cycling also.

11. PW-7, the victim girl 'X' has deposed that on the fateful evening at about 7:00 PM when she was sitting in the house of Suren Rajbongshi, the appellant came and asked her to accompany him to the back side of the house of Kamleswar Rajbongshi as he had something to tell her. The appellant in the backyard of Kamleswar Rajbongshi forcibly opened her salwar and subjected her to sexual intercourse. This incident was seen by Soneswar Rajbongshi and Sonali Rajbongshi in the torchlight. PW-7 'X' stated that on being seen, the appellant fled away, while she went to her house escorted by her parents, Soneswar and Sonali. PW-7 also stated that village meetings were called for two times but the appellant refused to admit his guilt and thereafter her father

lodged the case. PW-7 exhibited her medical examination report as Exhibit-2, her signatures thereon as Exhibit- 2(5) and Exhibit-2(6), her X-Ray report as Exhibit-4 and her signature thereon as Exhibit-4(2) and her statement recorded under Section 164 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 as Exhibit-5 and her signatures thereon as Exhibit-5(1) and Exhibit-5(2).

11.1. During cross-examination, PW-7 denied having omitted to state in her statement under Section 164 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 that Sonali and Soneswar had seen the appellant and herself in the backyard of Kamleswar, from where the appellant ran away. She disclosed that she did not raised any alarm when the appellant took her to the backyard of Kamaleswar Rajbongshi, and that some days prior to the alleged occurrence the appellant proposed to have love affairs with her and in that connection she had talks with him. She further disclosed that she is presently married and does not know her date of birth. She denied the defence suggestion of having love affairs with the appellant, for which she was sent to her sister's house in Punjab to arrange her marriage thereat.

12. PW-8, Sri Upen Haloi, ASI, who is the Investigating Officer of the case, has deposed that on receipt of an *ejahar* lodged by the informant on 29.01.2017 at Suagpur Outpost, he made a GD entry No. 393 dated 29.01.2017 and forwarded the *ejahar* to the Goreswar police station for registration of a case and on being entrusted with the responsibility of investigation he visited the place of occurrence, recorded the statement of the witnesses, caused the victim's medical examination, got the victim's statement recorded in Court, and collected the victim's medical examination report etc. and thereafter finding sufficient materials against the appellant arrested him and on completion of investigation handed over the case diary for submission

of Charge sheet and accordingly the then Officer-in-Charge of Goreswar Police Station Dilip Kumar Saikia submitted the charge-sheet against the appellant under Section 4 of POCSO Act.

12.1. PW-8 exhibited ejahar as Exhibit-1 and his signature thereon as Exhibit-1(2), the signature of then Officer-in-Charge, Goreswar P.S. Dilip Kumar Saikia as Exhibit-1(3), the sketch map of the place of occurrence as Exhibit-6, his signature thereon as Ext 6(1), Charge-Sheet as Exhibit-7 and the signature of Dillip Kumar Saikia the then Officer-in-Charge of Goreswar P.S. as Exhibit-7(1).

12.2. During cross examination, PW-8 revealed that he had not seized any article from the place of occurrence nor had he collected the victim's age certificate or any papers in connection with village '*bichars*'. PW-8 confirmed the fact that PW-1 had not stated before him that Suren Rajbongshi had seen the occurrence in the torch light and that the accused fled away from the place of occurrence while the victim returned home crying and thereafter reported the incident to him. PW-8 affirmed that PW-2 had not stated before him that informant had reported about the occurrence on the same night to the President and Secretary of the village. PW-8 also confirmed that PW-3 Suren Rajbongshi did not state before him that Soneswar had seen the appellant running away from the place of occurrence. PW8 also affirmed that PW-5, Soneswar Rajbongshi had not stated before him that he had seen the appellant and the victim in a compromising position, but averred that PW-5 had stated before him that he had seen the appellant running away in the light of the torch.

13. The appellant was examined under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 during which he denied the truthfulness of the testimony of

prosecution witnesses and pleaded his innocence. The appellant has also stated that he has been implicated by the victim girl by lodging a false FIR against him with an intention to get married with him as he was seen as an eligible bachelor. The appellant during his examination under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 has also admitted going to the house of Suren Rajbongshi, but he has denied the fact that he took the victim girl to the house of Kamleswar Rajbongshi. He has also stated that the victim after falsely implicated him in the case by lodging a false FIR, herself got married after some time. The appellant declined to adduce any evidence in his defence.

14. Mr. A. Paul, learned counsel for the appellant has submitted that the trial court has come to the conclusion of the guilt of the appellant wrongly without considering the inherent contradictions in the testimony of prosecution witnesses. Learned counsel for the appellant has submitted that the FIR in this case was lodged after a delay of six days, however, there was no proper explanation for the delay. The only explanation which was given that there was a village meeting, however, no evidence of village meeting being held has been adduced in the trial.

