

**IN THE COURT OF THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE FIRST  
CLASS (O), BHUBANESWAR, DIST-KHURDA**

Present : Sk. Md. Quais, M.A., LL.M.  
J.M.F.C. (O), BHUBANESWAR

Date of conclusion of argument : 29.04.2014  
Date of Order : 14.05.2014

C.M.C No. 17 /2009  
(C.M.C 39/2008 of Court of S.D.J.M., Bhubaneswar)  
(Arising out of GR 2588/1992 disposed of  
by Sri A.K. Sahoo, J.M.F.C., Bhubaneswar)

Rabindra Kumar Patra, aged about 56 years,  
S/o- Late Radhakrushna Patra,  
Village-Golam Mohammad Patna,  
P.S.-Balipatna, Dist-Khurda.  
A/P- Panidola, P.S.-Pipili,  
Dist-Puri.

**...Petitioner**

Vrs.

1. Sridhar Patra, aged about 46 years,
2. Kailash Patra, aged about 44 years,  
Both are Sons of Krutibash Patra  
Village-Golam Mohammad Patna,  
P.S.-Balipatna, Dist-Khurda.
3. State of Odisha represented through  
District Magistrate, Khurda.

**.....Opposite Parties**

For the petitioner : Ld. Sri S.K. Mishra & Associate Advocates  
For O.P No. 1 & 2: Ld. Sri S.K. Pradhan & Associate Advocates  
For O.P No. 3 : Ld. APP, Bhubaneswar.

**Petition Under Section 9 of Probation of Offenders Act.**

**ORDER**

This is a petition U/s. 9 of Probation of Offenders Act filed by the petitioner with a prayer to sentence the O.P No. 1 Sridhar Patra and O.P No. 2 Kailash Patra for the original offences U/s. 447/294/379/506/34 of IPC under which they were convicted in GR Case No. 2588/1992, for alleged violation of the conditions of the bonds entered into by them U/s. 4(1)(3) of P.O Act.

2. The case of the petitioner shortly runs as hereunder ;

That the petitioner Rabindra Kumar Patra was the informant in GR Case No. 2588/1992. The O.P No. 1 and 2 along with their associates were accused persons in the above noted case. The case has been disposed of on 11.01.2007 by the then J.M.F.C, BBSR, Sri A.K. Sahoo. In the judgement vide Exhibit-1 the O.P No. 1 and 2 and other three co-accused persons were convicted for offences punishable U/s. 447/294/379/506/34 of IPC. After the accused persons were held guilty, they were released on each furnishing bonds U/s. 4(1)(3) of P.O Act on the very day of judgement i.e. on 11.01.2007 with several conditions including condition no. 2: that “the convicts shall not commit a breach of peace or to do any Act that may occasion a breach of peace” and with condition no. 9 that “the convicts shall not consume any intoxicating commodities”. The

bond was executed for the period of one year for Rs.1000/-. During such period, the convicts were left under the supervision of S.D.P.O., Bhubaneswar. It is alleged that while the bonds were in force, the O.P No. 1 and 2 committed certain offences on 29.06.2007 and on 30.06.2007 as a result of which Balipatna P.S Case No. 63 dtd. 01.07.2007 for offences U/s. 341/323/294/506/34 of IPC was registered on the report of one Ramesh Chandra Nath. After investigation in this case, charge-sheet was submitted against O.P No. 2 along with other co-accused persons. Whereas F.F was not submitted against O.P No. 1. O.P No. 2 faced trial in the afore-cited case leading to GR Case No. 2442/2007 and he was acquitted therefrom. However, during trial the witnesses including the informant deposed that the occurrence had taken place but due to amicable settlement they don't want to depose anything against O.P No. 2 and his associates. It is also alleged that in his FIR the informant, Ramesh Chandra Nath has mentioned that both O.P No. 1 and 2 had consumed liquor during the time of occurrence on 29.06.2007 and 30.06.2007. Hence, it is averred that the O.P No. 1 and 2 violated the condition no. 2 and 9 of the bonds executed by them U/s. 4(1)(3) of P.O Act in GR Case No. 2588/1992.

