

FIRST INFORMATION REPORT

પ્રથમ માહિતી અહેવાલ

(Under Section 154 Cr.P.C.)

(ફોજદારી કાર્યસંહિતાની કલમ 154 હેઠળ.)

1 Distric અમદાવાદ શહેર Police ડી.સી.બી. પો યે 20 FIR N 11191011220 Date 25/06/20
t r e Sta લીસ સ્ટેશન, અ ar 22 o. 087 (તારીખ 22
(જિલ્લો) tion મદાવાદ શહેર (વર્ષ (પ્ર.માં)
(પોલીસ) અ.કમાં
સ્ટેશન) ક)

2 (i) Act આઈ પી સી Section 468,471,194,211,218,120 B
(અધિનિયમ) ns
(કલમો)

3 (a) Occurrence of offence:
(ક) (ગુન્હો બન્યાનો સમયગાળો)

Day. મંગળવાર Date from 01/01/2002 Date to 25/06/2022
(દિવસ) (તારીખથી) (તારીખ સુધી)
Time Perio Time from 00:00 Time to 11:00
d (કલાકથી) (કલાક સુધી)
(સમયગાળો)

(b) Information received Date 25/06/2022 Time 11:00
(ખ) at PS: (તારીખ) (સમય)
(પોલીસ મથકે માહિતી મળ્યા)

(c) General Diary Referen Time
(ગ) ce:Entry No. (સમય)
(સ્ટેશન ડાયરી સંદર્ભ: એન્ટ્રી નં)

4 Type of Informa પોલીસ સ્ટેશનમાં લખીને મોકલેલ
tion:(માહિતીનો પ્રકાર)
ર)

5 Place of Occurrence:
(ઘટનાનું સ્થળ)

(a) Direction and distance from ઉતર,10.00 (કિ.મી. Beat N
(ક) P.S.) o.
(પોલિસ સ્ટેશનથી દિશા અંતર) (બીટ નંબર)

(b) Address મેઘાણીનગર ,
(ખ) s અમદાવાદ શહેર.
(સરનામું)

(c) In case, outside the limit of this Police Station, then
(ગ) (પોલીસ સ્ટેશનની હદની બહાર હોય તો તે પોલીસ સ્ટેશનનું નામ)

Name of P.S. District
(પોલીસ સ્ટેશનનું નામ) (જિલ્લો)

6 Complainant/Informant:
(ફરિયાદી / બાતમીદાર)

(a) Name શ્રી સ.ત. પોલી (બ) Father's/ ડી.બી. બારડ

(ક) (નામ) સ ઇન્સ્પેક્ટર ડી. (ખ)
બી. બારડ

Husband's
Name
(પિતા/પતિનું
નામ)

(c) Date/Year of Birth
(ગ) rth
(જન્મ તારીખ / વર્ષ)

41

(d) Nationality ભારતીય
(ધ) (રાષ્ટ્રીયતા)

(e)

(ક)

(f)

(ચ)

Occupation

(ધંધો)

પોલીસ કર્મચારી

(g)

(છ)

Address

(સરનામું)

નોકરી ફાઈમ ગ્રાંચ ગાયકવાડ હવેલી,
અમદાવાદ શહેર.

7 Details of known/suspected/unknown accused with full particulars:
(Attach separate sheet, if necessary)

(ઓળખાયેલ/શકમંદ/વાજાઓળખાયેલ આરોપીની તમામ વિગતો સાથેની માહિતી)
(જરૂર જણાયતો અલાયદા કાગળ ઉપર વિગત દર્શાવવી)

Accused Name
(તહોમતદારનું નામ)

Age(Ap Address
prox.) (સરનામું)
(ઉંમર) (
આશરે)

(1) સંજીવ રાજેન્દ્ર ભટ્ટ

સુશીલ નગર સોસાયટી, પાર્ટ-૨, ડ્રાઈવ ઇન રોડ,
અમદાવાદ શહેર.

(2) આર.બી. શ્રીકુમાર રીટાયર્ડ આઈ.પી.એસ

શ્રીલક્ષ્મીદિપમ, સેક્ટર-૮, ,
ગામ. ગાંધીનગર,
તા. ગાંધીનગર,
જી. ગાંધીનગર.

(3) તીસ્તા સેતલવાડ

નિરાંત, જુહુ તારા રોડ, જુહુ,
જી. મુંબઈ સિટી,
જુહુ.

