

IN THE SPECIAL COURT :: SONITPUR, TEZPUR:: ASSAM

PRESENT:- N. AKHTAR, AJS
Addl. Sessions Judge,
Sonitpur::Tezpur.

Special (POCSO) Case No. 89 of 2018.

U/s. 10 of

Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012.

State of Assam

-Vs-

Nurul Islam

FOR THE PROSECUTION	:-	Mr. S.K.Moitra, Special PP.
FOR THE DEFENCE	:-	Mr. B.Borthakur, Advocate.
EVIDENCE RECORDED ON	:-	1.11.19, 27.11.19, 27.1.20 and 3.3.20.
ARGUMENTS HEARD ON	:-	18.06.2020.
JUDGMENT DELIVERED ON	:-	07.07.2020.

JUDGMENT

1. The brief case of the prosecution is that on 25.10.2018, the accused Nurul Islam brought the daughter of the informant namely XXX aged about 9 years to Tezpur for treatment. But the accused forcefully took her to a Movie Hall situated at Tezpur and sexually assaulted her which was noticed by some viewers in the hall who nabbed the accused and handed him over to police. Hence, the FIR was lodged by the mother of the alleged victim girl.

2. Based on the said FIR, a case being Tezpur PS Case No. 2222/2018 U/s 7 of the POCSO Act, 2012 was registered and after completion of investigation, chargesheet was submitted against the above-named accused person.
3. On appearance of the accused person, copies of relevant documents were furnished to him in compliance of the provision of Sec.207 CrPC. Having heard both the sides and considered the materials on record, a formal charge was framed against the accused person u/s 10 of the POCSO Act, 2012 and had been read over and explained to the accused person to which he pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.
4. During trial, the prosecution has examined as many as 6 (Six) witnesses including the investigating officer. The accused person was examined U/s 313 CrPC. Defence has not adduced any evidence. At the end of the trial, the argument advanced by the learned counsel for both the sides were heard at length.

POINT FOR DETERMINATION

- *Whether the accused person above-named on the alleged day of occurrence, committed aggravated sexual assault on the victim girl, aged below 12 years and thereby committed an offence punishable U/s 10 of the POCSO Act, 2012?*

DISCUSSIONS, DECISIONS AND REASON FOR DECISION

5. I have heard the arguments advanced by learned counsel for both the sides in Virtual Court and also gone through the evidence on record including the law relevant to the issue in hand.
6. It was argued by the learned Special Public Prosecutor that in the present case, the prosecution has led sufficient incriminating evidence to prove the guilt of the accused and the defence has absolutely failed to dislodge the version of the prosecution. It was further argued that

the accused while examined U/s 313 CrPC, had taken a specific plea but neither adduced any evidence nor has otherwise proved the defence case. It was further argued that the evidence of the victim girl is sterling in nature and there is no reason to discard her evidence which is also corroborated by other evidence on record. The learned Special PP has further strenuously argued that in a case of sexual assault, the evidence of the victim girl is of paramount importance and she not being an accomplice, no amount of corroboration is required to act on her evidence and also that her evidence need not even be supported by any medical evidence. It is therefore, argued that the accused is liable to be convicted and suitably punished. In support of his argument, reliance has been placed on the following decisions:

- ***Shiv Charan Talukdar Vs State of Assam, 2017 (4) GLT 395,***
- ***Pattu Lal Vs State of Punjab, AIR 1996 SC 3197 and,***
- ***Marbet Nongsiej Vs State of Meghalaya, 2020 Legal Eagle (Megh) 11.***

7. On the other hand, the learned defence counsel had argued that the first information of the alleged occurrence was given to the police from the Movie Hall but that information has been suppressed and the GD Entry was also not produced. It is further argued that no document has been produced to prove the age of the victim girl and as such, her actual age stands not proved in this case. It is also argued that the frock and panty of the alleged victim girl were not seized by the investigating officer. It was also argued that the evidence of the witness who claimed to be the eye witness of the occurrence suffers from contradiction and as such, his evidence cannot be acted upon. It is therefore, argued that there is no clinching and convincing evidence on record to bring home the charge against the accused and so, the accused is entitled to be acquitted of the charge.

