

Court No. - 7

A.F.R.

Case :- MISC. BENCH No. - 5502 of 2016

Petitioner :- Sabiya Begam @ Malka

Respondent :- State Of U.P. Thru. Prin. Secy. Home Civil Sect.
Lko. & Ors.

Counsel for Petitioner :- Devki Nandan Srivastava, Satendra
Kumar Verma

Counsel for Respondent :- Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Ajai Lamba, J.

Hon'ble Ravindra Nath Mishra-II, J.

(ORAL)

1. This petition seeks issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondents/police agency to register First Information Report in compliance of order dated 3.9.2015, passed in exercise of jurisdiction under section 156(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short 'Cr.P.C. '), by Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bahriach in Criminal Misc. No.1690 of 2015, Police Station Dargah Shareef, District Bahriach.

2. The facts and circumstances of the case giving rise to the occasion of filing this petition are required to be noticed.

3. It appears that in an incident of 11.5.2015, the daughter of the petitioner was done to death. It further appears that the petitioner approached the concerned Police Station for registration of First Information Report under Section 154 (1) Cr.P.C., and later under Section 154(3) Cr.P.C., however the police did not register the crime. Under the circumstances, the petitioner filed an application under Section 156 (3) Cr.P.C. dated 9.7.2015 (Annexure No.1).

4. Perusal of the application indicates that it has been alleged that the daughter of the petitioner aged about 14 years, was living with the petitioner and was a student of Class IX. Accused Akash is of bad character and committed the offence of rape upon daughter of the petitioner whereupon she became pregnant. When the accused was approached, the accused told the petitioner to get the fetus aborted or else the petitioner and

her daughter would be done to death. The petitioner informed the neighbours. It has been alleged that on account of these happenings, the accused started having enmity.

5. Further allegation is that on 10.5.2015, when the petitioner was posted on security duty in Dargah Shareef '*Mela*', both the accused entered the house of the petitioner forcibly and coercively administered a drug on the daughter of the petitioner for causing abortion, which was resisted by the daughter. The daughter was given beatings, and with an intention to cause her death threw her from the roof. Injuries have been received by the daughter. Neighbours gathered and one neighbour took the daughter to his house. The petitioner got free from security duty at 5.00 a.m. on 11.5.2015 and reached the house whereupon she found her daughter in supine condition. The petitioner brought her daughter home and thereafter took her to District Hospital. When the daughter regained consciousness, she informed the petitioner about the entire incident.

6. It has further been alleged in the complaint that thereafter the daughter died. The petitioner went in a shock. Benefit of mental condition of the petitioner/complainant was taken and body of the daughter of the complainant was buried. The petitioner was threatened and was kept confined therefore information could not be given to the police immediately. It has further been prayed that in case the body is exhumed, the post mortem examination can be conducted so as to unravel the truth.

When the police authorities did not register a criminal case on application given by the petitioner under Sections 154(1) Cr.P.C. and later under Section 154(3) Cr.P.C., the petitioner filed an application under Section 156 (3) Cr.P.C. whereupon order was passed by the Magistrate on 3.9.2015 directing registration of the crime and investigation, however, no action has been taken by the police. Hence, this petition for issuance of a direction for registration of the crime and effective investigation. The complaint made by the petitioner is available on record as Annexure No.1 and order dated 3.9.2015 passed by the Magistrate is Annexure No.2.

7. It appears that the petitioner approached Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bahriach vide application dated 5.11.2015 placed on record as Annexure 2 (colly.) praying for initiation of contempt proceedings against the police officials for not complying with order dated 3.9.2015 passed by the Magistrate.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that contempt petition might not be the appropriate remedy, however, the petitioner being an illiterate lady who only affixes thumb impression, and with limited means approached the nearest forum available by way of filing an application dated 5.11.2015.

9. Despite repeated efforts, when criminal proceedings were not initiated in accordance with law, the petitioner has approached this court. This court issued order dated 15.3.2016 in the following terms :-

“1. The petition seeks issuance of a writ of mandamus directing Station House Officer, Police Station Dargah Shareef, district Bahraich to register First Information Report in deference to order passed by concerned Magistrate dated 3.09.2015.