8 Reasons for delay in reporting by the complainant/Informant
(ફરિયાદી/બાતમીદાર તરફથી ગુનાની જાણ કરવામાં વિલંબ થવાના કારણો)
naa

9 Particulars of properties stolen(Attach separate sheet, if necessary)
(ચોરાયેલી/ગુનામાં સંડોવાયેલ ચીજ વસ્તુઓની વિગતો) (જરૂર જણાયતો અલાયદા કાગળ ઉપર વિગત દર્શાવવી).

10 Total value of property stolen
(ચોરાયેલી / ગુનામાં સંડોવાયેલ ચીજ વસ્તુઓની કુલ કિંમત)

)
11 Inquest Report/U.D. case No. if any
(મુત્યુ વિષયક તપાસ અહેવાલ / અકુદરતી મોતનો નંબર હોય તો તે)

12 First Information contents(Attach seperate sheet, if required)
(પ્રથમ માહિતી અહેવાલની વિગતો)(જરૂર જણાયતો અલાયદો કાગળ જોડવો)

તે એવી રીતે કે આ કમના આરોપીઓએ શ્રીમતી જાકીયા જાફરીની અરજી, અલગ અલગ કોર્ટની પીટીશન તથા એસ.આઈ. ટી. ના વડા સમાક્ષ ખોટા દસ્તાવેજ પુરાવાઓ બનાવી તેનો સાચા કરી ઉપયોગ કરી અલગ અલગ કમિશનમાં રજુ કરી આ કામના નિર્દોશ વ્યક્તિઓને મુત્યુ દંડની સજાની જોગવાઈઓની કલમો મુજબ પ્રોસીડીંગ થાય તે સારું અપ્રમાણીક પણે આ સમગ્ર વિષય સળગતો રહે તેવા બદ ઇરાદા સાથેના કત્ત કરી ગુનો કર્યા વિગેરે બાબત.

Complaint(ફરિયાદ)

Date: 25.06.2022

I am serving as Police Inspector in Crime Branch, Ahmedabad City since March 2019. I am submitting this complaint.first information on behalf of State against Teesta Setalvad r.o Nirant, Juhu Tara Road, Juhu, Mumbai; R. B. Sreekumar (Rtd IPS), r.o SrilekshmidEEPam, Sector 8, Gandhinagar; Sanjiv Rajendra Bhatt, presently lodged in Palanpur District Jail and permanent resident of Sushil Nagar Society, Part II, Drive Inn Road and others, inter alia, under sections 468, 471, 194, 211, 218, and 120 B of Indian Penal Code.

Honble Supreme Court of India, in its judgment pronounced on 24.06.2022 in Diary No. 34207.2018 (Zakia Ahsan Jafri Vs State of Gujarat and Anr) , inter alia, observed as under :

88. ... At the end of the day, it appears to us that a coalesced effort of the disgruntled officials of the State of Gujarat alongwith others was to create sensation by making revelations which were false to their own knowledge. The falsity of their claims had been fully exposed by the SIT after a thorough investigation. Intriguingly, the present proceedings have been pursued for last 16 years (from submission of complaint dated 8.6.2006 running into 67 pages and then by filing protest petition dated 15.4.2013 running into 514 pages) including with the audacity to question the integrity of every functionary involved in the process of exposing the devious stratagem adopted (to borrow the submission of learned counsel for the SIT), to keep the pot boiling, obviously, for ulterior design. As a matter of fact, all those involved in such abuse of process, need to be in the dock and proceeded with in accordance with law.

The said matter pertains to the complaint submitted by.in the name of Smt. Jakia Nasim Ahsan Jafri dated 08 06 2006 to The Director General of Police, Gujarat State, Police Bhavan, Gandhinagar for the registration of FIR u.s, 302 r.w 120(B) IPC and sec. 193 read with 114 IPC, 186 and 153 A, 186, 187 IPC and u.s 6 of Commission of Inquiry Act, The Gujarat Police Act and The Protection of Human Ri

gths Act, 1951. The said complaint contained allegations pertaining to the incidents which took place in Gujarat as an aftermath of Godhra Train burning incident. The brief background of the matter is as follows:

1. Incident in Gulberg Society: Pursuant to the killing of kar sevaks traveling in Sabarmati Express train at Godhra railway station on 27.02.2002, a call for Gujarat bandh was given by the Vishwa Hindu Parishad and other Hindu organizations on 28.02.2002. On the day of bandh i.e. 28.02.2002, a huge mob indulged in attack on the properties, shops and houses of Muslims as well as a Madarasa mosque of Gulberg society located in Meghaninagar, Ahmedabad City resulting in death of 39 Muslims including Late Ahesan Jafri, Ex MP. Late Ahesan Jafri, Ex MP fired from his private licensed weapon in self defense causing injuries to 15 persons in the mob.
2. Offence registered at Meghaninagar Police Station: An offence was registered vide Cr.No.1 67.02, Meghaninagar Police Station, commonly known as Gulberg Society Case on 28.02.2002. On completion of investigation by Crime Branch, Ahmedabad City, six (including five supplementary) charge sheets were filed in the court of Metropolitan Magistrate, Court No.11, Ahmedabad during the period 03.06.2002 to 18.10.2004.
3. N.H.R.C. Petition and formation of SIT: Meanwhile, the National Human Rights Commission had approached Honble Supreme Court by way of a Writ Petition (Crl.) No. 109 of 2003. Pursuant to the same, trial of Sessions Case No 152 of 2002 and Otrs., emanating of offence registered at Meghaninagar PS vide I CR NO 67 of 2002 (commonly known as Gulberg Society Case) and other eight Godhra Riots cases were stayed on 21.11.2003 by the order of Honble Supreme Court of India. Honble Apex Court vide its order dated 26.3.2008 had directed the State Government to constitute a five member Special Investigation Team to undertake inquiry. investigation including further investigation in the nine cases stated therein. The SIT filed three supplementary charge sheets before the concerned Metropolitan Magistrate in this case.
4. Complaint of Smt. Jakia: Smt. Jakia Nasim Ahesan Jafri submitted a complaint dated 08 06 2006. i.e. after more than four years of the incident, to Director General of Police, Gujarat State, Police Bhavan, Gandhinagar for the registration of FIR u.s, 302 r.w 120(B) IPC and sec. 193 read with 114 IPC, 186 and 153 A, 186, 187 IPC and u.s 6 of Commission of Inquiry Act, The Gujarat Police Act and The Protection of Human Rights Act, 1951. On receipt of the complaint, the DGP Gujarat, entrusted the matter to Addl. DG (Int.), Gujarat to inquire into the same, who took up the complaint and fixed dates to record the statement of Smt. Jakia Naseem Ahesan Jafri. Smt. Jakia Nasim Ahesan Jafri stated that till an offence on the basis of her complaint was registered, she was not ready to make any statement and insisted that the complaint given by her may be treated as FIR.



5. Petition in Honble High Court by Smt. Jakia: On 01 03 2007, Smt. Jakia Nasim Ahesan Jafri, supported by Ms. Teesta Setalwad, Secretary, Citizens for Justice and Peace, filed an application in the Honble Gujarat High Court. It was prayed by the petitioner in the said application to direct the DGP Gujarat to register a n FIR and further direct the same to be investigated by an independent agency, i.e. CBI. The Honble Gujarat High Court passed an elaborate order dated 02.11.2007, dismissing the said petition. It was clearly mentioned in this order that the petitioner did not adopt the procedure to file the complaint u.s 190 r.w 200 Cr.P.C. and directed the petitioner to file appropriate private complaint, if she wishes to do so.

6. Petition in Honble Supreme Court by Smt. Jakia: Aggrieved by said order, Smt. Jakia Nasim Ahesan Jafri and Citizens for Justice and Peace through its Secretary Ms. Teesta Setalvad filed a Special Leave Petition (Crl.) No. 1088 of 2008 on 18 12 2007, in the Honble Supreme Court of India. The Honble Supreme Court in the said Special Leave Petition (Crl.) passed an order dated 27.04.2009 which reads as follows:

Having heard learned Counsel for the parties we direct that complaint dated 08.06.2006 which the petitioners here in claim to have sent to the DGP of Gujarat shall be examined by the Special Investigation Team (in short SIT) constituted pursuant to the orders of this Court. The SIT shall look into the matter and take steps as required in law and give its report to this Court within three months

Call this matter after three months

This case shall be heard along with Writ Petition (Crl.) No. 109 of 2003 and connected cases.