8. I have carefully considered the aforesaid arguments canvassed before me. Before proceeding further, it would be relevant to point out that this is a case under POCSO Act, 2012. Therefore, the age of the victim girl is of utmost importance. So, let me first of all, deal with this crucial aspect regarding the age of the alleged victim girl. It is true that in this case, the prosecution has not produced any documentary evidence to prove the age of the victim girl. Even there is no medical evidence on record to show the age of the victim girl. The prosecution has only relied on the oral testimony of some of the witnesses to establish the age of the victim girl. PW1 who is the mother of the victim girl had deposed in her evidence that her daughter was 9 (Nine) years of age at the time of the alleged incident. No suggestion was even given to this witness to the effect that she told the age of her daughter on speculation. Even if it is assumed for a moment that this age was told on speculation but the fact remains that PW1 was the mother of the alleged victim girl and so, her speculation cannot be so blunt that it is likely to make a large variation from the actual age of the victim girl. After all, she was the mother of the victim girl and so, she is the best person to tell about the age of her own daughter. There is no reason for her to manipulate the age of her daughter or to give a wrong age. The defence also did not cross-examine PW1 on the aspect of the age of her daughter. Thus, I find nothing to disbelieve the evidence of PW1 as far as the age of her daughter is concerned.
9. This apart, when the victim girl was examined in the court on 1.11.2019, her age was recorded as 10 years. The victim girl was also put some preliminary questions by this court to judge her capacity of understating the questions put to her and also the ability to give rational answers thereto. Upon being satisfied, this court proceeded with her examination. This apart, in the entire episode of the events, there are other witnesses who had occasions to physically encounter the alleged victim girl. They are PW3 (Khanindra Deka), PW4 (Rajesh

Kumar Safi) and PW5 (Sanjib Rai). PW3 is another viewer who also went to see the movie on that day at the Theatre Hall and he had deposed that the accused went to see the movie along with the victim girl who was about 8/9 years of age. PW4 was at the counter of the Movie Hall and issued two tickets to the accused. He had also deposed that the accused came to the Cinema with a little girl of around 6/7 years of age. PW5 who was the operator of the Movie Hall had deposed that the accused went to see the movie along with a little girl of around 6/7 years of age and he showed the accused and the little girl their respective seats at the Theatre Hall. It may be true that all these witnesses told about the age of the victim girl on mere speculation but this court is alive to the fact every individual has his own sense of perception regarding the age of a person and such perception cannot go irrationally wrong. All of them have physically seen the victim girl and so, their oral evidence as to the supposed age of the victim girl has to be given due weightage. **In the light of the aforesaid evidence, I am of the firm view that the alleged victim girl was below 12 years of age at the time of the alleged incident.**

10. Now, let me look into the evidence of the alleged victim girl who is the most material witness in this case. She has been examined as PW2. Before her examination, this court put certain preliminary questions to her to ascertain her capability of understanding the questions and the rationality of the answers put back by her. Upon being satisfied that the alleged victim girl rationally responds to everything, she was examined by this court without administering any oath. She had stoutly deposed in the court that she knew the accused who resided in their neighbourhood. During those days, she was suffering from tonsil. One day the accused came to their house and told her mother that he knew a doctor who could recover her from her illness. Then, he came to her school and took her to doctor for treatment but instead of taking her to any doctor, he took her to a Cinema Hall. While watching the movie,

the accused touched her breast and also took her on his lap and took off her panty. Then he fingered in her private part. When she raised alarm, he gagged her mouth and pressed her neck. On hearing her cry, some boys in the Cinema Hall caught the accused and handed over to police. She had also stated that she was brought to the court where she gave her statement which is Ext-2.

11. In her cross-examination, she had deposed that there are about 40 students in her class and her aunt Monowara Begum was also a student of the same school. When the accused came and took her from the school, he did not file any application to the Head Master. She bunked the English class and went with the accused. She did not remember at what time, she went to the Cinema Hall with the accused. She also stated that there was a Horror movie running at that time and it was the first movie that she watched. The Cinema Hall was dark. She had denied the defence suggestion that it being a Horror movie, she got scared and cried out and then, out of suspicion, the people caught the accused. She had also denied the defence suggestion that the accused neither touched her breast, nor did he take her in his lap and took off her panty nor did he finger her private part. All other defence suggestions were also denied by her.