2. Perusal of order dated 03.09.2015 (Annexure-1) passed by Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bahraich indicates that a direction has been issued under Section 156(3) CrPC to the Station House Officer to register First Information Report. The needful, however, has not been done.

3. We have taken note of the fact that the alleged crime was committed on 10.5.2015. By virtue of delay in investigation, evidence is likely to be lost or manipulated.

4. Station House Officer, Police Station Dargah Shareef, district Bahraich is directed to remain present in Court on 31.3.2016 with an explanation as to under what circumstances, an order passed by the Magistrate has been ignored. The said officer would also show cause why cost in the sum of Rs.20,000/- be not imposed for not obeying an order passed in due process of law.

5. *It is, however, made clear that in case criminal case has already been registered before filing of the petition, the petitioner would be liable to pay the cost.*

6. *List on 31.3.2016."*

10. It appears that the criminal proceedings have been initiated on 30.3.2016 by way of registering crime No.278 of 2016 under Sections 376 and 304 I.P.C., Police Station Dargah Shareef, District Bahriach, after this court passed above extracted order.

11. The matter cannot however be allowed to rest, simply because the prayer of the petitioner has been allowed. We are coming across a large number of cases in which the police does not register F.I.R. even though a complaint might *prima facie* disclose commission of cognizable offence. We have also noticed that the police takes weeks and months in registering F.I.R. even after order is passed by a Magistrate under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. The present is one such case. Such conduct of the police results in interference in administration of criminal justice.

12. Shri Devanand Rajak, Sub Inspector, Police Station Kotwali Nagar, has filed affidavit dated 7.4.2016. The following are the contents of para 6 of the affidavit :-

"6. That the Superintendent of Police, thereafter directed Circle Officer-City District Bahriach to conduct an enquiry about the carelessness for not registering the First Information Report in compliance to the order passed by the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Bahriach. The Circle Officer has conducted the enquiry and held following Station House Officers namely Sri Akhilesh Kumar Mishra, Jitendra Kumar Singh, Sri Subh Suchit, Shri Sarfraj Ahmad and Ajeet Kumar Verma were responsible for not complying with the order passed by the learned court below. The Circle Officer has furnished the preliminary enquiry report to the Superintendent of Police Bahriach on 05.04.2016."

13. The above extracted paragraph from the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the police agency indicates that Circle Officer

conducted inquiry and held five Station House Officers posted in the Police Station in the interregnum period responsible for not complying with order of the court. Preliminary inquiry report has been furnished to Superintendent of Police, Bahriach. Superintendent of Police, Bahriach has initiated departmental proceedings. Names of the delinquent employees are as under :-

- 1. Shri Akhilesh Kumar Mishra,*
- 2. Shri Jitendra Kumar Singh,*
- 3. Shri Subh Suchit,*
- 4. Shri Sarfraj Ahmad*
- 5. Shri Ajeet Kumar Verma*

14. All the above named officers have filed short affidavits in this Court which are to the effect that non compliance of order passed by Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bahriach under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. cannot be justified in any manner. The officers have assured that same mistake will not be repeated. Essentially, the explanation given by the officers is that the order passed by the Magistrate was not brought to the notice of the Station House Officer by Head Moharrir and therefore the order could not be complied with.

15. Station House Officer of a police station has supervisory and superintending control over the Police Station and has to take responsibility for the action/inaction of the officials serving under his control. The procedure for giving information to the Station House Officer, by a subordinate employee in the police station is also required to be prescribed by the Station House Officer and it is required to be ensured that the procedure is followed.

16. It is evident that the superintending control of the respondents was lacking to an extent that an order passed by a court of law was left unattended and non-compliance thereof has caused interference in the administration of criminal justice. The crime that was required to be registered on 3.9.2015 or immediately thereafter, has been registered on 30.3.2016, i.e.

after approximately six months. In the interregnum period, evidently, evidence would have been lost insomuch as the body of the deceased could have been exhumed for postmortem examination, however, after this length of time, exhumation of the body might not bring any qualitative result. Substantial injustice has been caused to the rights of the petitioner, a lady who was supporting her daughter aged about 14 years, who was allegedly not only sexually violated but also done to death in a criminal action.

