

Presented on	:	06/09/2022
Registered on	:	06/09/2022
Decided on	:	18/02/2025
Duration	:	02 Y 05 M 12 D

EXHIBIT-13

MHCC050048402022



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT DINDOSHI
(BORIVALI DIVISION), GOREGAON, MUMBAI

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 272 OF 2022
(CNR NO.MHCC05-004840-2022)

IN
(C.C. NO. 2029/PW/2016)

Shri. Narsingh Bhujangrao Gude
An Adult, Indian Inhabitant of Mumbai
Presently residing at Room No.1, C-1,
Brihan Mumbai Officers Colony,
Khindipada, Mulund (W), Mumbai.

And

Address at : At Post- Ambulga,
Taluka- Khandar, Dist. Nanded,
PIN- 431 714.

...Appellant

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra
Through Dahisar Police Station

...Respondent

Ld. Adv. Mr. Ninad Muzumdar for Appellant.
Ld. APP Mr. Mahajan for Respondent/State.

**CORAM : H.H. ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE
SHRI D. G. DHOBLE (C.R. No.15)**

DATE : 18th FEBRUARY, 2025.

J U D G M E N T

The appellant has preferred this appeal under Section 374 of Cr.P.C. against the judgement and order dated 10/08/2022 passed by the Learned Metropolitan Magistrate, 26th Court, Borivali Mumbai, (Trial Court) in C.C. No.2602029/PW/2016 whereby the appellant was convicted for the offence punishable under Section 509 of Indian Penal Code (IPC) and under Sections 67, 67(A) of Information Technology Act (IT Act) and sentenced him to suffer simple imprisonment for 3 (three) months and fine of Rs.1,000/- in default of payment of fine, to suffer simple imprisonment for 15 days and also directed to pay compensation of Rs.3,000/- to the informant.

The brief facts leading to file present appeal is as under :

2 The appellant is the original accused. The PW-1, informant lodged report against the appellant on the basis of which offence was registered and after completion of investigation, chargesheet came to be filed. It is alleged that on 26/01/2016, in her house at Bungalow No. 74, Matoshree, Borivali (East), Mumbai, a Puja was being held in the Ward of the informant. At around 11:30 p.m., the informant checked her mobile phone and found 20 to 25 messages on her WhatsApp

account from an unknown mobile No. 9920793911. Upon opening the said messages, the informant found texts such as, “Are you asleep? Are you married or not? You are looking smart. You are very fair. I like you. My age is 40 years. Meet you tomorrow.” It was further alleged that some obscene messages were also sent from the said mobile number. After informing her husband about the messages, her husband (PW-2) attempted to make call on the said number, but the call was not answered. Subsequently, more messages were received from the same number, stating: “Sorry, call not accepted at night. WhatsApp chatting I like, come online.” Following these events, the informant lodged a report with Dahisar Police Station by producing screen shots. On the basis of which FIR No.46/2016 came to be registered.

3 During the course of the investigation, statements of witnesses were recorded by PW-4, Investigating Officer and the accused was arrested. The investigating officer also seized original mobile of the accused in front of panchas and prepared personal search panchnama thereof. Then he sought ownership of the mobile number from the Commissioner and collected vodafone report about ownership of the subscriber’s number. He also collected Forensic opinion regarding messages and photographs from the forensic experts. Upon completion of the investigation, Charge-sheet was filed against the accused before the Trial Court having found sufficient material to have committed alleged offence.

4 Thereafter, the charges were framed by Learned Trial Court against the accused under Section 509 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC)

read with Sections 67 and 67A of the Information Technology (IT) Act. The accused denied the charges and claimed to be trial.

5 In order to prove the guilt of the accused, the prosecution has examined as well as 4 (four) witnesses and relied upon documentary evidence. i.e Repor at Exhibit-12, FIR at Exhibit-13, Mobile Seizure Panchnama at Exhibit-25, Letter send to the Chemical Analyser Exhibit-26, Scientific Foreinsic report Article E, Report from Vodafone Company regarding ownership subscriber at Exhibit-35, correspondence at Exhibits- 27, 36, 37, 28, 29 and WhatsApp Screen shot at Articles A to D, etc. The defence did not lead any evidence in support of his defence. However, in his statement recorded under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Cr.PC.), the accused claimed false implication and total denial.

