

CNR : MHCC020105042017



Presented on : 15-09-2017

Registered on : 15-09-2017

Decided on : 03-02-2023

Duration : Y-5 : M-4 : Ds.-19

POCSO Special Case No.431 OF 2017

Exh. - 23

Form No. XXXII

Part 'A'

IN THE SPECIAL COURT FOR PROTECTION OF CHILDREN FROM SEXUAL OFFENCES ACT, 2012 AT FORT, GR. BOMBAY Present : S.C. JADHAV, The Designated Court under Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act,2012. (03/02/2023) <u>POCSO SPECIAL CASE NO.431 OF 2017</u>	
(FIR No. 159/2017, U/s.354, 354-D of IPC @ Sec. 12 of POCSO Act of Deonar Police Station).	
Complainant	State of Maharashtra Through Deonar Police Station.
Presented by	Mrs. Veena Shelar, Ld SPP for the State.
Accused	Santosh Jotiram Talekar Age: 32 yrs., Occ.: Service. R/A : P.L. Lokhande Marg, Dadasaheb Gaikwad Nagar, Lane No.20, Govandi, Mumbai.
Presented by	Shri. D.G. Gujral, Ld. Advocate for accused.

Part 'B'

Date of Offence	13/07/2017
Date of FIR	14/07/2017
Date of Charge-sheet	15/09/2017
Date of framing of charges	14/12/2018
Date of commencement of evidence	21/01/2022
Date on which judgment is reserved	03/02/2023
Date of the Judgment	03/02/2023
Date of the sentencing order, if any.	03/02/2023

Accused Details

Rank of the accused	Name of accused	Date of arrest	Date of release on bail	Offences charges with	Wither acquitted or convicted	Sentences imposed	Period of detention undergone during Trial for purpose of Section 428 of Cr.P.C.
1	Santosh Jotiram Talekar	14 th July 2017	20 th April 2018 From 05 th November 2022 to 03 rd February 2023	U/s. 354, 354-D of IPC and u/s. 12 of POCSO Act,	<u>Convicted</u> u/s.354 of IPC.	R.I. for One year and to pay fine of Rs.3000/- I.d. S.I. for one month	Year 1 Days 7

Part 'C'**List of prosecution/ defence/ Court witnesses****A. Prosecution**

Rank	Name	Nature of witness
PW-1	'L'	Victim
PW-2	Jaya Ghanshyam Bai	Neighbour

PW-3	'S'	Informant-victim's mother
PW-4	Shahid Ulla Khan	Pancha witness
PW-5	PSI Pradeep Bhitade	Investigating Officer
PW-6	PSI Minakshi Bhosale	First I.O.

B. Defence witness, if any:

Rank	Name	Nature of witness
DW-1	–	–

C. Court witness, if any:

Rank	Name	Nature of witness
CW-1	–	–

List of prosecution/ defence/ Court exhibits.**A. Prosecution**

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1.	Exh.4	Statement of victim u/s. 164 of Cr.P.C.
2.	Exh- 13	FIR
3.	Exh-17	Spot Panchanama dated 14/07/2017
4.	Exh- 18	Arrest panchanama
5.	Exh-19 (colly)	Medical reports (Admitted by defence)

B. Defence witness :

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1.	–	–

C. Court exhibits :

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1.	Exh.5	Charge
2.	Exh.6	Plea of accused
3.	Exh.21	Statement of accused u/s. 313 of Cr.P.C.

D. Material Objects:

Sr. No.	Material Object Number	Description

JUDGMENT

(Delivered on 3rd day of February, 2023)

Accused stands prosecuted for the offences punishable under Sections 354, 354-D of the Indian Penal Code and under Section 12 of Protection of Children From Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (here-in-after referred as “IPC” and “POCSO Act”) for outraging modesty of the victim- a child of 16 years and sexually harassing her.

(In view of Sec.228-A of the IPC and Sec.33(7) of the POCSO Act, name of victim and her mother is not disclosed to protect their identity).