17. The law on the issue of registration of F.I.R. is required to be considered. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has dealt with the issue in some detail in **Criminal Appeal No.781 of 2012 decided on 19.3.2015 while dealing with Mrs. Priyanka Srivastava and another Vs. State of U.P. and others.** Following has been held (relevant portion from paragraphs 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27) in context of duties of the police officers to register F.I.R., under what circumstances preliminary enquiry as regards, whether cognizable offence has been committed, can be conducted ; and duty of the Magistrate concerned when adjudicating on an application received under Section 156 (3) Cr.P.C. :-

19. In Anil Kumar v. M.K. Aiyappa : (2013) 10 SCC 705, the two-Judge Bench had to say this:

"The scope of Section 156(3) CrPC came up for consideration before this Court in several cases. This Court in Maksud Saiyed [(2008) 5 SCC 668] examined the requirement of the application of mind by the Magistrate before exercising jurisdiction under Section 156(3) and held that where jurisdiction is exercised on a complaint filed in terms of Section 156(3) or Section 200 CrPC, the Magistrate is required to apply his mind, in such a case, the Special Judge/Magistrate cannot refer the matter under Section 156(3) against a public servant without a valid sanction order. The application of mind by the Magistrate should be reflected in the order. The mere statement that he has gone through the complaint, documents and heard the complainant, as such, as reflected in

the order, will not be sufficient. After going through the complaint, documents and hearing the complainant, what weighed with the Magistrate to order investigation under Section 156(3) CrPC, should be reflected in the order, though a detailed expression of his views is neither required nor warranted. We have already extracted the order passed by the learned Special Judge which, in our view, has stated no reasons for ordering investigation."

20. In **Dilawar Singh v. State of Delhi : (2007) 12 SCC 496**, this Court ruled thus:

"18. ...11. The clear position therefore is that any Judicial Magistrate, before taking cognizance of the offence, can order investigation under Section 156(3) of the Code. If he does so, he is not to examine the complainant on oath because he was not taking cognizance of any offence therein. For the purpose of enabling the police to start investigation it is open to the Magistrate to direct the police to register an FIR. There is nothing illegal in doing so. After all registration of an FIR involves only the process of entering the substance of the information relating to the commission of the cognizable offence in a book kept by the officer in charge of the police station as indicated in Section 154 of the Code. Even if a Magistrate does not say in so many words while directing investigation under Section 156(3) of the Code that an FIR should be registered, it is the duty of the officer in charge of the police station to register the FIR regarding the cognizable offence disclosed by the complainant because that police officer could take further steps contemplated in Chapter XII of the Code only thereafter.

23. At this stage, we may usefully refer to what the Constitution Bench has to say in **Lalita Kumari v. Govt. of U.P.(2014) 2 SCC 1**, in this regard. The larger Bench had posed the following two questions:-

"(i) Whether the immediate non-registration of FIR leads to scope for manipulation by the police which affects the right of the victim/ complainant to

have a complaint immediately investigated upon allegations being made; and

(ii) Whether in cases where the complaint/information does not clearly disclose the commission of a cognizable offence but the FIR is compulsorily registered then does it infringe the rights of an accused."

Answering the questions posed, the larger Bench opined thus:

"49. Consequently, the condition that is sine qua non for recording an FIR under Section 154 of the Code is that there must be information and that information must disclose a cognizable offence. If any information disclosing a cognizable offence is led before an officer in charge of the police station satisfying the requirement of Section 154(1), the said police officer has no other option except to enter the substance thereof in the prescribed form, that is to say, to register a case on the basis of such information. The provision of Section 154 of the Code is mandatory and the officer concerned is duty-bound to register the case on the basis of information disclosing a cognizable [pic]offence. Thus, the plain words of Section 154(1) of the Code have to be given their literal meaning.

"Shall"

xxx xxx xxx xxx

72. It is thus unequivocally clear that registration of FIR is mandatory and also that it is to be recorded in the FIR book by giving a unique annual number to each FIR to enable strict tracking of each and every registered FIR by the superior police officers as well as by the competent court to which copies of each FIR are required to be sent.