6 The Learned Metropolitan Magistrate, after hearing both sides and considering the record, vide Judgment and Order dated 10/08/2022, convicted the appellant/accused under Section 509 of IPC and sentenced him to suffer simple imprisonment of (3) three months. Further, Sections 67 and 67A of the IT Act, sentenced him to suffer simple imprisonment of three (3) months along with a fine of Rs. 1,000/-, in default of which he was sentenced to suffer simple imprisonment for 15 days. He was also directed to pay compensation of Rs.3000/- to informant. Being aggrieved by the Judgment and Order dated 10/08/2022, the appellant preferred the present appeal before this Court amongst the grounds mentioned in the appeal memo.

7 Heard the Learned advocate for appellant and Learned APP for the State. I have carefully examined the impugned judgment and order dated 10/08/2022, the memorandum of appeal, the evidence and the documents on record. I have also considered the arguments advanced by the Learned advocates for both sides and the written notes of arguments filed including citations.

8 On the basis of which, following points arises for my determination. I have recorded my findings thereon for reasons to be recorded below.

<u>SR. NO.</u>	<u>POINTS</u>	<u>FINDINGS</u>
1	Whether the prosecution proves that the accused, on 26/01/2016, at about 11:00 p.m. to 12:30 a.m., insulted the modesty of the informant by sending messages and obscene photographs from his mobile on the WhatsApp account of informant with the intention that the same shall be heard or seen by the informant or introduced intrudes upon privacy of informant and thereby committed an offence punishable under Section 509 of IPC ?	Yes.
2	Whether the prosecution proves that on the aforesaid date, time, and place, the accused transmitted or caused to be published in electronic form any material by sending messages and obscene photographs on the WhatsApp account of the informant, which contained sexually explicit acts or conduct and which was lascivious or appealed to the prurient interest, or its effect was such as to	Yes.

	deprave and corrupt persons who were likely to read, see, or hear the matter contained or embodied in it, and thereby committed an offence punishable under Sections 67 and 67A of the Information Technology Act?	
3	Whether the impugned judgment and order requires interference ?	No.
4	What order ?	Appeal is dismissed.

REASONS

9 The Learned advocate for appellant submitted that the prosecution has not established that the appellant was the actual user of the SIM Card at the relevant time. The Vodafone Report (Exhibit-35) merely indicates that the mobile number was registered in the appellant's name but does not confirm its usage by him. He submitted that mere registration of a SIM Card in an individual's name does not prove exclusive usage unless corroborated by CDRs, location details, or witness testimony. The prosecution has not produced the alleged SIM card to establish that it was in the appellant's possession at the relevant time. Even assuming the mobile phone was seized, the prosecution has not proved that the relevant SIM card was inside it or not. The Panch witness (PW-3) turned hostile. Therefore, the seizure panchanama of mobile is not proved.

10 The Learned advocate for appellant further submitted that the Vodafone Report (Exhibit-35) lacks authentication as it does not bear

the signature or seal of an authorized officer. The prosecution failed to examine the Nodal Officer to verify the authenticity of this document. He submitted that documentary evidence must be proved by a competent witness who is author of the document. Further, the report is not accompanied by a certificate under Section 65B of the Indian Evidence Act, making it inadmissible. He placed reliance on the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **Anvar P. V. Vs. P. K. Basheer and others in Civil Appeal No.4226 of 2012 decided on 18th September, 2014**. There is no independent evidence, such as call detail records (CDRs) or tower location data, proving that the appellant used the mobile number to send the alleged messages. The prosecution failed to establish a direct link between accused and WhatsApp chats and obsence photos sent. The prosecution has failed to prove the charges beyond a reasonable doubt. The appellant, therefore, prays for setting aside the conviction and acquittal from all charges.

11 The Learned APP for Respondent/State submitted that the Vodafone report (Exhibit-35) clearly shows that the mobile number in question was registered in the appellant's name. In the absence of any alternative explanation from the defense, it can be reasonably presumed that the appellant was the user of the SIM Card. The evidence on record, including the Vodafone Report and the Cyber Forensic Report (Article-'E'), collectively establish that the offending messages originated from the appellant's mobile number. Even though PW-3 turned hostile, the seizure panchnama of original mobile phone of accused still holds evidentiary value, as it was proved by Investigating Officer. The defense did not raise any objection to the Vodafone report's

admissibility at the trial stage. The appellant has failed to discharge the burden under Section 106 of the Indian Evidence Act to explain who his registered number was used for sending the alleged messages, failing which an adverse inference may be drawn. The service provider's report and Forensic Scientific Report including oral evidence, sufficiently establishes the connection between the mobile number. He submitted that minor lapses in investigation do not automatically render the entire prosecution case doubtful. Finally prayed that the conviction of the appellant be upheld as the prosecution has proved the case beyond a reasonable doubt.

