



2026:AHC:146784-DB

AFR

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CAPITAL CASES No. - 16 of 2021

Ashok Sharma

.....Appellant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Appellant(s)	: Anil Kumar, Atul Pandey, Rajeev Giri
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: G.A.

Court No. - 49

HON'BLE AJAY BHANOT, J.
HON'BLE TARUN SAXENA, J.

[PER: HON'BLE AJAY BHANOT, J.]

1. The instant Capital Case arises out of a judgment rendered by the learned Sessions Court in Session Trial No.- 67 of 2011 (State Vs. Ashok Sharma) along with Session Trial No.- 53 of 2011 (State Vs. Geeta Devi) arising out of Case Crime No. 911 of 2010 under

year of additional rigorous imprisonment) . The learned trial court has also convicted the appellant for the offence under Section 201 I.P.C. and has accordingly sentenced him to 7 years of imprisonment along with fine of Rs. 20,000/- (in case of default of payment appellant is to serve one year of additional imprisonment).

2. Briefly put the prosecution case set out in the FIR is that on 21.12.2010 at about 04:00 a.m. Shravan Sharma son-in-law of the first informant informed him that Gram Pradhan Chopan had told the former by phone that Sunita and her daughter Jhalak aged about three years had been done to death and burnt. Both the victims had a saree tied in knots' round their necks'. The first informant then left for Chopan from his house at Mirzapur. On reaching Chopan along with other family members he saw his daughter Sunita and grand daughter Jhalak lay dead in the room. A saree was tied round their necks' and upper parts of the bodies' were burnt. Charpoy and mattresses in the room were also burnt. The first informant had a firm belief that Geeta (mother-in-law of Sunita) and Ashok Sharma had murdered the victims and thereafter burnt them. People in the vicinity had earlier informed him that Ashok Sharma frequented Geeta's house and the two had illicit relations. Sunita came in the way of the said relationship, which became the cause of her murder.

3. On a tehrir submitted by the first informant an FIR was

Sections 302 and 201 I.P.C. Cognizance of the offences was taken by the learned trial court on 11.03.2011.

4. Charges were framed against both the appellants by the learned trial court on 06.01.2012 as under :

“प्रथम- यह कि दिनांक 20/21.12.2010 की रात्रि में बहद स्थान ग्राम चोपन अन्तर्गत थाना चोपन जिला सोनभद्र में आपने सह अभियुक्त गीता देवी के सहयोग से अपने सामान्य आशय की पूर्ति में वादी मुकदमा की पुत्री सुनीता तथा उसकी नातिन झलक दोनों का गला साड़ी के फन्दा से कस कर उनकी हत्या कर दिया। इस प्रकार आपने ऐसा कार्य करके धारा-302 सपठित धारा-34 भा०दं०सं० के तहत दण्डनीय अपराध किया है। जो इस न्यायालय के प्रसंज्ञान में है।

द्वितीय- यह कि उपरोक्त दिनांक, समय व स्थान पर आपने वादी मुकदमा की पुत्री सुनीता तथा उसकी नातिन झलक की साड़ी के फन्दा से गला कस कर हत्या करने के उपरान्त साक्ष्य मिटाने के उद्देश्य से दोनों के शव को जला दिया था। इस प्रकार ऐसा कार्य करके आपने 201 भा०दं०सं० के तहत दण्डनीय अपराध किया है। जो इस न्यायालय के प्रसंज्ञान में है।”

5. Evidences adduced by the prosecution to bring home the charges are extracted below in tabular form:

Prosecution Witnesses

S. No.	Witness	Witness No.	Nature of Witness
1.	Satish Kumar Sharma	P.W. 1	First Informant
2.	Reeta Devi	P.W. 2	Eye Witness/Niece of deceased Sunita
3.	Manorama Devi	P.W. 3	Neighbour