"Information"

xxx xxx xxx xxx

111. The Code gives power to the police to close a matter both before and after investigation. A police officer can foreclose an FIR before an investigation under Section 157 of the Code, if it appears to him that there is no sufficient ground to investigate the same. The section itself states that a police officer can start investigation when he

has "reason to suspect the commission of an offence". Therefore, the requirements of launching an investigation under Section 157 of the Code are higher than the requirement under Section 154 of the Code. The police officer can also, in a given case, investigate the matter and then file a final report under Section 173 of the Code seeking closure of the matter. Therefore, the police is not liable to launch an investigation in every FIR which is mandatorily registered on receiving information relating to commission of a cognizable offence.

xxx xxx xxx xxx

115. Although, we, in unequivocal terms, hold that Section 154 of the Code postulates the mandatory registration of FIRs on receipt of all cognizable offences, yet, there may be instances where preliminary inquiry may be required owing to the change in genesis and novelty of crimes with the passage of time. One such instance is in the case of allegations relating to medical negligence on the part of doctors. It will be unfair and inequitable to prosecute a medical professional only on the basis of the allegations in the complaint."

After so stating the constitution Bench proceeded to state that where a preliminary enquiry is necessary, it is not for the purpose for verification or otherwise of the information received but only to ascertain whether the information reveals any cognizable offence. After laying down so, the larger Bench proceeded to state:-

"120.6. As to what type and in which cases preliminary inquiry is to be conducted will depend on the facts and circumstances of each case. The category of cases in which preliminary inquiry may be made are as under:

- (a) Matrimonial disputes/family disputes*
- (b) Commercial offences*
- (c) Medical negligence cases*
- (d) Corruption cases*
- (e) Cases where there is abnormal delay/laches in initiating criminal prosecution, for example, over 3 months' delay in reporting the matter without*

satisfactorily explaining the reasons for delay.

The aforesaid are only illustrations and not exhaustive of all conditions which may warrant preliminary inquiry.

120.7. While ensuring and protecting the rights of the accused and the complainant, a preliminary inquiry should be made time-bound and in any case it should not exceed 7 days. The fact of such delay and the causes of it must be reflected in the General Diary entry."

We have referred to the aforesaid pronouncement for the purpose that on certain circumstances the police is also required to hold a preliminary enquiry whether any cognizable offence is made out or not.

24. Regard being had to the aforesaid enunciation of law, it needs to be reiterated that the learned Magistrate has to remain vigilant with regard to the allegations made and the nature of allegations and not to issue directions without proper application of mind. He has also to bear in mind that sending the matter would be conducive to justice and then he may pass the requisite order. The present is a case where the accused persons are serving in high positions in the bank. We are absolutely conscious that the position does not matter, for nobody is above law. But, the learned Magistrate should take note of the allegations in entirety, the date of incident and whether any cognizable case is remotely made out. It is also to be noted that when a borrower of the financial institution covered under the SARFAESI Act, invokes the jurisdiction under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. And also there is a separate procedure under the Recovery of Debts due to Banks and Financial Institutions Act, 1993, an attitude of more care, caution and circumspection has to be adhered to.

25. Issuing a direction stating "as per the application" to lodge an FIR creates a very unhealthy situation in the society and also reflects the erroneous approach of

the learned Magistrate. It also encourages the unscrupulous and unprincipled litigants,"

26. *At this stage it is seemly to state that power under Section 156(3) warrants application of judicial mind. A court of law is involved. It is not the police taking steps at the stage of Section 154 of the code. A litigant at his own whim cannot invoke the authority of the Magistrate.*

A principled and really grieved citizen with clean hands must have free access to invoke the said power. It protects the citizens but when pervert litigations takes this route to harass their fellows citizens, efforts are to be made to scuttle and curb the same.