7. Inquiry. Investigation by SIT and scrutiny by Ld. Amicus Curiae: In this matter the inquiry and further investigation was conducted by SIT, and periodical reports were submitted before Honble Supreme Court. Honble Supreme Court had directed the Ld. Amicus Curiae to scrutinize all these reports, and give opinion on the same.

8. Order of Honble Supreme Court: The Honble Supreme Court of India after careful consideration of all the Reports submitted by the SIT, the opinion given by the Ld. Amicus Curiae, passed a final order on 12.09.2011, wherein it was directed as under:

Accordingly, we direct the Chairman, SIT to forward a final report, along with the entire material collected by the SIT, to the Court which had taken cognizance of Crime Report No.67 of 2002, as required under Section 173(2) of the Code.

9. Closure Report before Ld. Magistrate: As per orders of Honble Supreme Court, Final Report u.s 173(2) of the Code was submitted on 08.02.2012 in two volumes by the Investigating Officer for perusal, consideration and appreciation of Ld. Metropolitan Magistrate court No 11. In the said Closure Report it was concluded



by SIT that no prosecutable material is available against any of the accused persons. All the documents collected and statements recorded during course of inquiry investigation, along with reports of Ld. Amicus Curiae, were submitted before the Ld. Court. Copy of the Closure Report and record submitted, running into 26,000 pages, before the Ld. Court was supplied to the Complainant.

10. Protest Petition: The complainant preferred Protest Petition before the Ld. Magistrate

11. Order of Ld. Magistrate: Learned Metropolitan Magistrate, after extensively hearing the parties, accepted the closure report, denying to lodge the complaint and thus thereby, the protest petition of the petitioner was not entertained, vide order dated 26.12.2013.

12. Revision Application in Honble High Court: The complainant filed a Criminal Revision Application No 205 of 2014 in Honble High court of Gujarat, and vide order dated 05.10.2017 the prayers of the petitioner were rejected.

13. Special Leave Petition in Honble Supreme Court: Smt. Zakia Jafri and Smt. Teesta Setalvad have filed Special Leave Petition (Criminal) before Honble Supreme Court on 12.09.2018 having Diary No. 34207.2018, against the impugned final judgment and order dated 05 10 2017, in which vide order dated 24.06.2022 the prayers of the petitioner were rejected which contains elaborate reasons.

In the context of the aforesaid facts and other facts it appears that several cognizable offences are committed by the accused persons individually, collectively and/or in collusion with other individuals/entities/organisations.

In view of the same, as Police Inspector Crime Branch Ahmedabad City, I had perused the records of the various proceedings and other material either in the official record or in public domain and have prima facie found that following criminal cognizable offences are committed by above named accused and various other accused persons. The following are only few of the illustrative instances as investigation would reveal much more considering the totality of various calculated actions taken by the accused persons.

1. Sanjiv Bhatt, the then DIG had sent a letter dated 30.12.2011 to the Secretary, Honble Justice Navavati and Justice Mehta Commission of Inquiry enclosed therewith as Annexure D, which is a copy of fax message No. D 2 . 2 COM . ALERT . 174 . 2002, dated 28.02.2002, which he claimed to have sent to different authorities under his signature. Subsequently, on 04.01.2012, Sanjiv Bhatt forwarded to Chairman, SIT a copy of his letter No. SRB.COI.120104.01, dated 04.01.2012 addressed to Secretary, Justice Navavati Commission of Inquiry enclosed therewith



h a copy of fax message No. D 2 . 2 COM . ALERT . 100 . 2002, dated 27.02.2002 , claiming to have sent the same under his signature. The oral and documentary evidence available on record of SIT conclusively proves that these fax messages produced by Bhatt have been forged.fabricated.manipulated subsequently with a n ulterior motive, and have been produced by Sanjiv Bhatt for the first time before the Nanavati Commission of Inquiry and subsequently before SIT in January, 2 012. This act of forgery was done by Sanjiv Bhatt with an express intent to falsel y implicate various persons under grave sections of law.

2. Sanjiv Bhatt had falsely claimed before the SIT that he attended a late night meeting on 27 02 2002 called by the Chief Minister at his residence. Investigation conducted by SIT (under the supervision of the Hon. Supreme Court) conclusiv ely established that Sanjiv Bhatt was not present in the said meeting, and he ha d made above stated claims nine years after the incident to falsely implicate vari ous persons in grave sections of law. With a view to substantiate such a false cl aim and with a clear intention of involving innocent persons with offences punish able with life, he used forged and fabricated several documents.