6.	Chandrabali	P.W. 6	Head Moharrir
7.	Dr Saurabh Rawat	P.W. 7	Doctor who conducted the Post Mortem

Documentary Evidences			
Exhibit	Documents'	Proved by	Date
Ex Ka-1	Written Report	P.W.-1 Satish Kumar Sharma	31.03.2012
Ex Ka-2	Panchayatnama of Jhalak	P.W.-1 Satish Kumar Sharma	31.03.2012
Ex Ka-3	Panchayatnama of Sunita Sharma	P.W.-1 Satish Kumar Sharma	31.03.2012
Ex Ka-4	Site Plan	P.W.-5 Shiva Nand Mishra	21.08.2017
Ex Ka-5	Recovery Memo of Saree, Burnt Cloth with Ash and One Bottle Kerosene Oil	P.W.-5 Shiva Nand Mishra	31.03.2012
Ex Ka-6	Charge Sheet	P.W.-5 Shiva Nand Mishra	21.08.2017
Ex Ka-8	chick F.I.R	P.W.-6 Head	16.04.2018

	Jhalak	Saurabh Rawat	
Ex Ka-11	Post-mortem of Sunita Sharma	P.W.-7 Dr Saurabh Rawat	16.04.2018

Material Evidence		
S. No	Material	Exhibit
1.	Recovered Saree	Material Exhibit Ka-1
2.	Burnt Cloth	Material Exhibit Ka-1
3.	Bottle of Kerosene Oil	Material Exhibit Ka-1

6. The evidences shall be appraised in light of the fundamental aspects of the prosecution story and in the following sequence.

I. FIR.

7. P.W.1 deposed that information regarding the incident was received by him on 21.12.2010 at about 04:00 a.m. He immediately set out for Chopan along with his wife and two persons from the neighbourhood.

8. P.W. 1 further testified that he arrived with his party at the site of incident between 6:45 AM to 7 AM. The tehrir was dictated by him at the site of the incident to a scribe who took it down in writing

9. On the footing of the aforesaid tehrir the FIR was got registered at 7:25 AM on 21.12.2010 as Case Crime No. 911 of 2010, P.S. Chopan, District Sonbhadra under Section 302, 201 I.P.C. Head Constable Chandrabali, Head Moharrir/P.W. 6 had recorded the chick and proved the FIR which was marked as Ex. Ka-8. P.W. 6 also proved the G.D. entry relating to the FI.R., which was marked as Exh. Ka 9.

Inquest Report:

10. P.W. 1 testified that after lodgement of F.I.R. the police party came to the spot. The relevant documents were also drawn up by the officials and police party after reaching the site of the incident.

11. Recitals in the inquest report disclose that the I.O. Shivanand Mishra (P.W. 5) constituted a police team and reached the site of incident. The inquest proceedings were conducted till about 11:15 AM on 21.12.2010. The first informant Satish Sharma (P.W.1) as well as Sunil Sharma (P.W. 4) were witnesses to the inquest report.

12. The inquest report records that the bodies of the deceased Jhalak and Sunita were lying at the doorstep of the middle room and the center of the room respectively. Presence of family members of the deceased and persons residing in the locality find mention in the inquest report. In the opinion of the inquest witnesses the deceased were murdered. A saree was tied in knots' round the necks' of the deceased persons. An attempt to burn the bodies was also visible. The inquest reports of both the deceased

Recovery Memo:

13. Various articles were recovered from the incident site by the investigation officer. Recovery Memo drawn up at the place of the incident investigation officer on 21.12.2010 depicts recovery of the following articles:

(a). A saree, entangled around the bodies of the deceased. (As per the recovery memo the saree was tied round the necks' of both the deceased persons.)

(b). One bottle, which was smelling of kerosene oil, and one burnt piece of cloth.

14. The recovery memo was proved by the Investigation Officer, P.W.-5 Shivanand Mishra and marked as Exhibit Ka 5. P.W.-1, Satish Kumar Sharma and P.W.-4, Sunil Sharma were witnesses to the recovery.

Site Plan:

15. IO/P.W. 5 has deposed that the site plan was drawn up by him after reaching the site on 21.12.2010, at the pointing out of the first informant Satish Kumar Sharma/P.W..1. The site plan records that the house where the incident occurred belongs to Geeta Devi.

16. The site plan indicates the following points:

(a). Place of incident.

(b). Place from where the burnt cloth and bottle of kerosene oil were respectively found.

17. The site plan was proved by its author IO/P.W. 5.

18. It is to be noted that the site plan was not submitted to the following

(c) Place of recovery of saree, which was tied round the necks of the deceased persons.