2. Facts giving rise to prosecution case are as under:

On 14/07/2017, informant – mother of victim approached to Deonar Police Station and filed report. She alleged that on 13/07/2017, at about 8.00 pm, the victim returned home crying and disclosed that when she was in the market with her aunty (PW 2), accused stalked her. When the victim was purchasing vegetables, he came from her backside, took out 100/- rupees note and moved it on her lips and said “तू ऐसी क्या बोल रही है, मैं तुझे लाईक करता हूँ और तु इतना क्यूँ भाव खा रही है”. People gathered there and therefore, the victim returned home. The informant then, along with victim went to the house of accused, but he abused them which resulted into filing of this report. On the basis of her report, Crime No.159/2017 came to be registered against him for the offences punishable under Sections 354, 354-D of IPC and under Section 12 of the POCSO Act.

3. Investigation swung into motion. PSI Minakshi Bhosale (PW 6)

visited the spot of incident and prepared spot panchanama. She then sent the victim for Medical examination and also recorded statement of victim. She then arrested the accused by following due process of law. She also collected the birth certificate of the victim and got recorded her statement under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. She further recorded the statement of witnesses and after completion of investigation filed the charge-sheet.

4. My predecessor has framed the charge at Exh-5 for the offence punishable under Sections 354, 354-D of IPC and under Section 12 of POCSO Act, to which accused pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried. The plea of the accused is recorded at Exh.6. To prove the charge prosecution examined in all six witnesses. After recording the evidence of the prosecution witnesses the circumstances appearing against the accused were brought to his notice and explained to him. The reply given by the accused were recorded in his statement recorded u/s. 313 of Cr.P.C. The accused has denied the incriminating evidence and claimed innocence.

5. Heard Learned Special P.P. Smt. Veena Shelar for the State. She submitted that the prosecution has proved FIR through the informant - mother of the victim. The testimony PW-1 victim is consistent. Victim has deposed that accused has committed sexual harassment to her in public place. Her testimony is corroborated by PW 2. Rest of the prosecution witnesses, though are formal witnesses, have supported the prosecution. Considering this evidence on record, she submitted that as the guilt of the accused is proved to the hilt, he be convicted for the charges.

6. *Per contra*, Ld. Advocate Shri. D.G. Gujral for the defence has vehemently submitted that prosecution has miserably failed to prove the guilt of the accused. Evidence of informant is absolutely hearsay evidence. The version of the victim is unreliable. The happening of the alleged incident is highly impossible in a public place. There is no independent witness examined by the prosecution. Therefore, he prayed that the accused be given benefit of doubt and he be acquitted of the charges. He has also filed written notes of arguments.

7. Taking into consideration the evidence on record, arguments of Ld. SPP for the State and the Ld. Defence Advocate for the accused, following points arise for my determination and I gave my findings accordingly.

Sr. No.	POINTS	FINDINGS
1.	Does the prosecution prove that the victim was 'child' at the time of incident?	In the Affirmative.
2.	Does the prosecution prove that on 13/07/2017, at about 8.00 pm at vegetable stall in Govandi, Mumbai, accused used criminal force to victim with intent to outrage her modesty and thereby committed an offence punishable u/s. 354 of IPC?	In the Affirmative.
3.	Does the prosecution prove that on the aforesaid period, time and place, accused followed and contacted or attempted to contact the victim to foster personal interaction repeatedly, despite a clear indication of disinterest by	As prosecution has proved offence u/s. 354 of IPC, offence u/s. 354 D of IPC being implicit in Section 354 of IPC finding on this point

Sr. No.	POINTS	FINDINGS
	victim and thereby committed an offence of stalking punishable under Section 354-D of IPC?	become redundant.
4.	Does the prosecution prove that on the aforesaid date, time and place, accused committed sexual harassment upon victim – a minor by uttering words “तू ऐसी क्या बोल रही है, मैं तुझे लाईक करता हूँ और तु इतना क्यों भाव खा रही है” and thereby committed an offence punishable under Section 12 of the POCSO Act, 2012?	In the Affirmative.
5	What order?	Accused is convicted u/s. 354 of IPC and u/s.12 of POCSO Act.

REASONS

As to Point No. 1 :

8. Since the accused is charged for the offence punishable under Section 12 of the POCSO Act, it is for the prosecution to prove that victim was ‘child’ on the date of incident. Prosecution claims that the incident took place on 13/07/2017 and on that day, the victim was 16 years old. To prove her age, the prosecution relied on the testimony of victim wherein she testified that her date of birth is 18/06/2001 and during investigation, she has handed over her birth certificate to the police. The testimony of PW 3 – mother of the victim is also in the line of victim. Prosecution has produced the original birth certificate (Exh.10) on record. The tenor of cross-examination goes to show that defence has not challenged the age as well as date of birth as stated by

the victim during cross-examination of victim and PW 3.