27. *In our considered opinion, a stage has come in this country where Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. applications are to be supported by an affidavit duly sworn by the applicant who seeks the invocation of the jurisdiction of the Magistrate. That apart, in an appropriate case, the learned Magistrate would be well advised to verify the truth and also can verify the veracity of the allegations. This affidavit can make the applicant more responsible. We are compelled to say so as such kind of applications are being filed in a routine manner without taking any responsibility whatsoever only to harass certain persons. That apart, it becomes more disturbing and alarming when one tries to pick up people who are passing orders under a statutory provision which can be challenged under the framework of said Act or under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. But it cannot be done to take undue advantage in a criminal court as if somebody is determined to settle the scores. We have already indicated that there has to be prior applications under Section 154(1) Cr.P.C. and 154(3) Cr.P.C. while filing a petition under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. Both the aspects should be clearly spelt out in the application and necessary documents to that effect shall be filed. The warrant for giving a direction that an the application under Section 156(3) be supported by an*

affidavit so that the person making the application should be conscious and also endeavour to see that no false affidavit is made. It is because once an affidavit is found to be false, he will be liable for prosecution in accordance with law. This will deter him to casually invoke the authority of the Magistrate under Section 156(3). That apart, we have already stated that the veracity of the same can also be verified by the learned Magistrate, regard being had to the nature of allegations of the case. We are compelled to say so as a number of cases pertaining to fiscal sphere, matrimonial dispute/family disputes, commercial offences, medical negligence cases, corruption cases and the cases where there is abnormal delay/laches in initiating criminal prosecution, as are illustrated in Lalita Kumari are being filed. That apart, the learned Magistrate would also be aware of the delay in lodging of the FIR.”

18. To sum up the law as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Mrs. Priyanka Srivastava's case (supra) (above extracted portion), we find that the following has been held :-

(a). Perusal of the above extracted portion from the judgment rendered in Mrs. Priyanka Srivastava's case(supra) inheres two sets of circumstances. In the first eventuality, it has been provided that if any information disclosing a cognizable offence is brought to the notice of the officer incharge of a police station satisfying the requirement of Section 154(1) Cr.P.C., the said police officer has no other option except to enter the substance thereof in the prescribed form viz. register case on the basis of such information. Provision of Section 154(1) Cr.P.C. is mandatory and the officer concerned is duty bound to register a case on the basis of information disclosing a cognizable offence.

(b). In the second category are the cases which might require preliminary enquiry to ascertain whether the information reveals commission of any cognizable offence.

As to in what type of cases and in which case preliminary enquiry is required will depend on the facts and circumstances of each case. Some of the types of cases are mentioned in the above extracted portion of the judgement, viz. Matrimonial disputes/family disputes; Commercial offences; Medical negligence cases; corruption cases; Cases where there is abnormal delay/laches in initiating criminal prosecution, for example, over 3 months' delay in reporting the matter without satisfactorily explaining the reasons for delay.

We might add that other than the above noted cases there might be cases filed in counterblast for malicious prosecution; or on account of on going civil dispute so as to pressurise the other side by initiating criminal proceedings.

The list is not exhaustive and it would depend on the facts and circumstances of a case whether such enquiry is required. It has however, been specified in the judgement that such preliminary enquiry is required to be concluded within seven days of receipt of information/complaint.

(c). It has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India that where a Magistrate exercises jurisdiction on a complaint filed in terms of Section 156 (3) Cr.P.C. or Section 200 Cr.P.C., the Magistrate is required to apply his mind. The application of mind by the Magistrate should be reflected in the order. The mere statement that he has gone through the complaint, documents and heard the complainant, as such, will not be sufficient. After going through the complaint, documents and hearing the complainant what weighed with the Magistrate to order investigation under Section 156 Cr.P.C., should be reflected in the order, though a detailed expression of his views is neither required nor warranted.

It has been clarified in the above extracted judgement that the judicial Magistrate before taking cognizance of the offence, can order investigation under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. If he does so, he is not to examine

the complainant on oath because he was not taking cognizance of any offence. For the purpose of enabling the police to start investigation, it is open to the Magistrate to direct the police to register an F.I.R. Even if a Magistrate does not say in so many words while directing investigation under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. that an F.I.R. should be registered, it is the duty of the officer incharge of the police station to register the F.I.R. regarding the cognizable offence disclosed by the complainant.