Material Exhibits:

19. Recovered articles namely saree, burnt cloth/saree, bottle of kerosene oil was produced in sealed condition in court. The said articles were then identified and proved by P.W. 5 and marked collectively as Material Exhibit Ka-1

Bodies sealed and sent for PM

20. After the inquest report and other proceedings at the site of the incident were complete, the bodies were sealed and were made over to C.P. 713 Manoj Kumar and C.P. 676 Krishna Mohan. The said persons took the bodies to the hospital for postmortem on 21.12.2010.

Cause of Death: PM Report

21. The postmortem of both the deceased was conducted by a panel of doctors comprising Dr. Saurabh Rawat and Dr. D.K. Singh. Post-mortem of Jhalak Sharma was conducted on 21.12.2010 at 4:00 P.M. Post-mortem of Sunita Sharma was conducted on 21.12.2010 at about 04:25 P.M.

22. The post-mortem report of the deceased, Jhalak Sharma (Exhibit Ka-10), records ante-mortem injuries, cause of death, and time of death as follows:

“Ante-mortem injuries-

1. Dermal, epidermal burn injury all over head, forehead, in front of right arm and shoulder, upper part of right fore arm front side.

Rigor Mortis present all over the body. Right eye partially open and left eye closed.

Cause of Death- Asphyxia as a result of ante-mortem throttling.

Time of Death- Approx 12 hours before the Post-Mortem.

23. Post Mortem report of deceased Sunita Devi:

The relevant extracts of post mortem report of Sunita Devi depicting the ante-mortem injuries, cause of death and time of death are as under :

“External injuries (ante-mortem):

1. Abraided contusion 4×5 cm over upper lip right side lower lip.
2. Abraided contusion 04×03 cm over chin.
3. Abraided contusion 09×0.5 cm over right side neck in upper part below 04 cm of right ear.
4. Burns were present over the entire forehead, the right side of the face, the upper part of the left side of the face, and the right forearm(including the hand).

External examination :

Rigor Mortis present all over the body.

The uterus was bulky, containing a female child of 26-30 weeks approximately. The face was cyanosed (bluish) and the mouth was open. Urethral discharge was present which had dried. No bone joints were fractured.

Upon examination of neck, Trachea was found contused and Larynx, Trachea and Bronchi were found congested.

Cause of death- Death due to Asphyxia as a result of ante-mortem throttling.

Time of Death- Approx 12 hours before the Post-Mortem.

24. Dr. Saurabh Rawat, who had conducted the post mortem report entered the witness box as P.W.7. P.W.7 proved the postmortem reports and their contents. The postmortem of two deceased

25. Under cross-examination P.W.-7, Dr. Saurabh Rawat stated that the burn injuries were postmortem and no carbon articles were found in trachea.

ORAL TESTIMONIES:

P.W. 1 Satish Kumar Sharma

26. Satish Kumar Sharma-first informant while deposing as P.W. 1 stated that Sunita Sharma was married to Shravan Kumar for 12 years. Shravan Kumar was employed in the Railways and was posted in Rajasthan at the relevant point in time. Sunita and her daughter Jhalak were residing with Geeta Devi (mother-in-law of Sunita) in Chopan. P.W.-1 stated that he was informed on phone by his son-in-law of the murders. P.W.-1 immediately reached Geeta Devi's house at Chopan with his wife and two neighbours. Geeta Devi was present at the house. Describing the condition of the bodies, P.W.-1 deposed that the bodies of Sunita and Jhalak were at the doorstep, a saree was tied in knots' round their necks'. Sunita's face had some injury and burn marks.

27. P.W.-1 testified that he often visited Sunita's house. During those visits he came to know about the illicit relations of the accused persons. P.W.-1 further deposed that Sunita had also informed him about the same. Sunita had found Geeta and Ashok in a compromising position and after upbraiding them had asked Ashok not to visit them again. The accused persons killed Sunita for being a hurdle in the relationship.

deposition stated that on the fateful day she had gone to Vaishno Devi Temple, Dala. While returning she decided to spend the night at Sunita's house as it had become dark. Sunita, her mother-in-law, Geeta and Jhalak were present when she reached their house. Later Ashok also arrived. There was an altercation between Sunita and Ashok regarding his visits to their house. After having dinner Sunita, Jhalak, Geeta Devi and Ashok retired to one room; while she went to sleep in the adjacent room.