12 In order to appreciate the rival contentions set forth by the parties, let me now discuss the evidence on record. PW1 is the informant/victim. The informant in her evidence deposed that the incident took place on 26/01/2016. At about 11:30 p.m., she received 20 to 25 WhatsApp messages from a mobile number starting with 99 and ending with 911 on her own mobile No.8879997010. The messages contained text such as: "You are slim." "You are looking very smart." "You are fair." "My age is 40 years." "Are you married or not ?" She also stated that obscene pictures and messages were sent. She tried calling the sender, but the person did not pick up her call. Thereafter, she lodged a report (Exhibit-12) and also produced a certificate under Section 65(B) of the Indian Evidence Act along with the printouts of messages and pictures, marked as Article 'A' to 'D'. She further stated that due to these messages, she was troubled, insulted, and felt ashamed.

13 During the cross-examination, she admitted that her husband was elected as a Corporator of the Rashtriyawadi Congress Party and that she is now a Corporator from Shiv Sena Party. She further admitted that in 2012, the BMC provided her with Mobile No. 8879997010, which was registered with the BMC office and available to all BMC officers and employees. She admitted that WhatsApp was installed on the said mobile number and that voters from her Ward would send her messages. However, she specifically denied that her husband used her mobile phone or checked her WhatsApp messages. She also stated that she was unaware of any BMC officer sending her a WhatsApp message on 26/01/2016, inviting her and her family to a blood donation camp.

14 She denied the defence suggestion that no messages were received as per Articles 'A' to 'D', that no such incident occurred and that no obscene messages or photographs were received by her. She also denied the allegation that she lodged a false report due to a quarrel with a Hydraulic Engineer of BMC or that she used her political influence to pressure the police into registering the FIR. The prosecution, through the informant's evidence, proved the report (Exh. 12) and the FIR (Exh. 13). No contradictions or omissions were brought on record except for the defence's denial.

15 PW. No.2, Bhaskar Namdeo Khursange (Exhibit-15) is the husband of the informant. He supported the informant's version and deposed that on 26/01/2016 at about 11:30 p.m., the informant showed him her mobile phone, and he saw obscene messages and

pictures. The messages included: “You are very smart.” “You are looking beautiful.” “You like me.” Along with these messages, obscene pictures were also received. He further stated that he told the informant to call the sender, but the accused did not answer the call and instead continued sending WhatsApp messages. He and the informant then went to the police station and the informant lodged a report. His statement was recorded by the police.

16 The defence cross-examined PW-2 at length. He admitted that from 2007 to 2012, he was associated with the Rashtriyawadi Congress Party and that the informant is now a Corporator of Shiv Sena Party. However, he denied that he and the informant frequently visited the police station. He denied that he used the informant’s mobile. He admitted that any message can go viral on WhatsApp. A xerox copy of a newspaper article from Bombay Times was shown to him during the cross-examination. He admitted that the photos in the newspaper and WhatsApp were the same but denied that the newspaper photo went viral on WhatsApp at the relevant time. He admitted that Articles ‘A’ to ‘D’ do not bear the signature of the informant. However, he denied that the accused did not send any messages and denied the suggestion that the messages were not obscene or that they pressured the police into registering the FIR.

17 PW. No.3, Manoj Kupil Saha (Exhibit-17) was the panch witness. He only admitted his signature (Exhibit-18) on the panchnama but denied the contents of the panchnama. He denied that no original mobile phone was seized in his presence. As the panch witness resiled

from the panchnama, the prosecution sought permission from the Court and cross-examined him at length. However, the prosecution failed to bring any material supporting its case on record.

18 PW. No.4, Uday Baliram Rajeshirkhe (Exhibit-24) is the Investigating Officer (I.O.). He deposed that on 26/01/2016, he was attached to Dahisar Police Station. C.R. No. 46/2016 was registered by PSI Birade, and the investigation was handed over to him. During the investigation, he seized the mobile phone of the accused and prepared the seizure panchnama (Exhibit-25). He stated that he sent the mobile phone for chemical analysis and made official correspondence (Exhibit-26). The chemical analysis report (Article 'E') was filed on record. He further stated that he issued letters (Exhibits-27, 28, 29) to obtain information regarding the mobile number. Vodafone provided details (Exh. 35) confirming that the mobile belonged to the accused. He made further correspondence with the Cyber Cell (Exhibits- 36, 37).