12. Before proceeding further, it is important to point out here that in a case of sexual assault, the court can solely act on the testimony of the victim girl even without there being any corroboration. Corroboration is only a rule of prudence and not of law. It is also trite that the evidence of the victim even need not essentially be corroborated by medical evidence. The learned Special PP has relied on the case of ***Shiv Charan Talukdar Vs State of Assam, 2017 (4) GLT 395*** wherein the **Hon'ble Gauhati High Court** also held that if the evidence of the victim inspires confidence of the court, it can be the sole basis for conviction. The learned Special PP has further relied on the case of

Pattu Lal Vs State of Punjab (Supra) and ***Marbet Nongsiej Vs State of Meghalaya (Supra)*** wherein same views were taken.

13. It is also worthwhile to point out here that in case of a child witness; the issue of tutoring is often raised and argued. Same was done in this case also and it was argued that the evidence of the victim girl cannot be safely acted upon. I may point out here that in the case of **Nivrutti Pandurang Kokate Vs State of Maharashtra**, reported in **(2008) 12 SCC 565**, the **Hon'ble Apex Court** had observed as follows:

"Though it is an established principle that child witnesses are dangerous witnesses as they are pliable and liable to be influenced easily, shaped and moulded, but it is also an accepted norm that if after careful scrutiny of their evidence the court comes to the conclusion that there is an impress of truth in it, there is no obstacle in the way of accepting the evidence of a child witness."

14. Keeping the above principles in mind, when I look into the evidence of the victim girl, it appears to me that she had, in clear terms, stated in her evidence as to what exactly happened to her. She had stated that the accused took her to Movie Hall and while watching the movie, the accused touched her breast. Then, the accused made her sit on his lap and took off her panty and fingered her private part. When she tried to raise alarm, the accused gagged her mouth and also pressed her neck. On hearing her cries, the people in the Cinema Hall caught hold of the accused. She gave her statement in the court which is Ext-2. Though she was extensively cross-examined, yet the defence has totally failed to dislodge her evidence. Except some suggestions, the defence failed to elicit anything from her mouth to show that she was either deposing falsely or that she is not a reliable witness. It also cannot be deduced

anywhere from her evidence that she was tutored to give false evidence against the accused. Moreover, she being a child witness of around 10 years of age, it is highly improbable that she would cook up such a story against the accused on her own. There is also no apparent reason on her part to do so. This apart, though it has been pointed out above that the evidence of the prosecutrix in a case of sexual assault need not necessarily be corroborated by other evidence, yet in the present case, it would be seen that the evidence of the alleged victim girl receives substantial corroboration from the other evidence on record. She reported about the incident to her mother PW1. Therefore, her mother also narrated the same incident while she maintained that the accused took away her daughter on the pretext of visiting a doctor but instead, took her to a Cinema Hall and sexually molested her by fingering her private part. PW1 had also deposed that her daughter reported her about the incident. Thus, the evidence of PW2, the alleged victim girl has been fully corroborated by the evidence of PW1.

15. I may also point out here that the evidence of the victim girl has also been supported by PW3 who is absolutely an independent and disinterested witness. He did not even know the accused personally and he was only a viewer sitting behind the accused and the victim girl in the Cinema Hall. There is no reason for him to depose against the accused because he cannot be said to be interested in the prosecution and punishment of the accused. It appears from the evidence of PW3 that on that day, he also went to Jonaki Cinema Hall to see a movie. Then, accused Nurul Islam along with a girl child of around 8/9 years entered the Movie Hall and sat in the front row of the seat where PW3 was sitting. While watching the movie, PW3 noticed that the accused was touching the victim girl below her waist. The skirt of the victim girl was raised and the hand of the accused was on her private part. PW3 asked the accused not to do such thing and the accused stopped for a while but he again started doing the same thing. Since PW3 was sitting

in the row behind the accused, he informed the matter to the ticket collector. When, PW3 returned to his seat, he again noticed that the accused was doing the same act with the little girl. Then, PW3 raised alarm and caught hold of the accused. Some people informed the media persons. On being asked, the victim girl told PW3 that on earlier occasions also, the accused sexually molested her at her house and threatened her to kill if she would divulge the fact to anyone.