9. Bare perusal of Section 35 of Indian Evidence Act makes it clear that if entry is made by public servant in the official book in discharge of his official duty, then such entry becomes a relevant fact and admissible in evidence. The extract of birth register maintained by public officer in discharge of his public duty is, as such, admissible u/s. 35 of Indian Evidence Act and it is not necessary to examine the officer who records such an entry. This being so, birth certificate (Exh.10) does not require any formal proof. Therefore, I hold that date of birth of victim is 18/06/2001. Since the incident in question occurred on 13/07/2017 as per the prosecution's case, upon calculation the victim was 16 years i.e below 18 years of age. Therefore, I hold the prosecution has proved that on the day of incident victim was a 'Child' within meaning of Section 2(d) of POCSO Act. Hence, I answer **point No.1 in affirmative.**

As to Point Nos.2 to 4 :

10. As all these points are interlinked and interwoven, they are discussed together to avoid the repetition of facts. Before starting discussion, it is necessary to go through Section 354 of the IPC as well as Section 11 of the POCSO Act. Outraging a modesty of a woman is punishable u/s. 354 of IPC. The section defines that :

“Whoever assaults or uses criminal force to any woman, intending to outrage or knowing it to be likely that he will thereby outrage her modesty, shall be punishable with imprisonment of either description for a

term which shall not be less than one year but which may extend to five years and shall also be liable to fine. ”

11. One of the ingredient of Section 354 of IPC is 'assault'. The term 'assault' is defined in Section 351 of IPC which states that :

Whoever makes any gesture, or any preparation intending or knowing it to be likely that such gesture or preparation will cause any person present to apprehend that he who makes that gesture or preparation is about to use criminal force to that person, is said to commit an assault.

12. Whereas Section 11 of POCSO Act deals with the offence of sexual harassment of a minor and the same is as under :-

A person is said to commit sexual harassment upon a child when such person with sexual intent -

(i) utters any word or makes any sound, or makes any gesture or exhibits any object or part of body with the intention that such word or sound shall be heard, or such gesture or object or part of body shall be seen by the child ;

or.....

(ii)...

(iii)...

(iv)...

(v)...

(vi)...

13. In order to prove the above ingredients against accused, prosecution examined in all six witnesses. Out of them, PW 1 is victim, PW 2 – Jaya Bai, a neighbour, PW 3 - the mother of victim. She is informant in this case. PW 4 Shahid Ulla Khan is the pancha witness of spot panchanama. PW 5 Pradeep Bhitade is I.O. and PW 6 Minakshi Bhosale is Station House Officer. While recording the statement of accused under Section 313 of Cr.P.C. he merely denied the incriminating circumstances against him.

14. PW 1 victim is a star witness of prosecution. Therefore, her evidence is discussed first. It is her evidence that on 13/07/2017, at 8.00 pm, she went to market with aunty (PW 2), accused Santosh Talekar stalked her. He came from her right side and moved a 100/- rupee note on her lips. She further testified that when she saw towards him in anger, he said “ तू ऐसी क्यों कर रही है तू इतना भाव क्यों खा रही ” then, she returned and narrated the incident to mother (PW 3). According to victim, thereafter, she along with her mother went to the house of accused, but, he abused her mother in filthy language. Therefore, on the same day, at night, she went to Deonar Police Station and filed report. Police recorded her statement. She was sent for medical examination. She showed the spot of incident to the police. Police collected her birth certificate. She was also taken to Kurla Court for recording her statement.

15. It is her evidence that the accused used to stalk her while going to

college. He used to whistle at her and pass bad comments. The accused had threatened her father by saying that “ तेरी बेटी कॉलेज जाती है धंदा करने जाती है” Lastly, she testified that accused had threatened her that he will stab her and her mother with knife. Therefore, her mother filed report.

