IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Letters Patent Appeal No.197 of 2026
In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1101 of 2022

CNR No. BRHC010248302026

==========

Nirmala Kumari Daughter of Shri Mehar Chand Das, Resident of Village-Below, P.S- Barbigha, District- Sheikhpura.

... ... Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, (Home) Police Department, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director General of Police-cum-Inspector General of Police, Bihar, Patna.
3. The I.G. B.M.P. Bihar, Patna.
4. The D.I.G. B.M.P. Kendriya Mandal, Patna.
5. The Commandant, B.M.P.-02, Dihri.
6. The Superintendent of Police, Sasaram.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Appellant/s : Mr. Pranav Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar Singh, GA 8
Mr. Sanoj Kumar, AC to G.A.8

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY

CAV JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 05-11-2026

This *intra-court* appeal lays a challenge to an order dated 05.01.2026 passed by the learned Single Judge in a writ petition filed by the appellant herein being C.W.J.C. No. 1101 of

WEB COPY

2022, challenging the order dated 15.05.2019 whereby the learned Single Judge has dismissed the petition. The challenge in the petition by the appellant was to her dismissal from service as Constable No.143 resulting in the dismissal of the writ petition.

2. The facts to be noted for the purpose of this appeal are, the appellant herein was selected on the post of Constable on which she joined on 01.08.2018. Before undergoing the training process, she was given a verification form to be filled by her. She filled the same and submitted to the authority concerned on 05.07.2018. Pursuant thereto, she received a show cause notice dated 11.10.2018 stating therein that she made a suppression in the said verification form, about pendency of a criminal case against her.

3. The defence of the appellant was that she filled up the verification form ignorantly and not deliberately. It was also stated that the format of the verification form was not clear and for that reason, she filled up the form in such a manner. The show cause notice resulted in her dismissal from service vide order dated 17.11.2018. The appeal filed therefrom before the Appellate Authority had resulted in rejection making the appellant file a writ petition before this Court being C.W.J.C.

WEB COPY

No. 5331 of 2019, which was disposed of vide order dated 08.04.2019 directing the Deputy Inspector General of Police to dispose of the appeal of the appellant as expeditiously as possible by taking into consideration all the grounds urged by the appellant in the appeal in accordance with law.

4. Suffice it to state as no order was passed the, appellant preferred M.J.C. No. 2330 of 2019, which was disposed of by the Lok Adalat on 11.09.2021.

5. Finally, the appellate order was passed on 15.05.2019.

6. The counsel for the appellant had relied upon the Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Avtar Singh Vs. Union of India & Ors.*** in ***SLP (c) No.20525 of 2011*** more specifically, Paragraph No. 30(4), wherein according to the counsel, there is a categorical finding that in case, there is suppression or false information of involvement in a criminal case but where conviction or acquittal had already been recorded before filing of the application/verification form and such fact later comes to knowledge of employer, it is not necessary dismissal must follow.

7. The case of the appellant was also that despite order of this Court, none of the grounds as urged by the appellant

WEB COPY

were taken into consideration before passing of the order dated 15.05.2019.

8. The case of the respondents before the learned Single Judge was that the appellant had against query no. 7 of the verification form as to whether the appellant has ever been accused in a criminal or a civil case or has ever been sent to jail stated as categorical ‘No’. It was also stated that against query no. 8 whether the appellant is in debt or whether any criminal case or civil suit is pending against her, the answer was also ‘No’.

9. The learned Single Judge apart from referring to ***Avtar Singh*** (supra) has also referred to the Judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited & Anr. Vs. Anil Kanwariya, (2021) 10 SCC 136,*** wherein it is held that the relationship between the employer and employee is of trust.

10. We note that the learned Single Judge has in Paragraph No.7 onwards held as under:

> *“7. In the light of the submissions made, this Court as perused Annexure-1 which is a verification form in the light of the Rules 656 & 673 of the Bihar Police Manual 1978 and Rule 673(c) is very much clear which states as follows:-*
>
> *"(c) Enlistment orders. The order for enlistments shall then be entered in the order book, the*

WEB COPY

service book shall be prepared and the verification roll despatched to the Superintendent of the district in which the recruits home is situated. The number and date of despatch shall be noted in the proper place in the service-book, and on the return of the roll with a report that the man bears a good character and has made a truthful statement as to his antecedents, the Superintendent shall initial this entry, have the necessary entry made in the service-book and order the verification roll to be filed. If the character of the man is reported to be bad or his statement false, he shall be removed from the force."

