

**BEFORE THE RAILWAY CLAIMS TRIBUNAL,
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI**

CORAM: Shri. Alok Upasani, Member (Judicial)

Claim Application No: OA (II U) / MCC / 536 / 2019

1. Mr. Appasaheb Gopal Karande,
Aged 47 years.
Residing at:
B-Cabin Road, Ambekar Nagar,
Near Shivshakti Apartment, Room No. 7974,
Ambernath, Dist - Thane, Maharashtra. ... APPLICANT

Versus

Union Of India,
Through the General Manager,
Central Railway, CSMT,
Mumbai- 400001. ... RESPONDENT

Appearances:

Mr. D T Ajagekar	: Advocate for Claimant
Mr. P Pal	: Advocate for Respondent

Date of Institution: 14.08.2019

Date of Judgement: 24.12.2024

JUDGEMENT

1. The Claim Application has been filed by the Applicant, Appasaheb Gopal Karande, for compensation under Section 16 of the Railway Claims Tribunal Act, 1987 read with Section 123 (c) (2) & Section 124-A of the Railways Act, 1989, for injuries sustained by him in an alleged untoward incident, occurred on 21.10.2018.

The factual matrix of the matter in nut-shell is as below:

2. It is stated that Appasaheb Gopal Karande (hereafter referred as injured), resident of Ambernath, was working as a labourer. It is alleged that on 21.10.2018 he came to Ambernath Railway Station

and purchased a ticket to travel from Ambernath to Kalyan Railway Station. When the said train had started from Vithalwadi Railway station, due to rush and push from the passengers of the compartment, he accidentally fell down from the train and sustained injuries on head and right hand and was taken to Rukminibai Hospital, then Thane Civil Hospital for primary aid and thereafter was shifted to KEM Hospital, Parel for better medical treatment. It is further stated that the injured was travelling as a bonafide passenger, on the strength of a valid Second Class Railway Ticket but the said Ticket was lost in the incident. Hence, it is contended that the Applicant was involved in an untoward incident leading to his injuries.

3. In response to notice, Respondent - Railway Authority appeared and opposed the claim application. The Respondent has filed Written statement and also produced on record the DRM's report pertaining to investigation conducted by IPF/Kalyan, accompanied with other relevant police papers marked as "R-1".

It has been contended in the DRM's Report that:

"दिनांक 21.10.2018 को स्टेशन उप प्रबंधक विठलवाडी द्वारा समय करीबन 21.40 बजे जीआरपी कल्याण के प्रधान आरक्षक 291 धिगे को बुलाया तथा मेमो क्रमांक 038061 जारी करके बताया कि एक अज्ञात व्यक्ति रेल पटरी पार करने के दौरान अज्ञात लोकल ट्रेन की चपेट में आने से दाहिने हाथ व सिर पर मार लगने से जखमी हुआ। बाद प्रधान आरक्षक 291 धिगे द्वारा जखमी को उपचार हेतु रुकमणी बाई अस्पताल कल्याण ले जाया गया। बाद आन ड्युटी डाक्टर द्वारा अगले उपचार हेतु सिविल अस्पताल ठाणे में ले जाने हेतु बताया गया तथा स्थानांतरण पत्र जारी किया गया बाद जखमी व्यक्ति को जीआरपी द्वारा सिविल अस्पताल ठाणे में ले जाया गया उसी दौरान जखमी की पत्नी नामे शालन अप्पासाहेब कांरडे, अस्पताल में हाजिर हुई तथा उनके द्वारा स्वयं की जिम्मेदारी पर जखमी व्यक्ति को प्राइवेट अस्पताल में उपचार हेतु ले जाने बाबत निवेदन करने पर डाक्टर द्वारा अनुमति दी गई। बाद जखमी की पत्नी द्वारा स्वयं की जिम्मेदारी पर जखमी को प्राइवेट स्पताल में उपचार हेतु लेकर गये। जिस बाबत जीआरपी कल्याण के प्रधान आरक्षक एस.डी. धिगे द्वारा उक्त मामले के दस्तावेज जीआरपी थाना कल्याण में रिपोर्ट के साथ पेश करने पर जीआरपी कल्याण में जखमी क्रमांक 309/2018 दिनांक 22.10.2018 को दर्ज किया गया।