16. It is gathered from her cross-examination that accused is residing in her vicinity. The incident took place in a market near her vicinity at Govandi and it is a crowded area. She did not shout nor her aunty (PW 2) interfere at the time of incident. According to her, at the time of recording her statement, she had stated before the police that accused used to stalk her, whistle at her and pass bad comments at her. She has also stated before police that she had informed her father about it, but accused had threatened her father by saying that “तेरी बेटी कॉलेज जाती है धंदा करने जाती है”. She has also stated before police that accused had threatened her that he will stab her as well as her mother. But she could not assign any reason as to why these facts are not written in her statement before police. However, she has denied that there was quarrel between her mother and family of the accused and therefore, false complaint is filed against accused.

17. To corroborate victim, prosecution further examined PW 2- Jayabai. It is her evidence that on 13/07/2017, she went to the market with victim at about 8.00 pm. At that time, accused came from backside. He was chasing them. He took a note of Rs.100/-, and moved it on the lips of victim. PW 2 further testified that victim became angry. People gathered there. Then, she returned home and narrated the incident to the mother of victim – PW 3. Thereafter, victim's mother went to the house of accused, but he abused her. Therefore, they went

to police station. Police recorded her statement. She also identified accused in the court.

18. It is gathered from her cross-examination, when the victim shouted in the market, people were gathered, but nobody came for their help. Rest of the cross-examination of this witness is in denial.

19. The mother of victim - informant deposed as PW 3. According to her, on 13/07/2017, victim went to the market to purchase vegetables with her sister in law (PW 2) at evening. After sometime, victim returned crying. On inquiry, victim disclosed that Santosh Talekar, who stays in Lane No.20 came and moved Rs.100/- currency note on her lips and said “ मैं तुझे लाईक करता हूँ, तू भाव क्यों खाती है ” Then, she took the victim to the house of accused, but accused abused her. She then went to Deonar Police Station and filed report (Exh.13). Police recorded statement of victim. Victim was taken to the hospital as well as to the Kurla Court to record the statement.

20. It emerges from her cross-examination that accused was present at police station at the time of recording her statement. She again clarified that he did not come voluntarily at police station, but he was brought at police station before recording her statement. Most of the cross-examination of this witness is also in denial.

21. PW 4 - Shahid Ulla Khan, is the panch witness of the spot panchanama. Unfortunately, he did not support the prosecution case. Though, prosecution cross-examined him at length, nothing incriminating brought on record during his cross-examination.

22. PW 5 – Pradeep Bhitade, PSI from Deonar Police Station. According to him, WPSI Minakshi Bhosale had registered the crime No.159/2017. During investigation, he recorded the statement of witnesses, collected birth certificate of the victim and after completion of investigation, he filed the charge-sheet. It is gathered from his cross-examination that he did not get any independent witness in this case. Further, he did not record the statement of any shop-keeper though the incident occurred in the market.

23. Prosecution lastly examined PW 6 - Minakshi Bhosale, Station House Officer of Deonar Police Station. According to her, on 14/07/2017 informant came to the Police station and filed report that one person who stays in her vicinity sexually harassed her daughter/victim. She recorded her statement as per her version and registered Crime No.159/17. Then she visited spot of incident and prepared Spot panchanama (Exh.17) in presence of panch witnesses. Victim was sent for medical examination. She further recorded the statement of victim and arrested accused. According to her, the victim was also referred for recording statement u/s. 164 of Cr.P.C. Nothing material is elicited in her cross-examination to discard her testimony with regard to investigation carried out by her.

24. The accused has not denied the identity. During the cross-examination of victim as well as PW 2, the defence has tried to bring on record the exact situation of the market i.e. spot of incident. Admittedly, in this case prosecution did not examine independent witness. The victim in her evidence has clearly testified about the act committed by the accused. It is her evidence that on 13/07/2017, at 8.00 pm, she

went to market with aunty (PW 2). Accused Santosh Talekar stalked her. He moved a 100/- rupee note on her lips and said “ तू ऐसी क्यों कर रही है तू इतना भाव क्यों खा रही ” then, she returned and narrated the incident to her mother (PW 3). She also testified that accused used to stalk her, whistle at her and pass bad comments. The accused had also threatened to stab her and her mother. The testimony of the victim is corroborated by PW 2 and PW 3. Various suggestions were given to the victim, PW 2 as well as to PW 3 which are immaterial and do not shake their testimony about the happening of core act committed by the accused. Though some omissions are brought on record by the defense, those omissions are not proved by the defense through the police witness - PW 6, who recorded the statement of the victim.