8. It further transpires to this Court that from the record, it is apparent and admitted position that on the date of filing up of the verification form, there was a criminal case pending against the petitioner about which the statement has been made in the verification form that 'no' criminal case is pending and in this view of the matter, it transpires to this Court that the statement of petitioner is false.

9. So far as the judgment on which the petitioner is relying in case of Avtar Singh (supra), its paragraph no. 30(4) is very much clear and states as follows:-

"(4) In case there is suppression or false information of involvement in a criminal case where conviction or acquittal had already been recorded before filing of the application/verification form and such fact later comes to knowledge of employer, any of the following recourse appropriate to the case may be adopted:-

WEB COPY

(a) In a case trivial in nature in which conviction had been recorded, such as shouting slogans at young age or for a petty offence which if disclosed would not have rendered incumbent unfit for post in question, the employer may, in its discretion, ignore such suppression of fact or false information by condoning the lapse.

(b) Where conviction has been recorded in case which is not trivial in nature, employer may cancel candidature or terminate services of the employee.

(c) If acquittal had already been recorded in a case involving moral turpitude or offence of heinous/serious nature, on technical ground and it is not a case of clean acquittal, or benefit of reasonable doubt has been given, the employer may consider all relevant facts available as to antecedents, and may take appropriate decision as to the continuance of the employee."

10. Upon bare reading of the said observation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of Avtar Singh (supra), it is apparent to this Court that in case there is a suppression or false information of involvement in a criminal case where conviction or acquittal had already been recorded before filing of the application/verification form is not the actual fact in the present case. In the present case at the time of filing up the verification form, a false statement has been inserted in the verification form. Therefore, this judgment shall not help the petitioner in any manner.

11. So far as the judgment of Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited & Anr. (supra) is concerned, its paragraph nos.14 & 15

WEB COPY

are very much clear which states as follows:-

> *"14. The issue/question may be considered from another angle, from the employer's point of view. The question is not about whether an employee was involved in a dispute of trivial nature and whether he has been subsequently acquitted or not. The question is about the credibility and/or trustworthiness of such an employee who at the initial stage of the employment i.e. while submitting the declaration/ verification and/or applying for a post made false declaration and/or not disclosing and/or suppressing material fact of having involved in a criminal case. If the correct facts would have been disclosed, the employer might not have appointed him. Then the question is of TRUST. Therefore, in such a situation, where the employer feels that an employee who at the initial stage itself has made a false statement and/or not disclosed the material facts and/or suppressed the material facts and therefore he cannot be continued in service because such an employee cannot be relied upon even in future, the employer cannot be forced to continue such an employee. The choice/option whether to continue or not to continue such an employee always must be given to the employer. At the cost of repetition, it is observed and as observed hereinabove in catena of decision such an employee cannot claim the appointment and/or continue to be in service as a matter of right.*
>
> *In view of aforestated facts and circumstances of the case, both, the*

WEB COPY

learned Division Bench as well as the learned Single Judge have clearly erred in quashing and setting aside the order of termination terminating the services of the respondent on the ground of having obtained an appointment by suppressing material fact and filing a false declaration. The order of reinstatement is wholly untenable and unjustified."

12. It also transpires that in paragraph no. 8.8 of the judgement of Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited Anr. (supra), the said decision of Avtar Singh (supra) has been discussed in this manner which states as follows:-

. "8.8 After reproducing and/or reconsidering para 38.5 of the decision in Avtar Singh [Avtar Singh v. Union of India, (2016) 8 SCC 471 : (2016) 2 SCC (L&S) 425], in para 13, this Court observed and held as under: (Abhijit Singh Pawar case [State of M.P. v. Abhijit Singh Pawar, (2018) 18 SCC 733: (2019) 3 SCC (Cri) 431: (2019) 2 SCC (L&S) 420], SCC p. 742)

"13. In Avtar Singh [Avtar Singh v. Union of India, (2016) 8 SCC 471 : (2016) 2 SCC (L&S) 425], though this Court was principally concerned with the question as to non-disclosure or wrong disclosure of information, it was observed in para 38.5 that even in cases where a truthful disclosure about a concluded case was made, the employer would still have a right consider antecedents of the candidate and could not be compelled to appoint such candidate."