It is also alleged that while the bonds vide Exhibit-2 and

Exhibit-3 were in force on 01.07.2007 during the period of Panchayat Election Balipatna Police had submitted P.R U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C against O.P No. 1 and 2 apprehending breach of peace in the locality for which the executive Magistrate Bhubaneswar had initiated proceeding U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C vide C.M.C No. 738/2007 against O.P No. 1 and 2 along with their associates in which both the O.Ps had executed interim bond promising not to commit breach of peace during pendency of enquiry U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C. Hence it is averred that O.P No. 1 and 2 were involved and executed interim bond in C.M.C No. 738/2007 having done certain acts that occasioned a breach of peace.

With the aforesaid averments the petitioner has made prayer to recall the order of releasing O.P No. 1 and 2 under 4(1)(3) of P.O Act in GR Case No. 2588/1992 and to award sentence for the offences U/s. 447/294/379/506/34 of IPC against O.P No. 1 and 2 under the provisions of Section 9 (3)(a) of P.O Act.

3. Being summoned O.P No. 1 and 2 have appeared and have filed show cause to the petition of the petitioner. O.P No. 3 through its counsel has appeared and filed show cause.

It is admitted by O.P No. 1 and 2 that they were convicted in GR Case No. 2588/1992 and were released on executing bond U/s.

4(1)(3) of P.O Act on 11.01.2007 and the bond was in force till 10.01.2008. It is submitted that this petition has been filed on the very day of expiry of the supervision period i.e. on 10.01.2008. It is averred that the petitioner and O.P No. 1 and 2 were having previous enmity, for which a number of litigations was pending between them. It is further submitted that the case in GR No. 2442/2007 was pending at the time of filing show cause. Hence, before conclusion of trial no inference can be drawn, as institution of criminal case doesn't prove the guilt of O.P No. 1 and 2. It is also submitted that the O.P. No. 1 and 2 have never violated any condition of the bonds executed by them U/s. 4(1)(3) of P.O Act in GR Case No. 2588/1992. Hence, it is prayed to dismiss the petition filed by the petitioner U/s. 9 of P.O Act.

4. O.P No. 3 through Ld. APP has filed show cause in which it is stated that during the period of one year from dtd. 11.01.2007 to 10.01.2008 O.P No. 2 was involved in GR Case No. 2442/2007 for offence U/s. 341/323/294/506/34 of IPC. During the aforesaid period, both O.P No. 1 and 2 were proceeded U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C by executive Magistrate Bhubaneswar vide C.M.C No. 738/2007. With the aforesaid averments, it is prayed that since the O.P No. 1 and 2 violated conditions of their bonds U/s. 4(1)(3) of P.O Act they may

be called upon to suffer imprisonment for the original offences in GR Case No. 2588/1992.

5. The points to be determined are as follows:

**i.** Whether in between 11.01.2007 and 10.01.2008 while the bonds U/s. 4(1)(3) of P.O Act vide Ext.-2 and Ext.-3 executed by O.P No. 1 and 2 respectively were in force, the O.P No. 1 and 2 committed any breach of peace or did any act that might have occasioned a breach of peace violating condition no. 2 of the bonds ?

**ii.** Whether in between 11.01.2007 and 10.01.2008 while the bonds U/s. 4(1)(3) of P.O Act vide Ext.-2 and Ext.-3 executed by O.P No. 1 and 2 respectively were in force, the O.P No. 1 and 2 consumed any alcohol violating condition no. 9 of the bonds ?

6. In order to establish its case the petitioner has examined four witnesses in all out of whom P.W.1 is the petitioner himself, P.W.2, Ramesh Chandra Nath is the informant and witness in GR Case No. 2442/2007. P.W.3, Balaram Barik and P.W.4, Arjun Barik are witnesses in GR Case No. 2442/2007. None has been examined on behalf of Opposite Parties. As many as 20 numbers of documents have been exhibited on behalf of the petitioner out of which Ext.-1 is