It has been stressed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India that the Magistrate has to remain vigilant with regard to the allegations made and the nature of the allegations, and not to issue directions without proper application of mind. He has also to bear in mind that sending the matter for investigation, would be conducive to justice and then he may pass the requisite order. The Magistrate should take note of the allegations in entirety, the date of incident and whether any cognizable case is remotely made out.

It has been specifically held that the power under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. warrants application of judicial mind. A court of law is involved. It is not the police taking steps at the stage of Section 154 Cr.P.C. A litigant at his own whim, cannot invoke authority of the Magistrate. A principled and really grieved citizen with clean hands, must have free access to invoke the said power. It protects the citizen, but when pervert litigants take this route to harass their fellow citizens, efforts are to be made to scuffle and curb the same.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has held that applications made under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. are to be supported by affidavit of the person who seeks the invocation of the jurisdiction of the Magistrate. That apart, in an appropriate case, the Magistrate would be well

advised to verify the truth and also can verify the veracity of the allegations. The affidavit would make the applicant more responsible. The Hon'ble Supreme of India has taken judicial notice of the fact that such applications under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. are being filed in a routine manner without any responsibility whatsoever only to harass certain people. An application under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. can be filed only after applications under Section 154(1) Cr.P.C. and 154(3) Cr.P.C. have already been filed. These aspects should be clearly spelt out in the application and necessary documents to that effect are required to be filed alongwith the application under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C.

19. In the considered opinion of the court, the police has no discretion not to register F.I.R. in a case in which direction has been issued by a Magistrate under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. In such cases, as held in the above noted judgment, the Magistrate has already applied his mind in regard to *prima facie* commission of a cognizable offence, before issuing a direction under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. It therefore follows that once a direction is issued by the Magistrate under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. to register a case and investigate, law mandates that substance of the information is entered in the prescribed form and start investigation. The police in such cases has no discretion to delay registration of the case so as to verify facts, or even to consider whether cognizable offence has been committed.

20. We have taken notice of the fact that the Magistrate, while issuing directions to the Station House Officer of the concerned police station vide order dated 3.9.2015 (Annexure No.2), applied his mind on the facts and circumstances emanating from the complaint. The *prima facie* satisfaction as regards the ingredients of the offence allegedly committed has been recorded, and it has been opined that apparently offence of rape and murder has been committed.

21. In the case in hand though order was passed by the

Magistrate under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. on 3.9.2015 yet without any reason whatsoever, factual or legal, the F.I.R was not registered. Investigation was not under taken for over six months. The First Information Report has been registered after intervention of this court by way of seeking an explanation from the Station House Officer vide order dated 15.3.2016. The inaction of the concerned officers has interfered in administration of criminal justice delivery system.

22. As has been held in the inquiry report submitted by the Circle Officer concerned, the five Station House Officers named hereinabove, ignored the order passed by the Magistrate rendered under Section 156 Cr.P.C. and have also failed in discharging their statutory duty under Section 154 Cr.P.C. The petitioner, had to approach the Magistrate again. When no action was taken, the petitioner had to approach this Court with the grievance.

23. Considering the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case, we hereby impose costs in the sum of Rs.75,000/- to be collected from all the five police officers mentioned in the above portion of the judgment, to be paid to the petitioner.

24. The cost amount has been paid to the petitioner in court in cash today.

25. Learned counsel for the respondent State, has pointed out that effective investigation is being conducted. Body of the deceased has been exhumed. It is being verified whether daughter of the petitioner was pregnant at the relevant time and whether the other offences have been committed or not.

26. This Court trusts that the scientific investigation would be conducted with the assistance and aid of the best possible medical and forensic facility available in the State.

27. Shri S.P.Singh, learned A.G.A. appearing for the prosecution has assured the court that needful would be done.

28. In view of the above, this petition is disposed of.

29. Let a copy of this order be forwarded to the Director

General of Police, U.P., Lucknow, who is required to ensure that F.I.R. is registered at the earliest and investigation is undertaken, when an order is passed by a Magistrate under section 156(3) Cr.P.C.

Order Date : 18.5.2016.

Shukla.