29. P.W. 2 testified that she was awakened at about 2-3 AM by some commotion. She went to Sunita's room and found it locked (from inside). She peered into the room through a crack in the door. P.W.2 deposed that she saw Geeta Devi had muffled Sunita's face, while Ashok was strangulating Sunita with a saree. Jhalak was strangled to death by the same saree after she was woken up by the noise.

30. According to P.W. 2, she was petrified after seeing the incident and fled to the fields for safety and hid herself. In the morning she went to the neighbour Manorama's (P.W. 3) house and narrated the incident to her. Later she described the incident to Sunita's maternal family and the police party who had reached the site.

P.W. 3 Manorama Devi

31. Manorama Devi who is a neighbour of the deceased Sunita entered the witness box as P.W. 3. P.W.-3 in her testimony stated that the incident occurred in winter month at about 03-04 A.M.

32. Under cross-examination P.W. 3 testified that Geeta was crying out loud that her house was on fire. P.W.-3 also stated that she did not see Geeta at her house then quickly clarified that she had not seen the occurrence.

P.W. 4 Sunil Sharma

33. Sunil Sharma, while deposing as P.W. 4 stated that on the fateful day he and his wife were returning from Vaishno Devi, Dala. The couple decided to spend the night at Geeta Devi's house as it had become late. When they reached Geeta Devi's house they met Geeta Devi, Sunita, her daughter Jhalak. Later Ashok @ Babaji also came to the house. Sunita admonished Babaji and told him not to visit the house in future. Thereafter, P.W. 4 and his wife/P.W. 2 went to sleep in one room. Sunita, Jhalak Geeta Devi and Babaji retired to the adjacent room.

34. P.W. 4 then states that he and his wife/P.W. 2 woke up on hearing some noise at about 2 AM. They peeped through a gap in the door of the adjacent room. A light was glowing in the room. They saw Geeta Devi had bound down Sunita's feet with her hands while Ashok @ Babaji was strangulating Sunita with a saree. At that moment Sunita's three year old daughter woke up. Ashok and Geeta strangulated the little girl to death with the same saree.

35. P.W. 4 then deposed that he and his wife/P.W. 2 got scared by what they saw and escaped to the fields and hid there. Later they narrated the whole incident to Manorama Devi/P.W. 3. They used Manorama Devi's mobile to call Sunita's family members in the

P.W. 5 Shivanand Mishra, the Investigating Officer

37. Shivanand Mishra- Investigating Officer entered the witness box as P.W.5. P.W.5 in his testimony described the procedure of the investigation. According to P.W.5, he recorded the statement of Manorama Devi on 21.12.2010. On the same day, in parcha no. 1-B, he recorded the statement of eye witness Reeta Devi and thereafter recorded the statements of other witnesses. He arrested Geeta Devi on 23.12.2010, as depicted in parcha no. 3. The accused/appellant Ashok Sharma was absconding and was thereafter arrested on 11.03.2011 after taking out proceedings under Section 82 CrPC. According to P.W.5 as per the investigation there was only one eye witness to the incident, namely Reeta Devi/ P.W. 2

Submissions on behalf of the Accused-Appellant:

38. Shri Vinay Saran, learned Senior Counsel and Amicus Curiae assisted by Shri Pradeep Kumar Mishra, learned counsel and Amicus curiae and Shri Atul Kumar Pandey, learned counsel and Amicus Curiae have made the following submissions on behalf of the accused-appellant:

I. The appellant Ashok Sharma has been nominated solely on the basis of suspicion and hearsay.

II. The eye-witnesses are not reliable. The testimonies of the eye-witnesses are beset with contradictions and their conduct was unnatural. The testimonies of the eye-witnesses are not worthy of

V. There are material contradictions in the testimonies of P.W. 2 and P.W. 4 as regards the incident. P.W. 2 and P.W. 4 were also contradicted by P.W. 3.

VI. Medical evidence squarely negates the statements of P.W. 2 and P.W. 4.

VII. The motive of the appellant to commit the offence was not proved by applicable standards of evidence. There is no evidence to establish the presence of the appellant at the site of the incident.

VIII. The prosecution could not prove the case beyond reasonable doubt.

IX. The case did not fall in the category of rarest of rare cases and the death penalty was imposed without due consideration of relevant factors.