13. After hearing both the parties and upon perusal of the relevant rules and the judgments reported by counsel for the petitioner

WEB COPY

> *and the Respondent-State, this Court reached on the conclusion that the statement made by the petitioner in the verification form is false and the petitioner is not entitled for any relief as per the above facts and circumstances as well as the established law of the land. Hence, this writ petition stands dismissed."*

11. The submissions of learned counsel for the appellant are primarily the same as were urged before the learned Single Judge. The learned counsel for the appellant has also submitted that the Court of A.C.J.M.-I, Sheikhpura has finally cleared and acquitted the appellant from all the criminal charges on, 24.12.2024 and the said fact was/is a relevant consideration for the learned Single Judge to consider whether in the facts of the case, only on the ground of concealment the dismissal from service can take place.

12. The learned counsel for the appellant apart from relying upon the judgment in the case of ***Avtar Singh*** (supra) had also relied upon seven other following citations : ***2024(5) SCC 264 (Ravindra Kumar Vrs. State of U.P.), 2016(8) SCC 471 (Avtar Singh Vrs. Union of India & Ors.), 2024(1)SCC 175 (Ram Lal Vrs. State of Rajasthan and Ors.), 2021(10) SCC 136 (Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. & Anr. Vrs. Anil Kanwariya), 1976(1) SCC 560 (Dilip Kumar Sharma & Ors. Vrs. State of Madhya Pradesh, 2026(3) BLJ***

WEB COPY

180 (State of Bihar Vrs. Sonu Kumar) and ***2025(2)BLJ 38 (Sonu Kumar Vrs. State of Bihar & Ors.),*** in support of his contentions.

13. The only issue which arises for consideration is whether the learned Single Judge is justified in dismissing the writ petition filed by the appellant against her dismissal from service. There is no dispute in so far as the manner in which the appellant had filled the verification form. The same has been noted by the learned Single Judge in the following manner:

> ‘‘"क्या आवेदक कभी दांडिक "फौजदारी" या सिविल "दीवानी" मामले में अभियुक्त रहा है अथवा कभी कारावास भुगत चुकी है ? विवरण दें।
> नहीं ।
> क्या आवेदक ऋणग्रस्त है और उसके विरूद्ध कोई दांडिक "फौजदारी" या सिविल "दीवानी" मामला विचाराधीन है?
> नहीं ।"

14. The aforesaid answer would clearly reveal that a positive statement has been made by the appellant that she has never been accused in a criminal or civil case or has ever been sent to jail. It is also clear that on a query, whether any criminal case or civil suit is pending against her the answer is categorically ‘No’. The same would reveal that the appellant did

WEB COPY

conceal the case pending against her bearing F.I.R. No. Barbigha P.S. Case No. 245 of 2017 dated 20.05.2017 under Sections 341, 323, 324 and 504/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

15. The law in this regard is well settled. The learned Single Judge has referred to the judgments in the case of ***Avtar Singh*** (supra) and ***Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited & Anr.,*** (supra).

16. What is important is that the Rules 365 and 673 of the Bihar Police Mannual, 1978 more specifically 673(c) of which reference is made by the learned Single Judge in paragraph nos. 7 & 8 has significant bearing on the case/issue. We reproduce Paragraph Nos. 7 and 8 of the judgment as under:

> *"7. In the light of the submissions made, this Court as perused Annexure-1 which is a verification form in the light of the Rules 656 & 673 of the Bihar Police Manual 1978 and Rule 673(c) is very much clear which states as follows:-*
>
> > *"(c) Enlistment orders. The order for enlistments shall then be entered in the order book, the service book shall be prepared and the verification roll despatched to the Superintendent of the district in which the recruits home is situated. The number and date of despatch shall be noted in the proper place in the service-book, and on the return of the roll with a report that the man bears a good character and has*