the judgement dtd. 11.01.2007 passed in GR 2588/1992. Ext.-2 is the bond U/s. 4(1)(3) of P.O Act executed by O.P No. 1. Ext-3 is the bond U/s. 4(1)(3) of P.O Act executed by O.P No. 2. Ext-4 is the FIR in GR Case no. 2442/2007. Ext-5, Ext.-6 and Ext.-7 are the depositions of one Ramesh Chandra Nath, Arjun Barik and Balaram Barik in GR Case No. 2442/2007. Ext.-8 is the judgement in GR Case No. 2442/2007. Ext.-9 is the report of Probation Officer. Ext.-10 is the certified copy of order dtd. 01.02.2008 passed by Executive Magistrate, Bhubaneswar in C.M.C No. 738/2007 U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C. Ext.-11 is the case record in C.M.C No. 737/2007 U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C in the court of Executive Magistrate, Bhubaneswar. Ext.-12 to Ext.-20 are the interim bonds furnished by the Opposite Parties in C.M.C No. 737/2007 of the court of Executive Magistrate, Bhubaneswar. No documentary evidence has been adduced on behalf of the Opposite Parties.

7. Before analyzing the evidence put forth by the petitioner it is pertinent to have a glance at the provisions of Section 9 of Probation of Offenders Act which runs as hereunder.

**Section 9: *If the court which passes an order under Section 4 in respect of an offender or any court which could have dealt with the offender in respect of his original offence has reason to believe***

*on the report of a probation officer or otherwise, that the offender has failed to observe any of the conditions of the bond or bonds entered into by him, it may issue a warrant for his arrest or may, if it thinks fit, issue a summon to him and his sureties, if any, requiring him or them to attend before it at such time as may be specified in the summons.*

*2. The court before which an offender is so brought or appears may either remand him to custody until the case is concluded or it may grant him bail, with or without surety, to appear on the date which it may fix for hearing.*

*3. If the court, after hearing the case, is satisfied that the offender has failed to observe any of the conditions of the bond or bonds entered into by him, it may forthwith-*

*a. sentence him for the original offence; or*

*b. where the failure is for the first time, then without prejudice to the continuance in force of the bond, impose upon him a penalty not exceeding fifty rupees.*

*If the penalty imposed under Clause (b) of Sub-section (3) is not paid within such period as the court may fix, the court may sentence the offender for the original offence”.*

It is admitted by both parties that O.P No. 1 and 2 were



convicted for offences U/s. 447/379/294/506/34 of IPC in GR Case No. 2588/1992. It is also admitted by O.P No. 1 and 2 that they had executed bond U/s. 4(1)(3) of P.O Act on 11.01.2007 for a period of one year. It is also admitted that there was condition vide condition no. 2 in such bond that the convicts (O.P No. 1 and 2) shall not commit any breach of peace or shall not do any act that may occasion breach of peace. It also appears from Ext.-2 and Ext.-3 that there was a condition vide condition no. 9 that the convicts (O.P No. 1 and 2) shall not consume alcohol for the aforesaid period.

Now the dispute is whether the O.P No. 1 and 2 committed any breach of peace or any act that occasioned a breach of peace in between 11.01.2007 to 10.01.2008. Coming to the evidence of P.W.1 the petitioner himself, he has deposed that during the probation period O.P No. 1 and 2 caused disturbance with one Ramesh Chandra Nath of village-Patitapabana Patna on 29.06.2007 and 30.06.2007 for which GR Case No. 2442/2007 was registered. The case record in GR 2442/2007 has been called for for reference in this case. The F.I.R of GR 2442/2007 has been marked as Ext.-4. On perusal of Ext.-4 it appears that the F.I.R was lodged by one Ramesh Chandra Nath against O.P No. 1 and 2 for alleged occurrence on 29.06.2007 and 30.06.2007. However O.P No. 1 has not been

charge-sheeted in GR Case No. 2442/2007. P.W.1 further testified that the accused persons in GR 2442/2007 were acquitted after trial. It is further evident from the deposition of P.W.1 that in GR 2442/2007 one Ramesh Chandra Nath, Balaram Barik and Arjun Barik were examined as P.W.1, P.W.2 and P.W.3 respectively. The deposition of such witnesses has been marked as Ext.-5, Ext.-6 and Ext.-7 respectively. The judgement in GR Case No. 2442/2007 has been marked as Ext.-8 by the petitioner. P.W.1, P.W.2 and P.W.3 in GR Case No. 2442/2007 have deposed that there was an incident between Ramesh Chandra Nath and O.P No.2 in the year 2007, but the matter was settled amicably. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that although the proceeding in GR Case No. 2442/2007 ended in acquittal but it is evident from the deposition of the witnesses that there was an occurrence leading to the criminal case. On perusal of evidence adduced on behalf of the petitioner in this Misc. Case No. 17/2009, it appears that the witness P.W.1, Ramesh Chandra Nath in GR 2442/2007 has deposed as P.W.2 in Misc. Case 17/2009. P.W.2, Arjun Barik in GR Case No. 2442/2007 has been examined as P.W.4 in Misc. Case No. 17/2009. P.W.3, Balaram Barik in GR Case No. 2442/2007 has been examined as P.W.3 in Misc. Case No. 17/2009. Ramesh Chandra Nath while deposed in