Submissions of the learned AGA on behalf of the State:

39. Shri Amit Sinha, learned AGA, made the following submissions:

I. The prosecution case is supported by reliable eye-witnesses.

II. The FIR was promptly registered and the prosecution case stated therein inspires confidence.

III. The prosecution case is supported by reliable testimonies of two eye-witnesses.

IV. The recovery made at the site corroborates the prosecution

VI. The offence comes in the category of the “rarest of rare cases” inasmuch as a pregnant mother and her minor daughter were done to death by the accused-appellant and his accomplice.

Appraisal of Evidence

I. F.I.R.

40. The FIR was got registered by the father of the deceased Sunita. The timeline in the FIR matches other prosecution evidence including the inquest report, recovery memo, and post-mortem report. There is no inordinate delay in the lodging of the FIR. However, the veracity of the prosecution case set out therein needs to be determined after a composite appraisal of evidence.

II. Date, Time and Place of Incident

41. Various evidences including the FIR, inquest report, recovery memo, post-mortem report and statements of P.W. 1 and P.W. 3 show that the incident occurred at the house of Geeta Devi in the intervening night of 20/21.12.2010 or small hours of 21.12.2010.

III. Culpability of the appellant in light of the prosecution evidence and reliability of P.W. 2 and P.W. 4 as eye witnesses

42. Credibility of P.W.2 and P.W. 4 as eye witnesses will now be examined.

43. P.W.2 claims to be a close relative of the deceased as well as first informant. P.W.2 in her testimony under cross-examination admitted that the fact of light bulb glowing in the room when the

44. The P.W.2 watched her niece and grand niece being strangled to death as a silent spectator. She did not raise a hue and cry to call for help from the neighbours. The house where the incident occurred is located in a densely inhabited area as there are number houses in the neighbourhood. This is borne out from the testimony of P.W. 1. P.W. 2 also failed to call the police authorities or inform P.W.1 about the incident in the first instance. P.W. 2 was present at the time of the inquest proceedings. However, she failed to tell the investigation officer about the incident even at that point in time. The conduct of P.W. 2 is unnatural.

45. P.W.2 further claims to have informed P.W.3 in the early hours of morning. However, testimony of P.W.3 does not support the aforesaid fact.

46. The examination-in-chief of P.W.-2 does not indicate the presence of P.W.-4 at the time of the incident. P.W.2 introduced her husband as an eye witness for the first time while under cross examination. Under cross-examination P.W. 2 deposed that her husband had accompanied her to Sunita's house, and the couple were sleeping in the room adjacent to the place of incident. The belated disclosure of P.W.4's presence as an eye witness also contradicts her testimony in the examination in chief and raises grave doubts about her reliability as a witness.

47. In fact presence of P.W. 4 as an eye witness further impeaches the credit of P.W. 2. There was no reason for the couple for not raising an alarm to call for help from the neighbourhood or for

and a source of strength for her. Particularly, when the two accused persons are much more aged persons and none of them was armed.

48. There is another fault line in the testimony and conduct of P.W.

2. As per the statement of P.W. 1, Geeta Devi was present when he reached the site of incident. P.W. 2 claims to have been present at all relevant times. She did not inform the police authorities about Geeta Devi and the appellant even when they arrived at the site after the lodgement of the FIR.

49. Most importantly under further cross-examination P.W. 2 stated that she came to know about the incident in the morning and informed her husband about it.

50. In the wake of preceding discussion in view of the aforesaid inconsistencies, improvements and unnatural conduct, the credit of P.W.2 as an eye witness stands fully impeached and her testimony in respect of the incident is liable to be discarded in its entirety.

51. The P.W.-4 claims to have watched the incident with his wife silently and thereafter fled to the fields for safety. P.W.-4 also did not raise an alarm to alert the neighbours and call for help as seen earlier. The incident occurred in Geeta Devi's house which was in a densely populated neighbourhood. P.W.-4 also failed to inform the police at any time during or after the incident.

52. The deceased persons were being attacked by two elderly persons who were unarmed. This not only makes the silence of P.W.-4 and P.W.2 inexplicable, but also raises questions as to why

53. P.W. 1 testified that Geeta Devi was present when he reached the site of the incident. P.W. 4 has deposed that he was present throughout the episode and P.W.1 had arrived at 4:00 a.m. However he did not inform P.W. 1 about his witnessing the incident and complicity of Geeta Devi and Ashok Kumar at any point in time.