WEB COPY

> *made a truthful statement as to his antecedents, the Superintendent shall initial this entry, have the necessary entry made in the service-book and order the verification roll to be filed. If the character of the man is reported to be bad or his statement false, he shall be removed from the force."*
>
> *8. It further transpires to this Court that from the record, it is apparent and admitted position that on the date of filing up of the verification form, there was a criminal case pending against the petitioner about which the statement has been made in the verification form that 'no' criminal case is pending and in this view of the matter, it transpires to this Court that the statement of petitioner is false."*

17. In the case in hand, the suppression was not, after the acquittal has already been recorded but during the pendency of the case still, it was stated 'No'. The learned Single Judge has distinguished the judgement in the case of ***Avtar Singh*** (supra). He has referred to the judgment of ***Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited & Anr.,*** (supra) in Paragraph Nos. 14 and 15, which we reproduced as under:

> *"14. The issue/question may be considered from another angle, from the employer's point of view. The question is not about whether an employee was involved in a dispute of trivial nature and whether he has been subsequently acquitted or not. The question is about the*

WEB COPY

credibility and/or trustworthiness of such an employee who at the initial stage of the employment i.e. while submitting the declaration/ verification and/or applying for a post made false declaration and/or not disclosing and/or suppressing material fact of having involved in a criminal case. If the correct facts would have been disclosed, the employer might not have appointed him. Then the question is of TRUST. Therefore, in such a situation, where the employer feels that an employee who at the initial stage itself has made a false statement and/or not disclosed the material facts and/or suppressed the material facts and therefore he cannot be continued in service because such an employee cannot be relied upon even in future, the employer cannot be forced to continue such an employee. The choice/option whether to continue or not to continue such an employee always must be given to the employer. At the cost of repetition, it is observed and as observed hereinabove in catena of decision such an employee cannot claim the appointment and/or continue to be in service as a matter of right.

15. In view of aforestated facts and circumstances of the case, both, the learned Division Bench as well as the learned Single Judge have clearly erred in quashing and setting aside the order of termination terminating the services of the respondent on the ground of having obtained an appointment by suppressing material fact and filing a false declaration. The order of reinstatement is wholly untenable and unjustified."

18. The learned counsel for the appellant has heavily relied upon the judgment of a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the ***State of Bihar Vrs. Sonu Kumar*** passed in ***LPA No. 741***

WEB COPY

of 2025 in ***C.W.J.C. No. 6827 of 2023*** wherein this Court upon considering various judgments including on the scope of intra court appeal has not interfered with the judgment of the learned Single Judge, wherein the learned Single Judge has allowed the petition in favour of the respondent therein.

19. We have seen the judgment in the case of ***State of Bihar Vrs. Sonu Kumar*** (supra). The Division Bench of this Court has noted the fact that despite concealment in the verification form, the appointing authority proceeded to issue appointment letter in favour of the respondent therein and permitted her to join the service. The respondent was acquitted in the criminal case by a competent Criminal Court. The Court held the penalty of dismissal solely on concealment is not called for. Surely, the said judgment is distinguishable inasmuch as in the case in hand, the appointment was made before the appellant had filled the verification form wherein she has concealed the material facts. It is only upon inquiries pursuant to the filling of the verification form, the factum of the criminal case had come to the knowledge of the respondents which resulted in her dismissal from service.

20. What is also relevant is, as relied upon by the learned counsel for the respondents is the judgment of the

WEB COPY

Supreme Court in the case of ***State of U.P. and Anr. Vrs. Dinesh Kumar*** in ***Civil Appeal No. 196 of 2026***, wherein the Court has in Paragraph Nos. 6 to 9 has held as under:

> *"6. Proper and complete disclosure in applications for government employment is not a simple procedural formality, but a basic requirement rooted in fairness, integrity, and public trust. Government posts attract hundreds, and often thousands, of applicants for a single vacancy, each competing under the same stated conditions, scrupulous vetting of every candidate becomes imperative and essential to ensure a level playing field and to protect the credibility of the selection process. When an applicant withholds information about criminal antecedents, it undermines this process by depriving the appointing authority of the opportunity to make a fully informed assessment of suitability. While the law recognizes that non-disclosure, depending on the nature of the offence and surrounding circumstances, may not invariably be fatal to a candidature, it nevertheless remains a serious lapse. The gravity is significantly compounded when the non-disclosure is repeated, as it ceases to be accidental or inadvertent and instead reflects deliberate concealment. Such strikes at the core of trust reposed in candidates for public service, where honesty and transparency are indispensable attributes, and justify a far stricter view by the authorities.*
>
> *7. We notice that both, the attestation form as also the verification form extracted hereunder, furnish a disclaimer in the following terms:*
>
> > *"1. Giving any false information in this application or concealing any material information will be treated as disqualification and may render the candidate unfit for Government service."*
> >
> > *... ... ..."Disclaimer*
> >
> > *2. Furnishing of false information in the verification form or suppression of any material information will be punishable and*

WEB COPY

the candidate will be ineligible for employment under the Government. After completing and submitting this form, if the candidate is detained, arrested or convicted of any illegal act, find, deported or acquitted of a crime etc., the same should be immediately sent to the authority to whom the verification form was submitted earlier, failing which it will be treated as suppression of material information.

3. If, any person is found to have concealed any factual information or submitted in correct information in the verification for at any time during his service period, his tenure is liable to be terminated.

... ...
... "

8. Despite this clear stipulation as extracted supra the respondent submitted otherwise than the truth which was that there were cases pending against him. The acquittal/dropping of proceedings against him were subsequent developments and at the time of filling up of the forms the investigation in the case was active so also at the time of the affidavit. Since the disclaimer makes it clear that concealment of information would render the applicant ineligible/unfit for government service, what is the clincher is the status of the cases as disclosed at the time of filing of the forms. It cannot be disputed that at the relevant time, he submitted incorrect and false information.

9. In urging this Court to look at circumstances in his favour in accordance with ***Avtar Singh v Union of India. (2016) 8 SCC 471*** *and* ***Ravindra Kumar v. State of U.P., (2024) 5.SCC 264*** *he points out inter-alia his age which is approximately 45, the fact that he gave the affidavit prior to initiation of cancellation of appointment proceedings, the District Magistrate has placed on record his fitness for appointment. We are of the*

WEB COPY

> *considered view that none of these factors would justify overlooking the fact that at the relevant point in time he concealed the information. There is a maxim in law to the effect that 'juda lex sed lex' which means the law may be harsh, but the law is law. The factum that he said 'no' to pending proceedings against him not once but twice, shows demonstrated mal-intent and is in direct contravention of the disclaimer(s) given in the forms. Subsequent acquittal or the fact that he attempted to come clean about the suppression of facts cannot accrue to his benefit."*

21. It is noted from the aforesaid judgment of the Supreme Court that the Court held complete disclosure in the application for Government employment is not a simple procedural formality, but a basic requirement rooted in fairness, integrity and public trust. The Supreme Court also held while the law recognizes that non-disclosure, depending on the nature of offence and surrounding circumstances, may not be invariably fatal to a candidature, it nevertheless remains a serious lapse. It also held that the gravity is significantly compounded when the non-disclosure is repeated, as it ceases to be accidental or inadvertent and instead reflects deliberate concealment.

22. That apart, the Supreme Court had also noted the consequence of furnishing false information, which is similar to the provision of 573(c) noted by the learned Single Judge in the

WEB COPY

case in hand.

23. The aforesaid judgment is clearly applicable to the facts of this case. Similarly in the case of ***Yogeeta Chandra Vrs. The State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. in SLP (Civil) Nos.4860-4861/2019***, the Supreme Court has in Paragraph Nos. 6 to 8 held as under:

> *"6. In the application form, the applicant, who, as such, applied for the post of a judicial officer was required to disclose certain facts, more particularly, the facts stated in Clause 18 of the Application Form and non-disclosure of true facts and not only that but saying "No" can certainly be said to be suppression of material facts. It was immaterial whether there was a closure report or acquittal or conviction. At this stage, it is required to be noted that the particulars which were asked, whether "did you ever figure as an accused or a complainant in any criminal case? If so, give particulars with result. Therefore, the facturn of figuring the name either as an accused or a complainant in any criminal case was required to be disclosed with full particulars and with result. Therefore, the appellant cannot take the plea and/or defence that as a Closure Report was filed in the complaint in which she was the accused, the same was not required to be disclosed. On the basis of the nature of the allegations in the complaint either as an accused or a complainant, it is ultimately for the employer to take a conscious decision*