दिनांक 22.10.2018 को जीआरपी कल्याण द्वारा जख्मी व्यक्ति अप्पासाहेब गोपाल कारंडे का बयान दर्ज किया गया जिसमें उल्लेखित है कि वह दिनांक 21.10.2018 को उनके प्राईवेट काम हेतु समय 19.00 बजे घर से बहार निकला बाद विठ्ठलवाडी स्टेशन के प्लेटफार्म क्रमांक 2 से अप सीएसटी लोकल को पकड़ते समय संतुलन खोने से गिर गया।

उक्त घटना के मामले में प्राप्त दस्तावेजों का अवलोकन करने पर यह निष्कर्ष पाया कि संबंधित घटना के संबंध में उपस्टेशन प्रबंधक कल्याण द्वारा मेमो क्रमांक 038061 में दर्शाया गया है कि एक अज्ञात व्यक्ति विठ्ठलवाडी से कल्याण स्टेशन के मध्य किमी नं. 55/17 पर रेल पटरी पार करने के दौरान अज्ञात लोकल ट्रेन की चपेट में आने से दाहिने हाथ व सिर पर मार लगने से जख्मी हुआ। जीआरपी की रिपोर्ट में एवं जख्मी व्यक्ति अप्पासाहेब गोपाल कारंडे के बयान में एवं अन्य दस्तावेजों में रेलवे टिकट बाबत उल्लेख नहीं हैं ना ही यात्रा टिकट की छायाप्रति संलग्न है। घटना के संबंध में गार्ड मेमो या चश्मदीद गवाह का उल्लेख नहीं है। स्टेशन प्रबंधक विठ्ठलवाडी के मेमो के अनुसार जख्मी अप्पासाहेब गोपाल कारंडे उम्र 44 वर्ष हलवाडी से कल्याण के मध्य किमी नं. 55/17 के पास पटरी पार करते समय अज्ञात लोकल चपेट में आकर जख्मी हुआ, इससे जख्मी द्वारा रेल अधिनियम की धारा 147 का उल्लंघन होना साबित होता है। रेल प्रशासन द्वारा समय समय पर उद्घोषणा द्वारा यात्रियों को जागरूक किया जाता है कि अनाधिकृत रूप से पटरी पार न करे जिससे आपकी जान को खतरा उत्पन्न होकर जान भी जा सकती है। परन्तु जख्मी ने इसका भी उलंघन किया जिस कारण यह दुर्घटना घटित हुई है। उक्त घटना के लिये जख्मी स्वयं जिम्मेदार है।”

4. In view of pleading of both parties, and relevant documents produced on record, this Tribunal framed the following issues on 15.12.2020, for just and proper adjudication of Claim Application on merit within ambit of law.

1. Whether the injured was travelling in the train in question as a bonafide passenger?
2. Whether the injured fell down from the train, as alleged and whether the incident can be described as an untoward incident defined Under Section 123(c)(2) of the Railway Act 1989?
3. What is the nature of injuries sustained by the Injured?

4. To what Relief?

5. That, in order to establish the claim, the Injured, Appasaheb Gopal Karande stepped into the witness-box and filed his Affidavit dated 17.05.2023, in lieu of his examination-in-chief on record. He produced the relevant documents comprising:

SN	Documents	Exhibit
1.	Aadhar Card	A-1
2.	SM Memo	A-2
3.	Police Report	A-3
4.	Copy of Medical Papers	A-4
5.	Photo of Applicant	A-5

6. Applicant Appasaheb Gopal Karande (AW-1), in his affidavit dated 17.05.2023 deposed that, on 21.10.2018 he came to Ambernath Railway Station and purchased a ticket to travel from Ambernath to Kalyan Railway Station. When the said train had started from Vithalwadi Railway station, due to rush and push from the passengers of the compartment, he accidentally fell down from the train and sustained injuries on head and right hand and was taken to Rukminibai Hospital, then Thane Civil Hospital for primary aid and thereafter was shifted to KEM Hospital, Parel for better medical treatment. It is further stated that the injured was travelling as a bonafide passenger, on the strength of a valid Second Class Railway Ticket but the said Ticket was lost in the incident.