3. Government of Gujarat vide its letter dated 22 06 2011 forwarded to SIT a se t of emails exchanged between Sanjiv Bhatt, DIG (under suspension), Gujarat Po lice and certain individuals.co accused during April and May 2011 (which are the only mails available till that date). The scrutiny of the material forwarded by Go vt. of Gujarat establishes that certain vested interests individuals and organisati ons including Sanjiv Bhatt, different NGOs, some political leaders and organisati ons were hatching a criminal conspiracy to use various forums such as Honble S upreme Court.SIT for settling their scores and achieve an unlawful object of impl icating innocent individuals in offences punishable with life. These facts further go on to show that Sanjiv Bhatt had been colluding with some persons with veste d interests to see that criminal charges are made against several persons. For ac hieving this criminal intent Sanjiv Bhatt received some packets from others to ac hieve the criminal conspiracy of involving innocent individuals in serious offence s punishable with life. There is, thus, clear inducement.incentive (monetary and others) received by Sanjiv Bhatt. From the facts available on record such similar and other inducement.gratification.incentive having been received by him also n eeds a detailed probe and investigation.

4. Most of the allegations in the complaint of Smt Jakia Jafri are drawn from th e nine affidavits filed by R B Sreekumar before Nanavati Shah Commission. It is a matter of record that R B Sreekumar, Rtd. IPS was posted as Additional Directo r General of Police (Armed Unit), Gujarat at the time of riots and the facts stated by R B Sreekumar in the nine affidavits filed before Justice Nanavati Shah Comm



ission of Inquiry does not derive any of its content from the personal knowledge. Information which he might have received as occupant of this post. Similarly, perusal of his statements recorded by the Special Investigation Team reveals that the knowledge of all the facts, pertinent to the complaint, mentioned by him is acquired after he was posted as Additional Director General (Intelligence), Gujarat on April 9 2002. Further, R. B. Sreekumar did not make any allegations against the State Government in his initial two affidavits filed before Justice Nanavati Shah Commission of Inquiry, and started alleging only from third affidavit dated 09.04.2005.

5. R.B. Sreekumar has stated before SIT that he took over as Addl. DG (Int.) on 09 04 2002 and that he had been given many verbal orders, of which many were illegal and against the spirit of the Constitution of India. He had further stated that he had got issued a register from Shri O.P. Mathur, the then IGP (Admn. and Security) to record verbal instruction from higher officers i.e. DGP and above. He had further stated that he had made entries about the verbal instructions in this register from 16 04 2002 to 19 09 2002. Investigation conducted by SIT conclusively proves that in the said register Sreekumar had done antedating, and affixed secret and round office stamps without the knowledge of issuing authority. These acts reflect that Sreekumar had done these acts and many others deliberately to falsely implicate certain persons in grave sections of law.



6. There is material in the final report submitted by the SIT which indicates that Teesta Setalvad had conjured, concocted, forged, fabricated facts and documents and/or evidence including fabrication of documents by persons who were prospective witnesses of the complainant. It is not only a case of fabrication of documents, but also of influencing and tutoring the witnesses and making them depose on pre typed affidavits, as has been noted in the judgment of the Honble Gujarat High Court dated 11.7.2011 in Criminal Miscellaneous Application No. 1692.2011.

7. Smt. Zakia Ahsan Jafri in her cross examination in Gulberg Society case being CR No. 67.2002 as PW 337 had conceded that she knew Teesta Setalvad for some time and also about having met R.B. Sreekumar after the incident. She had stated that R.B. Sreekumar had come to Gulberg Society on 28.2.2002 and upon completion of four years she had met him. She had also stated that R.B. Sreekumar was presently working with Teesta Setalvad. She had also admitted in her cross examination that she had given statement on 22.8.2003 before the Nanavati Shah Commission and after giving that statement, she had no occasion to read c

copy of that statement. This indicate that she was tutored by Teesta Setalvad, a fact that she had to admit in the cross examination. She had also admitted in her cross examination that she had throughout followed the instructions of Teesta Setalvad. In the final supplementary report filed by the SIT in Gulberg Society case being CR No. 67.2002, it has been clearly noted that nineteen witnesses insisted to take on record their prepared signed statement(s), which according to them, were prepared by Teesta Setalvad and Advocate Mr. M.M. Tirmizi and did not show willingness to give their own statement. The statements so presented were stereotyped copies.computerised prepared statements given to them by Teesta Setalvad and Advocate Mr. M.M. Tirmizi and they had merely signed such prepared statements.