WEB COPY

whether to appoint such a person or not. What could be considered while actually appointing a person depends upon the facts and circumstances of each case and it is ultimately for the employer to take a conscious decision. The post which was applied by the appellant was a very important post of judicial officer and therefore, it was expected of a person who applied for the judicial officer to disclose the true and correct facts and give full particulars as asked in the application form. If in the application form itself, she has not stated the true and correct facts and suppressed the material facts, what further things can be expected from her after she was appointed as a judicial officer.

7. From the impugned judgment and order passed by the High Court, it appears that it was the case on behalf of the appellant that the services of the appellant could not be put to an end without holding the departmental enquiry under Article 311 of the Constitution of India. However, it is required to be noted that the termination was not on the ground of any misconduct. It was the case of cancellation of the appointment on not disclosing the true and correct facts in the application form. Therefore, as rightly observed by the High Court, there was no question of holding any departmental enquiry under Article 311 of the Constitution of India.

8. Under the circumstances, in the facts and circumstances of the case, no error has been committed by the High Court cancelling her appointment on the

WEB COPY

> *ground of not stating the true and correct facts and/or suppression of material facts. We are in complete agreement with the view taken by the High Court. No interference of this Court is called for"*

24. Vide the impugned order, the learned Single Judge has dismissed the writ petition. Surely, the scope of interference in the Letters Patent Appeal as held by the Division Bench of this Court in the case of ***State of Bihar Vrs. Sonu Kumar*** (supra) is very limited that too, primarily corrective in nature and interference is warranted only when the judgment of the learned Single Judge suffers from patent illegality, perversity or manifest error of law.

25. At this stage, reference be made to ***B. Venkatamuni Vs. C.J. Ayodhya Ram Singh & Ors. In (2006) 13 Supreme Court Cases 449***, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as under:-

> *"18. ... ... In an intra-court appeal, the Division Bench undoubtedly may be entitled to apprise both questions of fact and law, but the following dicta of this Court in Umabai & Anr. vs. Nilkanth Dhondiba Chavan (Dead) By Lrs. & Anr. [(2005) 6 SCC 243], could not have been ignored by it, whereupon the learned counsel for Respondents relied:-*
>
> *"It may be, as has been held in Asha Devi vs. Dukhi Sao, (1974) 2 SCC 492 that the power of the appellate court in intra-court appeal is not exactly the same as*

WEB COPY

> *contained in Section 100 of the Code of Civil Procedure but it is also well known that entertainment of a letters patent appeal is discretionary and normally the Division Bench would not, unless there exist cogent reasons, differ from a finding of fact arrived at by the learned Single Judge. Even as noticed hereinbefore, a court of first appeal which is the final court of appeal on fact may have to exercise some amount of restraint."*

26. From the above, it is clear that unless the conclusions drawn are wholly unreasonable and suffers from legal infirmity, the Appellate Court would refrain from interfering with the findings so recorded.

27. It also follows the power has to be exercised with restraint keeping in mind that the purpose of such jurisdiction is to correct errors which are apparent and substantial and not to undertake a fresh appreciation of the entire matter.

28. Though the learned counsel for the appellant has also relied upon other judgments which we have noted above but having considered the latest position of law on the issue in question, we are of the view that the conclusion drawn by the learned Single Judge in the facts of the case more specifically keeping in view the Bihar Police Manual Clause 573(c) which clearly contemplates the consequence of furnishing false information, we hold there is no error nor it is a case of perverse

WEB COPY

finding, which calls for interference with the impugned judgment.

29. Accordingly, the Letter Patent Appeal filed by the appellant is dismissed.

30. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(V. Kameswar Rao, CJ)

(Partha Sarthy, J) : I agree.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

shailendra/-

AFR/NAFR	A.F.R.
CAV DATE	29.09.2026
Uploading Date	05.11.2026
Transmission Date	NA

WEB COPY