7. In the cross-examination of injured Applicant Appasaheb Gopal Karande (AW-1) he has stated as under:

"I am a resident of Ambernath. I was engaged in the labour work. After the incident, I am jobless. The incident occurred on 21-10-2018. On the date of incident, was travelling from Ambernath to Kalyan. I am not a regular traveler. The incident occurred at Vithalwadi station. Due to push from other passengers, I fell down and my hand was amputated. I had given statement to the Police. I identify my thumb impression on statement dated 22-10-2018."

The Ld. Counsel for Respondent – Railway suggested that the incident occurred while crossing the tracks. It was further suggested that the injured was not in possession on any valid ticket and was not a bonafide passenger at the time of the incident. However, the AW-1 Appasaheb Gopal Karande turned-down all these suggestions put forth on behalf of Respondent.

8. After examination of Applicant, the Applicant closes his evidence vide pursis dated 17.05.2023.

Respondent did not adduce any oral evidence in the matter.

9. During arguments, Ld. Counsel for the Applicant argued that the AW1 has filed an affidavit and submitted that due to rush and push from the passengers of the compartment, the victim accidentally fell down from the train resulting in the untoward incident. It is also submitted that the applicant was a bonafide passenger and travelling on the strength of valid Railway Ticket, however, the same was lost in the incident.

Ld. Counsel for the Respondent in its defence submitted that, in absence of any valid travelling authority the injured cannot be said to be a bonafide passenger. It is further submitted that, the alleged incident cannot be termed as untoward incident as it occurred while trespassing the railway tracks and is a self inflicted injury for which Railway administration cannot be held responsible and the said incident dated 21.10.2018 does not fall within the purview of Sec. 124 A (c) of Railway Act, 1989.

10. I have heard the Ld. Counsels appearing for the Applicants and Respondent. I have also gone through the entire documents produced on record. Now, before embarking into the merits of the matter, it would be profitable to set-forth the relevant provisions of the Railway Act 1989 as below:

Sec. 2 (29) defines "passenger" as under:

"passenger" means a person travelling with a valid pass or ticket".

Sec. 123 (c)(2) defines "untoward incident" as under:

"(c) "untoward incident" means-

xxxxx

(2) *the accidental falling of any passenger from a train carrying passengers."*

Sec. 124 - A of the Railways Act is also useful to quote as under:

124-A. Compensation on account of untoward incidents.-

"When in the course of working a railway an untoward incident occurs, then whether or not there has been any wrongful act, neglect or default on the part of the railway administration such as would entitle a passenger who has been injured or the dependant of a passenger who has been killed to maintain an action and recover damages in respect thereof, the railway administration shall, notwithstanding anything contained in any other law, be liable to pay compensation to such extent as may be prescribed and to that extent only for loss occasioned by the death of, or injury to, a passenger as a result of such untoward incident :

Provided that no compensation shall be payable under this section by the railway administration if the passenger dies or suffers injury due to -

- a) suicide or attempted suicide by him;*
- b) self-inflicted injury;*
- c) his own criminal act;*
- d) any act committed by him in a state of intoxication or insanity;*
- e) any natural cause or disease or surgical treatment unless such treatment becomes necessary due to injury caused by the said untoward incident.*

Explanation - For the purposes of this section, "passenger" includes-

- i) a railway servant on duty; and*
- ii) a person who has purchased a valid ticket for travelling, by a train carrying passengers, on any date or a valid platform ticket and becomes a victim of an untoward incident.*

In the backdrop of aforesaid legal provisions, I proceed to scrutinize the evidence produced on record. It is also imperative to bear in mind that the provisions of Evidence Act as well as Procedural law are not strictly applicable to the proceeding before this Tribunal.

Issue No. 1 & 2:

11. These issues being interconnected are being taken up together for the sake of brevity and better appreciation.

12. I have carefully perused SM/Vithalwadi's Memo dated 21.10.2018 wherein, it is stated that, "*Unknown passengers right hand injured and head injured.*" Further, he has also mentioned the reason for the incident as "Hit by unknown train while trespassing". The Police Report states that as per SM/Vithalwadi, the victim got injured at Km 55/17. I have also perused the statement of the Injured Applicant recorded by police on date 22.10.2018 i.e the very next day of the incident, wherein, he has stated that on 21.10.2018 he was travelling from Ambernath to Kalyan Railway Stations. As soon as the train left Vithalwadi Railway Station, due to rush in the train, he lost the balance and accidentally fell down at Platform No. 2 of Vithalwadi Railway Station and sustained injuries to his right hand and head. The statement recorded on the next day of incident has more sanctity and evidentiary value in the eyes of law. The DRM's investigation Report concluded that injured was hit by an unknown local train while trespassing the Railway tracks and attributes that the alleged incident is a self inflicted injury.