19 In cross-examination, he admitted that when the incident took place, the informant was a Corporator of Shiv Sena and that her husband was an Ex-Corporator of Rashtriyawadi Congress Party. He admitted that the informant and her husband often visited the police station. He admitted that he did not seize the informant's mobile phone nor prepare any panchnama while taking printouts from the informant's mobile. He denied allegations that he falsified the investigation under political pressure. He admitted that the seized mobile phone model was easily available in the market. However, he denied that he filed a false Charge sheet against the accused.

AS TO POINT NOS. 1 AND 2 :

20 PW. No.1, Riddhi is the informant and the star witness of the prosecution. She was corporator in BMC at the relevant time. The informant in her evidence stated that the incident took place on 26/01/2016. At about 11:30 p.m., she received 20 to 25 WhatsApp messages from a mobile number starting with 99 and ending with 911 in her own mobile number 8879997010. The messages contained text such as: "You are slim." "You are looking very smart." "You are fair." "My age is 40 years." "Are you married or not?" "I like You", etc. Along with these messages, obscene pictures were also sent to her.

21 PW-1 stated that she tried calling the sender but the person did not pick up her call. Thereafter, feeling insulted and ashamed, she lodged a report (Exhibit-12) and also produced a certificate under Section 65(B) of the Indian Evidence Act along with the printouts of messages and pictures, marked as Article 'A' to 'D'. She denied that her husband used her mobile phone or checked her WhatsApp message. She denied that no messages were received as per Articles 'A' to 'D', that no such incident occurred, and that no obscene messages or photographs were received by her.

22 PW. No. 2, Bhaskar is the husband of the informant. He supported the informant's version and corroborated the testimony of PW-1. He deposed that on 26/01/2016 at about 11:30 p.m., the informant showed him her mobile phone, and he saw obscene messages and

pictures. He further stated that he told the informant to call the sender, but the accused did not answer the call and instead continued sending WhatsApp messages. During cross examination, nothing was brought on record. The defense raised political rivalry as a motive for false implication, but no contradictions affecting the core allegations were brought on record.

23 Record reveals that PW1 filed certificate under Section 65(B) of the Indian Evidence Act along with the printouts of messages and pictures, marked as Article 'A' to 'D', which substantiate their testimony. Testimony of PW-2 husband of informant corroborated the messages and confirmed that it contained obscene material. The testimonies of PW-1 and PW-2 are cogent, consistent, and reliable in respect of receipt of messages and picture. Since PW-1 submitted a certificate under Section 65B of the Indian Evidence Act along with printouts of WhatsApp messages and obscene pictures (Articles 'A' to 'D'). This satisfies the legal requirement of secondary evidence for admissibility of electronic records, as per the ratio of Hon'ble Supreme Court's judgement in case of **Anvar P. V. Vs. P. K. Basheer (supra)**.

24 The argument of political rivalry as a motive for false implication was not supported by any evidence. There is no substance in the contention of learned advocate for the appellant that WhatsApp chat and obscene photographs were not exhibited and it cannot be read in evidence since no certificate under Section 65(B) of the Indian Evidence Act was enclosed. Non-seizure of mobile phone of PW1 does not make difference. Furthermore, no woman would stake her dignity

by implicating accused in false case. Therefore, the oral and documentary evidence of PW-1 and 2 proves that she was received messages and obscene photographs from the mobile No. 9920793911 in her own mobile number at the relevant date and time.

25 So far as obscenity is concerned, Section 509 IPC criminalizes words, gestures or acts intended to insult the modesty of a woman. Section 67 of the I.T. Act criminalizes the publication or transmission of obscene material in electronic form. Section 67A applies to sexually explicit material. The obscenity must be judged from the perspective of an average person applying contemporary community standards. PW1 is women and she was Corporator and her husband was also Ex-Corporator. The messages and picture were sent to her in the evening after 11.00 pm to 12.30 a.m. messages contained text such as: "You are slim." "You are looking very smart." "You are fair." "My age is 40 years." "Are you married or not?" "I like You". And likewise messages.