16. In his cross-examination, PW3 stated that he went to see the movie along with his girl friend. Their seat No. was C1 and C2 and the seat No. of the accused was B1 and B2. To the left side of their seat, there was the wall of the Hall and to the right side, some other audience were sitting. In the balcony, there were around 15 persons watching the movie. He had also clearly stated that though it was dark, but PW3 could see the act of the accused in the light of the screen of the Movie Hall.

17. The learned defence counsel had picked up certain portion of the evidence of PW3 and suggested to him that he omitted to state those vital facts to police which was however, denied by PW3. These contradictions were also duly proved through PW6, the investigating officer. It was therefore, argued by the learned defence counsel that the evidence of PW3 suffers from serious contradiction and so, cannot be acted upon. I have duly considered this aspect. I have also gone through the previous statement of PW3 recorded U/s 161 CrPC in the case diary in exercise of the power conferred by Sec. 172 (2) of the CrPC. **Needless to mention that a criminal court has the power U/s 172 (2) of the CrPC to go through the entries made in the case diary, not as evidence but to aid it in any enquiry or trial.** On such perusal of his previous statement recorded U/s 161 CrPC, what is noticeable is that he substantially stated the facts before the investigating officer though some omissions were noted. In my considered opinion, those omissions are not vital in the facts and

circumstances of this case. Moreover, this is high time for the court administering criminal justice to remain alive to the fact as to how investigations are conducted in our country and under what circumstances, statements of the witnesses are recorded U/s 161 CrPC by the police. Therefore, in my humble opinion, it would be unwise to reject the evidence of a witness merely for the reason that he omitted to state some facts before the investigating officer. It is also a matter of common knowledge that witnesses normally narrate the facts in the court little elaborately as their statements are very quickly recorded during investigation. So, there is bound to occur some omissions/variations while a witness deposes in the court and so, the evidence of a witness ought not to be lightly brushed aside on account of trivial omissions and insignificant variations. **I am therefore, of the view that the evidence of PW3 inspires confidence and can be safely acted upon.**

18. It was further argued on behalf of the defence that there was no occasion for PW3 to see any incident of sexual molestation which allegedly occurred inside the Movie Hall as there is clear evidence that the Movie Hall was totally dark while the movie was being displayed on the screen. It is true that the victim girl herself stated that the Hall was dark. I am of the view that no amount of evidence is required at least to prove the fact that darkness exists while any movie is being shown in a Movie Hall. **But here the question which needs to be addressed is: What amount of darkness exists inside a Movie Hall and whether there remains total invisibility all along?**

19. It is a matter of common knowledge and we all have perhaps experienced at least once in our lifetime, if not more, the thrill of going to a Movie Hall to watch a movie. Before beginning of a movie, the lights are all dimmed and so, when initially we step into the hall, we often grope in the darkness that exists inside. But after remaining for sometime in the dark hall, we can gradually see the objects around us.

This happens due to the fact that the aperture of the pupil in human eye controls the amount of light entering the eye. In bright sunshine, the aperture becomes small in size and so, when we enter the dark hall, we cannot immediately see the surrounding objects because very little light enters our eye which is not sufficient for immediate visibility. After a short time, the aperture of the pupil of our eye gets enlarged to allow more light into the eye enabling us to see in the dark. In my considered opinion, no amount of evidence is required to prove these facts in a court of law as these are scientifically proven facts and therefore, this court can take judicial notice of such facts. **I am therefore, of the view that the defence argument that PW3 could not have seen any molestation inside the darkened Movie Hall does not sound good particularly when PW3 was admittedly sitting just in the row behind the seat of the accused.**

20. It would also be seen from the evidence on record that PW4 who was the employee of Jonaki Cinema Hall at that time had deposed that while the movie was running on that day, a boy came and told him that the accused was misbehaving with a little girl. He was also told that the accused was fondling over the body of the little girl. PW4 then went to the accused and asked him what was happening but the accused denied everything. PW5 who was also an employee of the said Cinema Hall at the relevant time, had deposed that the accused took tickets and went to the top floor of the theatre hall where 12/13 viewers were sitting in the upper class. After a while, he heard a noise and saw that some boys were holding the accused by his collar and on being asked, the boys told him that the accused was misbehaving with a little girl. Then, the accused was taken to the office room situated at the ground floor and police was informed. Thus, the evidence of PW4 and PW5 is also fully corroborative of the evidence of PW3 who had also deposed that he initially informed the employees of the Cinema Hall about the misdeed of the accused when he noticed the same for the first time.