54. P.W.-4 was also present when P.W.-1 arrived with the police party at the site. P.W.-4 was a witness to the inquest and recovery proceedings along with P.W.-1. However, he remained silent at all relevant times. Had P.W.4 informed the police party on their arrival Geeta Devi would have been arrested at the spot. The aforesaid conduct of P.W.-4 is wholly unnatural considering the fact that he is a close relative of P.W.-1.

55. P.W.-4 claims to have informed P.W.-3 about the incident in the morning. The aforesaid statement is falsified by the testimony of P.W.-3.

56. Under cross-examination P.W.-4 testified that Geeta Devi was arrested at the spot. The aforesaid statement was contradicted by the testimony of P.W.5 who had effected the arrest. P.W.-5 deposed that Geeta Devi was arrested at the Chopan Bus Stand on 23.12.2010. The arrest memo drawn up by P.W. 5 which depicts the said facts pertaining to the arrest is paper No. 42Kha/7 in the records of the trial court.

57. P.W.-5 has also deposed that P.W.-4 did not inform him that

58. Under further cross-examination P.W. 4 stated that he was first informed about the incident by P.W.3, and that his statement regarding the incident is based on what P.W. 3 had narrated to him.

59. P.W. 1 has testified that there was no eyewitness to the incident. Furthermore, the I.O./P.W.-5 has deposed that P.W.-2 was the only eye witness and further categorically stated that P.W.-4 was not an eye witness to the incident.

60. In the light of the preceding discussion and considering the contradictions and the unnatural conduct of P.W. 4, the credit of P.W. 4 is wholly unreliable and his testimony as a witness is completely discarded.

61. The absence of ligature marks on the necks of both the deceased persons, and the opinion of the doctor that the cause of death was asphyxia as a result of ante mortem throttling are undisputed. The post mortem reports (Exh Ka-10 and Exh Ka-11) and testimony of the doctor/P.W. 7 are medical evidences of high credibility. The medical opinion completely negates the contrary version of P.W. 2 and P.W. 4 that both the deceased persons were strangled to death by a saree.

62. There are material contradictions regarding the manner in which the deceased Sunita was murdered, in the testimonies of P.W. 2 and P.W. 4. P.W.2 has testified that Geeta Devi had muffled Sunita's face while P.W.2 has deposed that Geeta Devi had bound down Sunita's feet with her hands.

Court finds that the credit of P.W.-2 and P.W.-4 as eye witnesses was successfully impeached in the trial.

64. P.W.-2 and P.W.-4 are wholly unreliable witnesses and their testimonies claiming to be eye witness are not worthy of belief and are discarded in entirety.

Presence of the Appellant-accused Ashok Sharma

65. There is no other evidence to establish the presence of the accused-appellant Ashok Sharma at the time of the incident or at any stage proximate to the incident. The appellant Ashok Sharma does not ordinarily reside at Hargarh, P.S. Jigna, District Mirzapur. He is a resident of another village.

66. The ocular testimony of P.W. 2 and P.W. 4 were the sole pivots of prosecution case against the accused-appellant Ashok Sharma minus the testimonies of P.W. 2 and P.W. 4 there is no other incriminating evidence to implicate the appellant-accused in the instant case is in the record.

Impugned Judgement:

67. The learned trial court in the impugned judgment has entirely erred in law by upholding the credibility of two witnesses, namely P.W.2 and P.W.4 while returning the conviction against the appellant Ashok Sharma. The learned trial court thus erred in fact and in law by rendering the impugned judgment in respect of the appellant- Ashok Sharma.

punishment of life imprisonment upon the appellant-Ashok Sharma.

Conclusions

69. In light of the preceding discussions, this Court finds that the prosecution has failed to prove the charges under Section 302 read with Section 201 IPC against the appellant-accused Ashok Sharma beyond reasonable doubt. The appellant-accused Ashok Sharma is hereby acquitted of the charges for which he was tried and which are subject matter of this appeal.

70. The appellant-accused Ashok Sharma shall be released forthwith from prison, unless wanted in any other criminal case.

71. The Capital Appeal No. 16 of 2021 is accordingly allowed.

72. A copy of this judgement translated in Hindi to be served upon the appellant by the Secretary, District Legal Services Authority.

(Tarun Saxena,J.) (Ajay Bhanot,J.)

July 8, 2026

Ashish/Dhananjai/Vandit