26 The perusal of picture appear to be obscene as model with less clothes. Though it was admitted that same was earlier published in paper. No married woman or her husband, i.e. PW-1 and PW-2, who are reputed and Corporator would bear such whatsapp and obscene photos sent on mobile of PW-1 in evening time from 11.00 pm to 12.30 a.m. when there is no any relationship with sender of the informant. Nothing is brought on record by the accused that there were any relationship in between them. The alleged messages words, acts would amount to insult the modesty of women and sending or translating would amount to offence. The essential ingredients of Sections 67 and

67A of the I.T. Act, as well as Section 509 IPC, were duly satisfied.

27 The Learned advocate for appellant submitted that the Vodafone Mobile No. 9920793911 was not belong to accused. The Trial Court erroneously relied on Exhibit-35 (Vodafone report) as no SIM card seized. The Nodal Officer of Vodafone was not examined to prove the authenticity and correctness of the report. The report is not supported by a Section 65B Certificate and is therefore, inadmissible. It was further submitted that though the mobile phone was seized but punch witness turned hostile therefore, seizer of mobile and repot of forensic analysis is not admissible. The said contention is not applicable in the present case for the reason stated below.

28 The entire case is based on alleged electronic evidence. In **Anvar P. V. Vs. P. K. Basheer (2014) 10 SCC 473**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that secondary evidence of electronic records must be properly proved by producing certificate as per requirement of Section 65B of the Indian Evidence Act. In the present case, original mobile of accused is seized containing WhatsApp chat and obsence photos under the panchnama at Exhibit-25. The same is proved by PW-4, Investigation Officer. The original device from which it was send was produced before the Court, therefore, 65B Certificate is not required since original device was produced before Court. Even though PW-3 turned hostile, the seizure panchnama still holds evidentiary value, as proved and corroborated by the Investigating Officer's testimony. There is no material brought on record by the accused as to why the evidence of I.O. should not be believed in regard to seizer of mobile phone

including Vodafone SIM card of accused. The evidence of I.O. is corroborated by the Cyber Forensic Analysis Report, Article 'E'. The Vodafone Report (Exhibit-35) clearly shows that the mobile number in question was registered in the appellant's name. Though it was not proved by examining Nodal Officer of Vodafone. However, during cross-examination, the appellant did not challenge the authenticity of this document, nor was any suggestion made denying ownership.

29 The evidence of Cyber Forensic Analysis Report (Article 'E') which is admissible in evidence indicate that Exhibit-1, i.e. Samsung mobile phone description and battery Exhibit-1/1 MTNL SIM Card and Exhibit-1/2 Vodafone SIM Card description, were conducted test reading and analysed files from mobile phone, SIM Card using. On through Cyber Forensic Analysis Report of above exhibits, case related WhatsApp chat and call logs dated 26/01/2016 were found in mobile phone Exhibit-1 which are given in enclosed CD marked as Annexure CD, CY 273/2016. The said mobile is proved to have been seized from accused. The Cyber Cell's report (Article 'E') verified that the WhatsApp messages originated from the appellant's mobile number. This was issued by Directorate of Forensic science laboratory, Mumbai, Home Department, Government of Maharashtra. The said report is admissible in evidence.

30 Exhibit-35 is Vodafone report showing Subscriber No. 9920793911 is an accused and through Exhibit-27, the Investigating Officer obtained information regarding ownership of the Sim card. Vodafone Report confirmed that the number was registered in the appellant's name. The defense did not raise any objection to the

Vodafone report's admissibility at the trial stage. No evidence has been put forth by the accused to show that the said number is not belonged to accused.

31 The evidence on record of PW-4 including seizure panchnama of Exhibit-25, the Vodafone report Exhibit-35 and the Cyber Forensic Report (Article 'E'), collectively establish that the offending messages originated from the appellant's mobile number. The appellant is author thereof. This is direct evidence linking accused to message and picture sent. The appellant has failed to discharge the burden under Section 106 of the Indian Evidence Act to explain who has used his mobile and how his registered number was used for sending the alleged messages.

32 It is settled law that when certain facts are within the special knowledge of the accused, he must provide a plausible explanation, failing which an adverse inference may be drawn against accused who is subscriber of number. The service provider's report sufficiently establishes the connection between the mobile number and the appellant. The minor lapses in investigation do not automatically render the entire prosecution case doubtful. The seizure of original mobile from accused strengthens the case that the appellant was in possession and control of the mobile number at the relevant time.