GR Case No. 2442/2007 that there was an occurrence in the year 2007 with O.P No. 2 but in C.M.C 17/2009 he has deposed in Para-2, during cross-examination that he had put his signature on Ext.-4 (F.I.R In GR Case No. 2442/2007) as per direction of Police on a blank white paper. Later on he could know that a false case was instituted by Police against O.P No. 1 and 2. He further deposed that the allegation in GR Case No. 2442/2007 was false and there was no such occurrence. After knowing the mischief done by Police, by instituting such case, he had settled the dispute with O.P No. 1 and 2 amicably. Arjun Barik was declared hostile by the petitioner in C.M.C. No. 17/2009. while he deposed in GR Case No. 2442/2007 that there was an occurrence in the year 2007 which was compromised between the parties, he deposed in C.M.C 17/2009 that he was not aware of the incident in GR Case No. 2442/2007 nor had he seen the occurrence. As he was not aware of the incident, he has not deposed about the occurrence in GR Case No. 2442/2007. Balaram Barik was also declared hostile by the petitioner in C.M.C. No. 17/2009. He deposed to have given evidence in GR Case No. 2442/2007. But during cross-examination he admitted to have no knowledge about the incident in GR Case No. 2442/2007.

8. From such evidence of Ramesh Chandra Nath, Arjun Barik

and Balaram Barik who are informant and witnesses respectively in GR Case No. 2442/2007. It appears that none has proved the occurrence in GR Case No. 2442/2007. Moreover, the informant himself has deposed that there was no such occurrence as per allegation in GR Case No. 2442/2007. Ramesh Chandra Nath has not been declared hostile by the petitioner as such his evidence can be relied upon. Let us see the finding of the court in GR Case No. 2442/2007. It reveals from Ext.-8 (Judgment in GR Case No. 2442/2007) in Para-7 wherein the court has held that there is no iota of evidence to bring home the charge against the accused persons for committing the alleged offence. With the aforesaid observations, the O.P No. 2 along with co-accused persons were acquitted in GR Case No. 2442/2007. On close scrutiny of the evidence of P.W.2, P.W.3 and P.W.4 in C.M.C. No. 17/2009, the documentary evidence vide Ext.-8, I am at conclusion that the petitioner has failed to establish the occurrence in GR Case No. 2442/2007. If the allegation is not established and the occurrence in GR Case No. 2442/2007 is denied by the informant himself, it is not prudent to believe that the O.P No. 1 and 2 had committed any breach of peace on 29.06.2007 and 30.06.2007.

9. So far as proceeding U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C is concerned it will be

useful to quote the provisions of Section 107 of Cr.P.C before analyzing the facts of the case.

**Section: 107 of Cr.P.C:** *“(1) When an Executive Magistrate receives information that any person is likely to commit a breach of the peace or disturb the public tranquility or to do any wrongful act that may probably occasion a breach of the peace or disturb the public tranquility and is of opinion that there is sufficient ground for proceeding, he may, in the manner hereinafter provided, require such person to show cause why he should not be ordered to execute a bond [with or without sureties,] for keeping the peace for such period, not exceeding one year, as the Magistrate thinks fit.*

*(2) Proceedings under this section may be taken before any Executive Magistrate when either the place where the breach of the peace or disturbance is apprehended is within his local jurisdiction or there is within such jurisdiction a person who is likely to commit a breach of the peace or disturb the public tranquility or to do any wrongful act as aforesaid beyond such jurisdiction”.*