There is nothing on record to show, how SM/Vithalwadi came to know about the incident, the memo issued by him is silent on this point. Admittedly, the SM/Vithalwadi is also not an eye witness of the incident. Therefore, it is difficult to accept the reason "tick marked" by the said Station Master. On perusal of record and in absence of any evidence from Respondent's side regarding trespassing by the injured and conclusion arrived by the DRM of trespassing would be of no help to the respondent and same cannot be relied upon. Neither any Motorman nor any Guard was examined by the Respondent to prove the instant case of being trespassing. Moreover, during his deposition, the injured Applicant Appasaheb Gopal Karande stated that he was travelling from Ambernath to Kalyan Railway Station and due to rush in the

train he lost his balance and accidentally fell down. There was no apparent reason for the Applicant to trespass the tracks. Further, no-one has witnessed the Applicant going in front of the running train or crossing the tracks, including the Loco Pilot and Guard of the local train.

13. The instant case cannot be said to be a case of knock down as alleged by the Respondent in view of observation made herein above. In case of (*Shri Balu Narayan Gawale And Ors v/s The Union Of India in Appeal No. 2127 of 2011*) dated 22.07.2024, Hon'ble High Court at Bombay wherein the Hon'ble High Court at Para 14 has observed as under:

"As the case of the Respondent was that the deceased was knocked down by the train while crossing the railway track, the burden was upon the Respondents to lead evidence to prove the said fact. Despite being aware of the exact position when the body of the deceased was found, in the memo issued by the Station Master to the on duty GRP it is stated that the deceased was knocked down by some unknown down local train. It is surprising that it is claimed deceased was knocked down by some unknown down local train as the deceased was found at a particular spot and the railways could have easily identified the train which would be passing through the particular spot at that particular time. Admittedly, Railways have not examined any official neither the motorman of the alleged train which has knocked down the deceased in order to prove that the deceased was crossing the railway track. The Appellants have discharged the initial burden of proving that the deceased was a bona fide passenger holding a valid ticket, had boarded the train at the relevant time and due to heavy overcrowding of the train fell out of the train and had expired as a result of injuries sustained. The provisions of Section 124 of the Railways Act provides for compensation on account of any untoward incident except in the event of contingencies mentioned in clauses (a) to (e). The exceptions carved out in the said section have not been established in the present case. The impugned judgment is therefore perverse for the reason that the Tribunal has failed to notice that the inquest panchanama specifically mentioned that the ticket was found in the wallet of the deceased and secondly, the Tribunal failed to appreciate that the Respondents have not examined any witnesses and thus the case

of the Appellants was established by the evidence which has been produced on record. In case of Ramdhan alias Namdeo (supra) this Court had held that nothing prevented the Respondents from substantiating the plea that the deceased was crossing the railway track and was knocked down. It is well settled that the provisions of compensation in the Railways Act is a beneficial piece of legislation and when upon cumulative consideration of facts and circumstances based on evidence which has come on record it can be reasonably considered on preponderance of probability that the deceased had expired due to an accidental death which does not fall within any of the provisions carved out in Section 124-A of the Act, the claim should have been allowed. In the present case, the dismissal of the claim by the Tribunal suffers from perversity for the reasons stated above and is required to be reversed. It is not disputed by learned counsel appearing for the Respondent that claim of Rs. 8 Lakhs would be liable to be paid in event the appeal succeeds as held by the Apex Court in the case of Union Of India vs. Prabhakaran."

Thus in view of above verdict and in absence of any evidence of trespassing, the contention of the Respondent that injured was hit by train or knockdown is misplaced and misconceived.

14. It is settled proposition that provisions of section 124-A are based on the principle of strict liability or no fault liability and it is mandated that the Railway administration is bound to pay the compensation regardless of any wrongful act, negligence or default on the part of the railway administration. The Railways can escape the liability to pay the compensation only when the said injury comes within the exception clauses (a) to (e) of the proviso to Section 124-A of the Railways Act, 1989 (Supra).