33 The WhatsApp messages received by the informant (PW-1) and produced as Articles 'A' to 'D' can be presumed to be the same as

those sent from the originator's device. The Forensic Report (Article 'E') confirms that the messages originated from the appellant's registered number. The scope of Section 88A of the Indian Evidence Act, which allows the court to presume the correctness of the content of an electronic message as transmitted but does not presume the identity of the sender. Even though Section 88A does not create a presumption about who sent the messages.

34 But the prosecution has relied on circumstantial and corroborative evidence, including the Vodafone report (Exhibit-35) confirming that the mobile number belonged to the appellant. The forensic analysis report establishing that the obscene whatApp messages and absence photographs were sent from mobile phone of accused. Since the appellant had exclusive knowledge of his phone's usage, he had the burden to explain how the messages originated from his number. His failure to provide any plausible explanation allows the Court to draw an adverse inference. The sender's identity is not automatically presumed but is established through circumstantial evidence, documentary proof and adverse inference under Section 106 of the Indian Evidence Act which is duly established by the prosecution.

35 Thus, the combined effect of Article 'E', Exhibit-35 and the appellant's failure to explain as who was author sufficiently proves his involvement beyond reasonable doubt. The evidence on record clearly establishes that the appellant sent the obscene WhatsApp messages and images to PW-1. The prosecution has proved the charges beyond reasonable doubt. This Court is agree with the finding recorded of the

Ld. Trial Court. There is no perversity or illegality. The alleged offence is occurred against women. The sentence awarded by the Trial Court is neither harsh nor excessive, considering the nature of the offence against a woman. Therefore Ld. Trial Court rightly denied benefits of probation of offender act. Hence, I answer as to point Nos. 1 and 2 affirmative.

AS TO POINT NOS. 3 AND 4 :

36 Since the prosecution has proved that the appellant sent the obscene WhatsApp messages and images to PW-1 and in view of affirmative findings as to Point Nos.1 and 2, therefore, the appellant is rightly convicted and sentenced by the Learned Trial Court. This Court found no illegality or perversity in the impugned judgement and order. There is no need to interference at the hand of this Court. Hence, I answer as to Point No.3 negative. In view of above observations and findings, the appeal filed by the appellant having no merit, is deserves to be dismissed as to no cost having regard to the fact and circumstances of the case. Hence, in answer to Point No.4, I proceed to pass following order.

ORDER

1 Criminal Appeal No.272 of 2022 is dismissed.

2 The conviction and sentence imposed by the Judgment and order dated 10/08/2022 passed by Learned Metropolitan Magistrate, 26th Court, Borivali Mumbai, (Trial Court) in C.C. No.2602029/PW/2016,

under Section 509 of Indian Penal Code and under Sections 67, 67(A) of Information Technology Act, are upheld.

3 Bail bond of appellant stands cancelled. The appellant be taken into custody forthwith for execution of sentence.

4 The conviction and sentence warrant of appellant be prepared and send to the Superintendent of Jail to undergo the sentenced as imposed by the Learned Trial Court.

5 Copy of this judgement be sent to the Learned Trial Court and Jail Authority for necessary compliance. One of the copy be given to appellant, free of cost immediately.

6 Criminal Appeal No.272 of 2022 stands disposed of accordingly.

DATTA
GOVINDA
DHOBLE

Digitally signed
by DATTA
GOVINDA
DHOBLE
Date:
2025.02.18
16:46:35 +0530

(D. G. DHOBLE)

Date : 18/02/2025

Additional Sessions Judge,
City Civil & Sessions Court,
Borivali Division, Dindoshi, Mumbai

Date of directly typed on computer : 18/02/2025

Checked and signed by HHJ on : 18/02/2025

“CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THE ORIGINAL SIGNED JUDGMENT/ORDER.”

18/02/2025 at 4:27 p.m.
UPLOAD DATE AND TIME

Mrs. P. P. Dabholkar
NAME OF STENOGRAPHER

Name of the Judge (With Court Room No.)	SHRI. D. G. Dhoble (C.R. NO.15)
Date of Pronouncement of JUDGMENT/ ORDER	18/02/2025
JUDGMENT/ORDER signed by P.O. on	18/02/2025
JUDGMENT/ORDER uploaded on	18/02/2025