21. It would again be seen that in this case, the defence has failed to establish its pleas on every count. **Firstly**, it was the case of the defence that the victim girl was brought to a doctor on account of her ailment. The accused while examined U/s 313 CrPC had also stated this fact. But surprisingly enough, neither any evidence has been led by the defence to establish the said fact nor was any prescription produced before the court to show that the doctor was in fact visited on that day. Rather, the victim girl herself deposed clearly that no doctor was visited on that day and the accused directly took her to the Cinema Hall. This in turn, shows the ill-intention of the accused who had a pre-planned design to perpetrate the alleged act. **Secondly**, it was the further plea of the defence that there was a Horror movie going on at that time and the victim girl got scared to see a spooky scene and loudly cried out for which, it was suspected by the viewers that the accused was doing some misdeed with the victim girl and he was accordingly apprehended. But this plea of the accused also fails because the victim girl herself admitted in clear terms in her cross-examination that she did not get scared while seeing the Horror movie. In the face of such evidence of the victim girl, the defence plea cannot be accepted to be true. **Thirdly**, the accused in his statement U/s 313 CrPC had also stated that the father of the victim girl borrowed a sum of Rs. 50,000/- (Rupees fifty thousand) from the accused which was not refunded despite demands made by the accused. It was therefore, argued that the accused had been falsely implicated out of grudge.

22. I have duly considered this argument but regret my inability to convince myself of this argument. No evidence has been led by the accused to show that the father of the victim girl in fact, borrowed the sum of money as stated by the accused. Otherwise also, nothing could be brought on record to show that the said amount of money was ever borrowed by the father of the victim girl. Mere statement of the accused U/s 313 CrPC is not enough to prove a fact. A fact has to be

proved in the manner provided in the Evidence Act either by adducing defence evidence or by eliciting facts by way of cross-examination of prosecution witnesses. The defence has failed to do so in this case. This apart, it is also highly improbable that a father would invent such a false story against his own daughter which is likely to reflect on her chastity in near future. Dealing with such a factual scenario, the **Hon'ble Apex Court**, in the case of **BHARWADA BHOGINBHAI HIRJIBHAI VS STATE OF GUJARAT**, reported in **AIR 1983 SC 753**, observed as follows:

"It is also unthinkable that the parents would tutor their minor daughter to invent such a story in order to wreak vengeance on someone. They would not do so for the simple reason that it would bring down their own social status in the Society apart from ruining the future prospects of their own child. They would also be expected to be conscious of the traumatic effect on the psychology of the child and the disastrous consequences likely to ensue when she grows up."

23. Thus, in the light of the aforesaid discussions, I am of the view that the defence plea of false implication has no leg to stand and is liable to be outrightly rejected.

24. The learned defence counsel had further argued that prior to the lodgment of the FIR, a telephonic information was received by police from the Cinema Hall based on which, GD Entry No.935/2018 was made but the said GD Entry was not produced before the court. It is therefore, argued that the earliest information was suppressed in this case. It appears that PW6, the investigating officer of this case has

stated in his cross-examination that the copy of the said GD Entry is with the case diary but the same has not be found with the case record. I have perused the case diary to see the said GD Entry to satisfy myself as to whether the prosecution has suppressed the genesis of the occurrence. It appears to me that the information received by the police based on which the GD Entry was made was palpably a cryptic information and so, the same could not have been treated as the first information. The caller also did not mention his name and so, such information indeed cannot form the basis for commencement of the investigation in a criminal case. Therefore, the instant FIR of this case cannot be termed as subsequent one so as to be hit by Section 162 of the CrPC.

25. It was further argued that though the evidence on record revealed that media was called and media persons were also present after the occurrence, but no one from the media people was examined by the investigating officer. I find no force in this argument. The investigating officer has examined the victim girl, employees of the Cinema Hall and also one of the viewers who was sitting just behind the accused and the victim girl in the theatre hall. They are indeed material witnesses. The investigating officer in a criminal case cannot be expected to examine each and every person who might have acquired knowledge of the commission of the offence.

26. It was also argued that the frock and panty of the victim girl which she was wearing at the time of commission of the alleged offence were not seized by the investigating officer. I am of the view that this is not a case of penetrative sexual assault but it is a case of aggravated sexual assault. Therefore, non-seizure of wearing apparels of the victim girl is of no consequence at all and the prosecution case which is otherwise well-established cannot be viewed with suspicion for such flimsy reason.