Now coming to the facts of the case, P.W.1, the petitioner has deposed that during probation period of O.P No. 1 and 2 on 07.07.2007 a proceeding U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C was instituted on the report of Balipatna Police before Executive Magistrate,

Bhubaneswar vide C.M.C No. 738/2007. The case record in C.M.C No. 738/2007 was called for from the Court of Executive Magistrate-cum-Sub-collector, Bhubaneswar which is available for reference. The order dtd. 01.02.2008 passed in 738/2007 has been marked as Ext.-10 for the petitioner. The interim bonds U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C executed by O.P No. 1 and 2 in C.M.C No. 737/2007 of the Court of Executive Magistrate, Bhubaneswar have been marked as Ext.-15 and Ext.-12 respectively. C.M.C. No. 737/2007 is counter to C.M.C No. 738/2007. While O.P No. 1 and 2 are first party in C.M.C No. 737/2007, they are second party in C.M.C No. 738/2007. Being first party in 737/2007 O.P No. 1 and 2 had executed Ext.-15 and Ext.-12 respectively. It is argued by Ld. Counsel for the petitioner that since O.P No. 1 and 2 were involved in committing different offences they faced enquiry U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C and promised before Executive Magistrate, Bhubaneswar not to commit further overtact, that may probably occasion a breach of peace. It is further submitted that without challenging the order of Executive Magistrate O.P No. 1 and 2 have executed interim bond U/s. 116(3) of Cr.P.C. As such the contents of Ext.-15 and Ext.-12 are admitted by the O.P No. 1 and 2. Let us examine the contents of Ext.-15 and Ext.-12. The contents of both the documents are same except the name and address of the

delinquents. Ext.-12 executed by O.P No. 2 is as follows:

*“whereas I, Sri Kailash Chandra Patra, S/o- Krutibash Patra, Inhabitant of Village-Golam Mohammad Patna, P.S.- Balipatna, Dist-Khurda have been called upon to enter into a bond to keep the peace for the term of Six months or until the completion of the inquiry in the matter of U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C now pending in the Court of Executive Magistrate, Bhubaneswar, I hereby bind myself not to commit a breach of the peace, or do any act that may probably occasion a breach of the peace, during the said term or until the completion of the said inquiry and in case of my making default therein I hereby bind myself to forfeit to Government the sum of Rs.1,000/- (Rupees one thousand only)”*.

Section 107 of Cr.P.C is preventive Section requiring security for keeping peace and public tranquility in a locality. The intention is to prevent commission of breach of peace. The condition no. 2 imposed in the bond vide Ext.-2 and Ext.-3 U/s. 4(1)(3) of P.O Act executed by O.P No. 1 and 2 clearly speaks that the convicts shall not commit breach of peace or do any act that may occasion a breach of peace. In other words, for proof of violation of condition no. 2 of the bond, two ingredients are required to be fulfilled. It must be established that the convicts did some overtact and due to such

overtact the breach of peace was disturbed in the locality. The overtact by the O.P No. 1 and 2 is alleged occurrence in GR Case No. 2442/2007 and political rivalry with other groups. The occurrence in GR 2442/2007 could not be established. No other act of O.P No. 1 and 2 either for commission of any offence or any act against the public tranquility is established. Moreover, furnishing interim bond which itself discloses that the O.P No. 1 and 2 had promised not to do any act which would occasion a breach of peace cannot be held to be an admission on the part of O.P No. 1 and 2 for committing any breach of peace or doing any act that occasioned a breach of peace. Prevention cannot take the place of commission of breach of peace. The proceeding in 107 of Cr.P.C in C.M.C 737/2007 and C.M.C 738/2007 could not be completed by Ld. Executive Magistrate and no final order was passed in either of the case. Interim bond was preventive measure taken to keep peace during pendency of the proceeding and nothing more.

10. Ext.-9 is the report of Sub-Divisional Probation Officer, Bhubaneswar. S.D.P.O, Bhubaneswar has reported regarding institution of GR Case No. 2442/2007 and proceeding U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C which I have already discussed in the foregoing paragraphs. Apart from pendency of aforesaid two proceedings no other adverse



report is made against the O.P No. 1 and 2 by S.D.P.O., Bhubaneswar.