25. The testimony of victim is consistent with the report as well as her statement recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. There is no probability brought on record suggesting any previous enmity between the victim and accused, so as to falsely implicate him. There is nothing in her testimony to suggest that she was tutored in any manner so as to falsely depose against the accused. There is no reason to discard or disbelieve her version. She unequivocally stated before the Court the acts of the accused. Her evidence is not shaken during the cross-examination. Immediately after the occurrence of the incident, she returned home and narrated the incident to her mother. It is apparent that the evidence of victim is reliable, acceptable and inspiring confidence of the Court, it being a direct and substantial evidence.

26. The other evidence is in the nature of spot panchanama. No doubt PW - 4 panch did not support the prosecution case, it has come on record that on 14/07/2017, PW 6 - investigating officer visited the

spot of incident which was shown by the victim and prepared spot panchanama (Exh. 17) in presence of two pancha witnesses. The cross-examination of the victim and PW 2 also clearly shows the exact situation of the spot of incident. Thus, it is clear that the evidence of victim, PW 2, PW 6 as well spot panchanama (Exh. 17) is consistent and corroborates each other with regard to the spot of incident.

27. From the evidence on record, it emerges that the on 13/07/2017 accused had been to market at Govandi at about 8.00 pm and moved Rs.100/- note on the lips of the victim by saying “तू ऐसी क्यों कर रही है तू इतना भाव क्यों खा रही ” intending to insult her modesty. The sole testimony of victim is sufficient to prove the guilt of the accused. Though, prosecution did not examine independent witness, it will not prove fatal to the prosecution case. The victim is also a competent witness. From her cross-examination, no material contradiction or omission are brought on record and nothing is suggested in respect of inimical terms between both families. Moreover, the recitals of statement of victim recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. are corroborative in nature and consistent with her oral testimony. Moreover, no mother would use her child that too female and put her integrity, character and future at stake by making such false allegations. Therefore, her testimony is reliable and acceptable.

28. Section 30 of the POCSO Act provides for presumption of culpable mental state wherein duty is upon the accused to rebut the said presumption beyond reasonable doubt. The term “Culpable Mental State” includes intention, motive, knowledge of a fact and belief in, or reason to believe, a fact. Here, in the present case, the burden was on the accused to prove beyond all reasonable doubt that he had no such

mental state-intention to sexually assault the victim. Moving a note of Rs.100/- on the lips of the victim and then uttering the words “ तू ऐसी क्यूँ कर रही है तू इतना भाव क्यूँ खा रही ” itself suggests that the accused had committed the act with no other reason, but only with sexual intent to commit sexual assault and thus, the accused failed to rebut the presumption.

29. Upon evaluating the testimony of star witnesses–victim and PW 2 corroborated by other evidence, the prosecution has been able to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt that the accused had moved Rs.100/- note on her lips and uttered the words “ तू ऐसी क्यूँ कर रही है तू इतना भाव क्यूँ खा रही ” and thereby outraged her modesty of the victim and also sexually harassed her. Outraging a modesty of a woman is punishable under section 354 of the IPC. Further an act of uttering the words such as “ तू ऐसी क्यूँ कर रही है तू इतना भाव क्यूँ खा रही ” and moving or exhibiting the object i.e. note of Rs. 100/- on the lips of the victim with sexual intent is punishable under Section 12 of the POCSO Act. Thus, the accused is guilty for committing an offence under Section 354 of IPC and under Section 12 of POCSO Act. Further Section 354 of the IPC is aggravated form of offence under section 354-D of the IPC, therefore, no separate finding is required for section 354-D of the IPC.

Hence, I answer **Point Nos.2 and 4 in affirmative and point No. 3 accordingly.**

30. As the accused has been found guilty for the offences punishable under Section 12 of the POCSO Act as well as under Section 354, of

IPC, it is necessary to hear the accused on the point of quantum of sentence. Here, I stop to hear the accused on the point of sentence.

Dt.03/02/2023.

**(S.C.JADHAV)
Special Judge under P.O.C.S.O. Act,2012
MUMBAI**

31. Accused is produced through Video Conference. His Advocate is absent. Heard accused on the point of quantum of sentence. He submitted that he is not concerned with the victim. He is innocent. His family depends on him. He is the only earning member in his family. His old aged mother is suffering from cancer. He therefore, submitted that leniency be shown while awarding sentence.