15. In this case Ld. Counsel for the Respondent did not lead any evidence to prove that the act of the injured, sustaining injuries was amenable within any of the exception clauses as envisaged under Section 124-A of the Railways Act, 1989 (Supra).

16. In the above premises, I have no doubt that the victim Appasaheb Gopal Karande during the course of travelling by unknown local train, sustained serious injury and Respondent

cannot be exempted from the liability to pay compensation under section 124 A of Railways Act, 1989.

17. In this case no Railway Ticket was recovered by the Railway Police, during personal search of the victim. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has dealt with the issue, when ticket is not recovered in an untoward incident, in case of Union of India Vs. Rina Devi in Civil Appeal No. 4945 of 2018, in which light burden has been cast upon the Claimants which can be discharged by them by way of filing an affidavit with relevant fact and Respondent has to rebut the presumption. The relevant portion of the judgement in case of Union of India Vs. Rina Devi (Supra), is reproduced as under:

"Mere absence of ticket with such injured or deceased will not negative the claim that he was a bonafide passenger. Initial burden will be on the claimant which can be discharged by filing an affidavit of the relevant facts and burden will then shift on the Railways and the issue can be decided on the facts shown or the attending circumstances. This will have to be dealt with from case to case on the basis of facts found. The legal position in this regard will stand explained accordingly".

Since accidental fall of the Applicant during the course of travelling has been established and Respondent could not succeed to prove that the injured was not a bonafide passenger at the time of incidence, whereas, the injured Applicant has discharged the burden cast upon him in regard to possession of a valid ticket at the time of incident by way of filing his Affidavit and by way of deposition before this Court. In this case no spot panchnama was prepared and the injured after this incident was shifted from the place of incident to hospital. Therefore, considering the situation in this case and in consideration of the judgement of Apex Court in UOI Vs. Rina Devi (Supra), there is no impediment to conclude that the victim was a bonafide passenger at the time of incidence and his ticket might have lost in post incidence events.

18. On the basis of facts and circumstances of this case and preponderance of evidence adduced on record, I find that the

injured Appasaheb Gopal Karande, on 21.10.2018, while travelling as a bonafide passenger of a local train from Ambarnath to Kalyan Railway Station, accidentally fell down and sustained injuries to his right hand and head. Accordingly, the incident is covered under "untoward incident" as defined under Section 123 (c) (2) read with Section 124-A of the Railways Act, 1989.

Hence, I answer the Issue No. 1 & 2 in affirmative and in favour of the Applicant.

ISSUE NO. 3 & 4

19. The Applicant has filed Discharge Summary of KEM Hospital, Parel, wherein, he was diagnosed with the following injuries:

a) Traumatic amputation of right hand from arm.

During the cross-examination of the injured on 17.05.2023, Ld. Counsel for the Applicant and Respondent have verified the injuries with medical papers on record, and they conceded that the injury mentioned above would be amenable under Sr. No. 2, of Part III viz, "For amputation below shoulder with stump less than 8 inches from tip of acromion" of Railway Accidents and Untoward Incidents (Compensation) Rules, 1990 as amended in 2016. Therefore, based on the compensation amount applicable as on the date of incident, the Applicant is entitled to receive an amount of Rs. 6,40,000/-(Rupees Six Lakh and Forty Thousand Only), for the scheduled injury mentioned above. Accordingly, the Applicant is entitled for a total compensation amount of Rs. 6,40,000/-(Rupees Six Lakh and Forty Thousand Only) as compensation for the said injury sustained by him in an untoward incident.

Since the date of accident i.e. 21.10.2018, is after 31.12.2016, therefore in view of norms laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Union of India Vs. Rina Devi (Supra), the aforesaid Applicant is entitled for a compensation of an amount of Rs. 6,40,000/-(Rupees Six Lakh and Forty Thousand Only) plus interest @ 9% p. a., from the date of incidence till the date of

award, as a compensation on account of the injury sustained by him, in an untoward incident.