11. From my discussions made in the foregoing paragraphs, I am at conclusion that there is no convincing reason to believe that the O.P No. 1 and 2 in between 11.01.2007 to 10.01.2008 had committed any breach of peace or did any act that might have occasioned a breach of peace violating condition no. 2 of the bonds U/s. 4(1)(3) of P.O Act vide Ext.-2 and Ext.-3 respectively executed in GR Case No. 2588/1992.

Except Ext.-4 (F.I.R in GR Case No. 2442/2007) there is no material alleging consuming of alcohol by O.P No. 1 and 2 during the period under Probation, violating condition no. 9 of the bonds U/s. 4(1)(3) of P.O Act vide Ext.-2 and Ext.-3 respectively executed in GR Case No. 2588/1992. The contents of Ext.-4 could not be established as the informant Ramesh Chandra Nath himself declined to have known its contents. He has also denied the alleged occurrence. As such it is unsafe to believe that O.P No. 1 and 2 had consumed alcohol during the period under Probation.

With the observation made in the foregoing paragraphs, I am at conclusion that the petition filed by the petitioner is having no merit. Accordingly, the petition U/s. 9 of P.O Act filed by the

petitioner calling upon O.P No. 1 and 2 to receive sentence stands rejected. Send back the case record in GR Case No. 2588/1992, Case Record in GR Case No. 2442/2007 and Case Record in C.M.C No. 738/2007 to the concerned Courts from which it was called for.

O.P No. 1 and 2 are discharged from their P.R bonds executed on dtd. 24.07.2012.

Sd-  
14.05.2014  
J.M.F.C.(O), Bhubaneswar

Dictated, corrected and pronounced in the open court on this the 14<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2014 under my hand signature and seal of this court.

Sd-  
14.05.2014  
J.M.F.C.(O), Bhubaneswar

List of witnesses examined for Petitioner

|       |                      |
|-------|----------------------|
| PW.1  | Rabindra Kumar Patra |
| P.W.2 | Ramesh Chandra Nath  |
| P.W.3 | Balaram Barik        |
| P.W.4 | Arjuna Barik         |

List of witnesses examined for Opposite Parties

None

List of documents admitted in evidence for Petitioner

|       |  |
|-------|--|
| Ext.1 | Judgment dtd. 11.01.2007 passed in GR Case No. |
|-------|--|

- 2442/2007.
- Ext.2 The bond U/s. 4(1)(3) of P.O Act executed by Sridhar Patra.
- Ext.3 The bond U/s. 4(1)(3) of P.O Act executed by Kailash Patra.
- Ext.4 F.I.R of GR case no. 2442/2007.
- Ext.5 Deposition of Ramesh Chandra Nath in GR Case No. 2442/2007.
- Ext.6 Deposition of Arjun Barik in GR Case No. 2442/2007.
- Ext.7 Deposition of Balaram Barik in GR Case No. 2442/2007.
- Ext.8 Judgment in GR Case No. 2442/2007.
- Ext.9 Report of Probation Officer.
- Ext.10 Certified copy of order dtd. 01.02.2008 passed by Executive Magistrate, Bhubaneswar in C.M.C No. 738/2007 U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C.
- Ext.11 Certified copy of order dtd. 01.02.2008 passed by Executive Magistrate, Bhubaneswar in C.M.C No. 737/2007 U/s. 10 of Cr.P.C.
- Ext.12 Interim bond U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C filed by O.P No.
- 2.
- Ext.13 Interim bond U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C filed by Bhagirathi Patra.
- Ext.14 Interim bond U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C filed by Gangadhar Patra.
- Ext.15 Interim bond U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C filed by O.P No. 1.
- Ext.16 Interim bond U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C filed by Sibadatta Patra.
- Ext.17 Interim bond U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C filed by Debadatta Patra.
- Ext.18 Interim bond U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C filed by Ranjan @Rajakishore Sahoo.
- Ext.19 Interim bond U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C filed by Lipuna @ Bibhudatta Patra.
- Ext.20 Interim bond U/s. 107 of Cr.P.C filed by Kailash Chandra Sahoo.

List of documents admitted in evidence for Opposite Parties

N I L

Sd-  
14.05.2014  
J.M.F.C.(O), Bhubaneswar