15. Learned counsel for the appellant has also submitted that the trial court has erred in coming to the conclusion that the victim girl was major when the incident had occurred, in spite of the fact that the doctor who examined the victim, i.e., PW-6 had opined on the basis of radiological test that the age of the victim would be above 16 years and below 18 years. Under such circumstances, the trial court ought to have given the margin of error in the age as ascertained by radiological examination by two years on either side as observed by the Supreme Court of India in the case of "**Jaya Mala -Vs-**

Home Secretary, Government of Jammu and Kashmir and Ors."
reported in "**(1982) 2 SCC 538**".

16. The learned counsel for the appellant has submitted that had the benefit of margin of error of two years have been given to the appellant in ascertaining the age of the victim, the victim would have been regarded as a major at the time of commission of the offence and thereby the question of consent would have been material in that case.

17. The learned counsel for the appellant has also submitted that the trial court has ignored the medical evidence of the PW-6 wherein he had stated that no injury was found on the private parts of the victim girl and nothing was there to ascertain to come to the conclusion that she was subjected to sexual intercourse except an old hymen tear, which was detected. According to the PW-6, it could have also been caused due to other activities like cycling etc.

18. The learned counsel for the appellant has also submitted that the trial court has ignored the testimony of the victim girl to the effect that she herself accompanied the appellant to the backside of the House of Kamleswar Rajbongshi and she did not make any hue and cry which could have alarmed the other people there. It is also submitted by the learned counsel for the appellant that the testimony of PW-5 Soneswar Rajbongshi who has claimed to have seen the victim as well as the appellant in a compromising position is also relevant. He deposed that when he saw the appellant as well as the victim in the torch light, both of them fled away. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the appellant that if the victim had been taken there without her own consent, there was no reason for her to flee away from that place when they were witnessed by the PW-5 and PW-2. It is submitted that the victim

girl, being a major was a consenting party and when they were noticed by the PW-2 and PW-5 and other people of the locality, she had falsely implicated the appellant of forceful sexual intercourse only to save herself from humiliation. It is also submitted by the learned counsel for the appellant that in her statement given under Section 164 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, the victim girl had named two other persons, namely, Butu and Pranjali, who had witnessed the appellant and the victim when they were together, however, neither Butu nor Pranjali were examined as prosecution witnesses.

19. On the other hand, Mr. K. K. Parasari, learned Additional Public Prosecutor has submitted that the trial court has correctly arrived at the conclusion of guilt of the present appellant as the victim girl as well as PW-2 and PW-5, have clearly implicated the appellant in the offence alleged against him. It is also submitted by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor that the delay in lodging the FIR in the instant case has been explained by the prosecution witnesses as the delay was caused due to holding of village meetings (*Bichar*) in resolving the issue amongst the villagers and it is only when the village meeting failed, the father of the victim was compelled to lodge an FIR.

20. It is also submitted by the learned Additional public Prosecutor that the age of the victim has been stated to be 16½ years by her father as well as herself and PW-2 and the doctor i.e., PW-6 has also ascertained the age of the victim to be more than 16 years and less than 18 years. It is submitted by learned Additional Public Prosecutor that the oral testimony regarding the age of the victim has been corroborated by medical evidence and the trial court was not wrong in ascertaining the age of the victim girl to be less than 18 years. It is also submitted by learned Additional Public Prosecutor that under

the facts and circumstances of this case the trial court has rightly come to the conclusion of the guilt of the appellant on the basis of evidence available on record and the impugned judgment does not warrant any interference by this Appellate Court.

21. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for both the sides and have perused the evidence on record carefully.

22. In the instant case ascertainment of the age of the victim girl at the time of the commission and the time of the incident is relevant for the adjudication of this case as the charge against the appellant was framed under Section 4 of the POCSO Act, 2012.

23. For ascertaining the age of the victim in an offence where the consent of the victim is relevant, the criteria for ascertaining the age of a juvenile may be taken as a yardstick as per the observation made by the Supreme Court of India in the case of "***Mahadeo s/o Kerba Maske –Vs- State of Maharashtra and Anr.***" reported in "***(2013) 14 SCC 637***" wherein it was observed by the Apex Court as follows: -

"12. We can also in this connection make reference to a statutory provision contained in the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Rules, 2007, where under Rule 12, the procedure to be followed in determining the age of a juvenile has been set out. We can usefully refer to the said provision in this context, inasmuch as under Rule 12(3) of the said Rules, it is stated that:

"12. (3) In every case concerning a child or juvenile in conflict with law, the age determination inquiry shall be conducted by the court or the Board or, as the case may be, by the Committee by seeking

evidence by obtaining—

- (a)(i) the matriculation or equivalent certificates, if available; and in the absence whereof;
- (ii) the date of birth certificate from the school (other than a play school) first attended; and in the absence whereof;
- (iii) the birth certificate given by a corporation or a municipal authority or a Panchayat;"

Under Rule 12(3)(b), it is specifically provided that only in the absence of alternative methods described under Rules 12(3)(a)(i) to (iii), the medical opinion can be sought for. In the light of such a statutory rule prevailing for ascertainment of the age of a juvenile, in our considered opinion, the same yardstick can be rightly followed by the courts for the purpose of ascertaining the age of a victim as well."