27. Thus, from the total analysis of the evidence on record, it clearly transpires that the accused on the day of the incident, took away the victim girl on the pretext of visiting a doctor and instead, brought her to a Cinema Hall and sexually molested her. The accused had touched her breast, took off her panty, made her sit on his lap and fingered on her private part. PW2, the alleged victim girl has elaborately stated all these facts in her evidence. Her evidence is also fully corroborative of her statement given U/s 164 CrPC during investigation. She reported about the incident to PW3 on being asked. She also reported about the incident to her mother who is PW1. All these witnesses supported the version of the prosecutrix. This apart, PW3 being an independent witness himself noticed all the nefarious acts being carried out by the accused and warned him but the accused did not stop. Thus, the evidence on record is absolutely overwhelming in nature and fully establishes the case of the prosecution.

28. In the result and for the reasons and discussions made herein above, I have no hesitation in my mind in holding that the prosecution has succeeded in proving the charge against accused namely Nurul Islam. He is hence, found guilty of the offence U/s 10 of POCSO Act, 2012 and convicted accordingly.

29. The accused perpetrated the said criminal act in a pre-meditated design. He brought the victim girl of around 8/9 years of age to the Cinema Hall on the pretext of showing her to a doctor on account of her ailment and invaded on her chastity. I am therefore, of the view that the accused does not deserve to be granted the benefit of the provision of Sec. 360 of the CrPC or the provisions of Probation of Offenders Act, 1958.

30. HEARING ON QUESTION OF SENTENCE:

Sec. 235 (2) of the CrPC is a mandatory provision of law. The court is required to hear the accused on the question of sentence. I have

accordingly heard the accused person. He had stated that he is married having wife and children and is also the sole bread winner of his family and so, he prayed for leniency in the matter of imposition of sentence.

31. Having so heard and on conviction as aforesaid, the accused is sentenced to **suffer RI for 5 (Five) years and to pay a fine of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) and in default of payment of fine, to suffer further RI for 6 (Six) months u/s 10 of POCSO Act, 2012.**

32. The period of detention already undergone by the accused person shall be set off.

33. **COMPENSATION TO VICTIM:**

I have considered the provision of Sec. 33 (8) of POCSO Act, 2012 and also Rule 7 of POCSO Rules, 2012. Having considered the facts and broad circumstances of this case under which the offence was committed and all other relevant aspects of this case including the age of the victim, her social background as perceivable from the evidence and severity of the mental trauma presumably suffered by the victim, I am of the considered view that an order as to compensation deserves to be *suo moto*, passed in favour of the victim girl. In this regard, I have also duly considered the directions rendered by the **Hon'ble Apex Court** in the case of **Nipun Saxena and Another Vs Union of India and Others, WP(C) No. 565 of 2012 dated. 05.09.2018.**

34. **It is therefore, directed that a compensation which is quantified at Rs. 1,00000/- (Rupees One lakh) shall be paid to the victim girl by the District Legal Services Authority, Tezpur after complying with the norms and procedures prescribed therefor. Let a copy of this judgment be also sent to the District Legal Services Authority, Tezpur, for doing the needful as directed above.**

35. *Let a free copy of this judgment be forthwith furnished to the accused person.*
36. Forward a copy of this judgment to the District Magistrate in compliance of Sec.365 CrPC.

Given under my hand and seal of this court on the 07th day of July/2020.

Typed and Corrected by me:

Addl. Sessions Judge,
Sonitpur:: Tezpur.

APPENDIX

PROSECUTION WITNESSES:

- PW1 (Mother of Victim)
PW2 (Victim girl)
PW3 (Sri Khanindra Deka)
PW4 (Sri Rajesh Kumar Safi)
PW5 (Sri Sanjib Rai)
PW6 (Sri Dijen Chandra Borah)

PROSECUTION EXHIBITS:

- Ext-1: FIR
Ext-2: Statement U/s 164 CrPC.
Ext-3: Sketch Map
Ext-4: Chargesheet

DEFENCE WITNESSES:

None

DEFENCE EXHIBITS:

NIL.

Addl. Sessions Judge,
Sonitpur:: Tezpur.