32. Per contra, the Ld. Special Public Prosecutor for the prosecution submitted that the offence is against the minor, committed by the accused in the market. Hence, maximum sentence be imposed.

33. On perusal of record, it is clear that the offence took place in the year 2017. On 14/07/2017, accused came to be arrested. He was released on bail on 20/04/2018. Later on, accused came to be arrested and detained in another crime of Deonar Police Station. Offence of sexual harassment under Section 11 of POCSO Act as well as offence punishable under Section 354 of IPC is proved against the accused. Section 42 of the POCSO Act provides that, where an act or omission constitutes an offence punishable under this Act and also under sections 166-A, 354-A, section 354-C, 354-D, 370, 370-A, 375, 376, 376-A, 376-C, 376-D, 376-E or section 509 of the Indian Penal Code, then,

notwithstanding anything contained in any law for the time being in force, the offender found guilty of such offence shall be liable to punishment under this Act or under the Indian Penal Code as provides for punishment which is greater in degree. Sec. 354 of the IPC provides imprisonment not less than one year but which may extend to five years and fine. Whereas Sec. 12 of the POCSO Act, provides imprisonment for a term which which may extend to three years and fine (as the incident took place before amendment in POCSO Act, we have to consider the provisions of old Act.) As section 354 of the IPC provides greater degree of punishment, no separate punishment is required for offence punishable under section Sec. 12 of the POCSO Act.

34. Initially, accused was under judicial custody for a period from 14/07/2017 to 20/04/2018. Thereafter, he was detained in prison in another crime, so his presence is secured by way of production warrant issued to the jail authority. Accordingly, he was produced before this court on 05/11/2022 by way of production warrant. Since then his custody came within the purview of Judicial custody till date and same would be reckoned as period of detention during the course of trial and the same shall be set off against the sentence of imprisonment.

35. At the same time, submissions of accused has to be considered. The mitigating circumstances in favour of the accused is that his family depends on him. His mother is a cancer patient. The Apex Court has on number of occasions indicated that the punishment must fit the crime and that, it is the duty of the Court to impose a proper punishment depending upon the degree of criminality and desirability for imposing such punishment. Further considering the nature of

offence in my opinion it is not necessary to award compensation to the victim. Keeping in mind the proposition of law, I am of the considered view that following sentence would meet the ends of justice. In conclusion, I proceed to pass the following order :-

ORDER

1. Accused Santosh Jotiram Talekar is hereby convicted under Section 235(2) of Criminal Procedure Code, for the offence under Section 354 of the IPC with rigorous imprisonment of One (1) year and to pay fine of Rs. 3000/- (Rs.Three Thousand only) and in default, to undergo simple imprisonment of One (1) month.
2. As accused is convicted under Section 354 of the IPC which provides greater punishment, no separate sentence is imposed for the offence punishable under Section 12 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012.
3. Accused to surrender his bail bonds.
4. Accused is entitled for set off as per Section 428 of Cr.P.C. The period of substantive sentence awarded to the accused Santosh Jotiram Talekar is already undergone by him as he is in detention during the course of investigation and trial, so there is no necessity for him to serve substantive sentence.
5. Sealed/unmarked articles, if any, be destroyed after the expiry of appeal period.
6. The accused is apprised of his right to prefer an appeal.

7. Copy of this Judgment be provided to the accused free of cost as per the Section 363 (1) of Cr. P.C.

8. As the Special Case No. 431/2017 is disposed off by this Judgment, the Record and Proceedings be sent to the Record Department.

(Judgment pronounced through video conference in Open Court)



(S.C.JADHAV)
Special Judge under P.O.C.S.O. Act, 2012.
MUMBAI

03/02/2023.

Dictated on : 03/02/2023.

Transcribed on : 03/02/2023

Sign on : 04/02/2023.

“CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THE ORIGINAL SIGNED JUDGMENT/ORDER.”

04/02/2023 6.00 p.m.

Mrs. S.U. Manjrekar

UPLOAD DATE AND TIME

STENOGRAPHER (GRADE I)

Name of the Judge (With Court room no.)	Smt. S.C. JADHAV (CR. 35)
Date of Pronouncement of JUDGMENT/ORDER	03/02/2023
JUDGMENT/ORDER signed by P.O. on	04/02/2023
JUDGMENT/ORDER uploaded on	04/02/2023