The above referred offences illustratively stated herein above, inter alia, clearly establish that Sanjiv Bhatt, R B Sreekumar, Teesta Setalvad and others had conspired to abuse the process of law by fabricating false evidence to make several persons to be convicted for an offence that is punishable with capital punishment thereby committing an offence punishable under section 194 of the Indian Penal Code. Furthermore it has been established in the course of the investigation done by the SIT that Sanjiv Bhatt, R B Sreekumar, Teesta Setalvad and others had instituted false and malicious criminal proceedings against innocent people with the intention to cause injury, an act punishable under section 211 of the Indian Penal Code. Sanjiv Bhatt and R B Sreekumar who at the time of their acts of commission and omission were public servants and they had framed incorrect records with intent to cause injury to several persons for which they are culpable under section 218 of the Indian Penal Code. Sanjiv Bhatt, R B Sreekumar, Teesta Setalvad and others had conspired and had prepared false records and had dishonestly used those records as genuine ones with the intention of causing damage and injury to several persons thereby having committed offences, inter alia, punishable under sections 468 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code.

This FIR may kindly be registered not only in the context of the above material and other materials, judgment of the Honourable Supreme Court referred above in general and paragraph quoted in particular and also on independent grounds, inter alia, for finding out the behind the scene criminal conspiracy and financial and other benefits.inducements for commission of various serious offences in collusion with other individuals, entities and organisations

I, Darshansinh B Barad, Police Inspector, Detection of Crime Branch, Ahmedabad City hereby give complaint on behalf of the state against Sanjiv Bhatt, R B Sreekumar, Teesta Setalvad and others under sections 194, 211, 218, 468, 471 read with 120B of the Indian Penal Code.



(Darshansinh B Barad)

Police Inspector,

Detection of Crime Branch,

Ahmedabad City

- 13 Action Taken : Since the above information reveals commission of offence(s) u/s as mentioned at Item No. 2:

(લીધેલ પગલાં : ઉપરના અહેવાલની ઉપરની આઈટમ નં.(2) માં જણાવ્યા પ્રમાણેનો ગુનો બન્યાનું જણાઈ આવતા)

(1) Registered the case and took up the investigation or(કેસની નોંધણી કરી તપાસ હાથ ધરી છે)

(2) Directed (Name of I.O.) take up the Investigation or(તપાસ કરનાર અધિકારીનું નામ):- ડિ વિજયસિંહ પથુભા ચુડાસમા Rank(હોદ્દો):- મદદનીશ પોલીસ કમિશનર
No.:- dpc060769 to take up the Investigation or(નંબર)

F.I.R. read over to the complainant/informant, admitted to be correctly recorded and a copy given to the complainant/informant, free of cost.

(પ્રથમ માહિતી અહેવાલ ફરિયાદી / બાતમીદારને વાંચી સંભળાવેલ છે અને ફરિયાદીએ લખાવ્યા પ્રમાણેજ નોંધવામાં આવેલ છે. તેવું ફરિયાદી / બાતમીદારે સ્વીકારેલ છે અને ફરિયાદી / બાતમીદારને તેની નકલ વિના મુલ્યે આપવામાં આવી છે.)

R.O.A.C.

(વાંચી સંભળાવવામાં આવ્યું અને તે બરાબર છે.)

Signature of Officer in charge,
Police Station

(પોલીસ મથકનો હવાલો ધરાવતા અધિકારીની સહી.)

- 14 Signature/Thumb Impression of the complainant/informant. Name વિજયભાઈ કરમશીભાઈ દેસાઈ (નામ)
(ફરિયાદી/બાતમીદારની સહી/અંગૂઠાની છાપ)

Rank હેડ કો GPF No PGUJ1554
(હોદ્દો) સ્ટેબલ (જીપીએફ નંબ 08
ર)

- 15 Date and time of dispatch to the court. 25/06/2022 11:15

(ફરિયાદ કોર્ટમાં રવાના કર્યોની તારીખ અને સમય)