Hence, I pass the following order

ORDER

- a) The Claim Application filed under section 16 of Railway claims Tribunal Act 1987, is hereby allowed.
- b) The Respondent shall pay **Rs. 6,40,000/-(Rupees Six Lakh and Forty Thousand Only)** plus interest @ 9%, from the date of incident to the date of order, to the Applicant as a compensation.
- c) The Respondent shall deposit entire amount of award in the office of Additional Registrar, RCT Mumbai within 30 days from the date of receipt of this order.
- d) In case of default in payment within the stipulated period of 30 days as referred above, the Respondent shall pay the further interest @ 9% per annum from the date of receipt of this order till the date of deposit of payment in RCT.
- e) As per the guidelines delineated by the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board) vide Notification dated 3rd June, 2020 under GSR 347 (E) which came into effect from 1st day of January, 2020, after considering the status of the Applicant and to protect the amount from being frittered away, the amount of Rs. 6,40,000/-(Rupees Six Lakh and Forty Thousand Only) plus pro-rata interest shall be disbursed in the following manner:
 1. Applicant Appasaheb Gopal Karande shall be permitted to withdraw an amount of Rs. 40,000/- (Rupees Forty Thousand only), in his Saving Bank Accounts through NEFT/RTGS, from the total awarded compensation amount of Rs. 6,40,000/-(Rupees Six Lakh and Forty Thousand Only) plus interest @ 9 % p.a. from the day of incident till date.
 2. The balance amount of Rs. 6,00,000/- (Rupees Six Lakh only) plus interest, be kept in the name of Applicant

Appasaheb Gopal Karande, in Fixed deposit account in any Nationalised Bank located nearer to the permanent residential address of the Applicant, in the manner described below.

Applicant's name.	Amount to be disbursed in favour of Applicant(s) by NEFT/RTGS	Amount to be invested in Annuity Deposit Scheme of Nationalized Bank and the amount to be dispersed monthly.
Appasaheb Gopal Karande	Rs. 40,000/- (Rupees Forty Thousand only)	Rs. 6,00,000/- (Rupees Six Lakh only) plus pro-rata interest kept in Annuity scheme on similar line as MACAD with monthly payment of Rs. 6,000/- (Rupees Six Thousand Only) in Savings Bank account of the awardee till whole deposit is exhausted.

3. The Claimant is directed to open an individual Savings Bank Accounts in any Nationalized Bank located nearer to the place of permanent residence of Applicants.

4. The Bank is hereby directed not to permit any joint name(s) to be added in the Savings Bank Accounts of the Applicant i.e. the Savings Bank Account of the Applicant shall be an individual Savings Bank Account and not a Joint Account. The concerned Bank is further directed not to issue any Cheque Book and/or Debit Card in the name of Applicant for the above referred S.B. account. If the same are issued, the concerned Bank authority is directed to take step to cancel/revoke the same before making any payment of awarded amount to the Applicant. Moreover, the concerned Bank shall take care for not issuing any

Debit Card relating to above referred S.B. account of the Applicant by any other branch of the Bank. The Bank shall put an endorsement on the Passbook issued in favour of Applicant to the effect that no Cheque Book and/or Debit Card shall be issued to the Claimant without the permission of this Tribunal.

5. The concerned Bank of the Claimant is directed to permit the Claimant to withdraw money from their Savings Bank Accounts by means of a withdrawal form only. The Claimant is directed to produce the copy of this order before the concerned Bank for requisite endorsement in the Passbooks.

6. The Original Annuity Deposit shall be retained by the bank in safe custody. However, the statement containing the monthly payment, last payment date, etc. shall be furnished by Bank to the Claimant.

7. The Bank shall not grant any loan, advance, withdrawal or pre-mature discharge on the Annuity Deposits without permission of this Railway Claims Tribunal. Annuity scheme shall be governed by directions of G.S.R. 347 (E) dated 03.06.2020 issued by Ministry of Railway. This should be strictly implemented by the parties concerned. For better appreciation of the Scheme, GSR may be referred.

8. The Claimant is directed to produce the original Bank Passbook with the necessary endorsement as well as Aadhaar Card and PAN Card before the Additional Registrar, RCT, Mumbai. ADR shall take the following documents on record from the Claimant before releasing the awarded amount.

- (a) Details of the Bank Accounts of the Claimants near to the place of their permanent residence with necessary endorsement.

- (b) Aadhaar Card and PAN Card or any other appropriate ID card; and
- (c) Two sets of photographs and specimen signatures of the Claimants.

9. There shall be no order as to cost.

10. The certified copy of this judgement be given to Applicant free of cost.

Judgement pronounced on 24th December, 2024, in open court.

(Alok Upasani)
Member (Judicial)

MGF