24. It is only in absence of any certificate of age as mentioned in the foregoing paragraph the ascertainment of age of the victim can be done by radiological examination. However, as observed by the Apex Court in the case of "**Jaya Mala -Vs- Home Secretary, Government of Jammu and Kashmir and Ors.**" (*supra*) one can take judicial notice that the margin of error in age ascertained by radiological examination is two years on either side and in case of ascertainment of age through radiological examination, the benefit of margin of error in ascertainment of age would always go to the accused, in this case the appellant. In the considered opinion of this Court, the trial court has erred in denying the benefit of the margin of two years in the estimation of age to the present appellant only by observing that no child who does not have a birth certificate and whose medical evidence is determined to

be within the range of medical evidence will get justice under POCSO Act, 2012.

25. For invoking the provisions of POCSO Act, 2012 the primary requirement is that the victim has to be a minor and the ascertainment of age of the victim is crucial in such cases and it is incumbent on the prosecution side to adduce sufficient evidence to show that the victim was a minor when the incident had occurred. In the instant case, the evidence available on record is of two kinds, one is the oral evidence of PW-1, PW-2 and PW-7 where they have stated that the victim is of sixteen and a half years of age, however, it appears that the oral testimony of the above mentioned witnesses is only rough estimation of the age of the victim and the more reliable evidence is the evidence of PW-6 where the age of the victim has been ascertained on the basis of radiological examination to be more than sixteen years and less than eighteen years and under such circumstances the margin of error of two years on either side has to be taken and the appellant is entitled to get benefit from the margin of error in case where the age of the victim has been ascertained on the basis of radiological examination only. In the instant case if we give the benefit of the margin of error in the age of the victim ascertained by radiological examination, the age of the victim would be more than 18 years at the time of commission of alleged offence. Therefore, in the considered opinion of this Court, the victim would be regarded as major at the time of commission of alleged offence and the appellant would get benefit from the variation of the margin of two years in ascertainment of the age of the victim.

26. As regards the question as to whether the victim had been subjected to sexual intercourse or not, the evidence of the doctor who examined the victim

girl, i.e., PW-6 shows that no marks of any violence or recent sexual intercourse were found during the medical examination of the victim girl nor did she find any injuries on the person of the victim girl. Though the victim, while deposing as PW-7 has stated that the appellant had asked her to accompany him to the back side of the house of Kamleswar Rajbongshi as he had something to tell her and when she accompanied him, he had subjected her to sexual intercourse. However, during her cross examination, she has stated that she did not raise any alarm and also stated that some days prior to alleged occurrence, the appellant proposed to have love affairs with her. The conduct of the victim girl in voluntarily accompanying the appellant to the backyard of the house of Kamleswar Rajbongshi, which is a secluded place, and thereafter making no hue and cry when the appellant had sexual intercourse with her itself indicate that the victim was a consenting party. It also appears that from the testimony of PW5-, namely, Soneswar Rajbongshi who has deposed that when he saw the appellant and the victim in a compromising position in the torch light, both of them fled away therefrom and thereafter it is only the PW-2 and PW-5 who made hue and cry and not the victim girl herself. The act of victim girl running away also indicates that the victim was not forcefully taken there and she was a consenting party to the said act. The circumstances under which the victim and the appellant were found by the PW-2 and PW-5 itself shows that when the appellant ran away from the place of occurrence the victim was left with no other option but to allege that she was subjected to forcible sexual intercourse whereas the conduct prior to detection of their acts by PW-2, PW-5 and other people shows that the act was consensual in nature and as the victim has been ascertained as major for the reasons stated in the foregoing paragraphs of this judgment,

the appellant is entitled to the benefit of doubt which this court hereby gives to him.

27. For the reasons mentioned above, this Court is of considered opinion that the evidence on record falls short of showing that the victim girl was minor at the time of the alleged incident and that she was subjected to forcible sexual intercourse. The evidence on record only suggests that the act was consensual and therefore the appellant is entitled to get the benefit of doubt in this case which this Court hereby gives to him. The conviction and sentence imposed on the appellant by the trial court under Section 4 of the POCSO Act, 2012 is, therefore, liable to be set aside and accordingly set aside.

28. This appeal is accordingly allowed.

29. The appellant is set at liberty forthwith.

30. Let the record of the trial court be sent back to the trial court along with a copy of this judgment.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant