

**:::IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL
MAGISTRATE:::
JUVENILE JUSTICE BOARD :::::::::::
BONGAIGAON.**

JJB CASE No. 33/2013.
U/Ss.25-A/29 NDPS ACT.

State of Assam

-Vs-

1. **Papuia Hmar.**
2. **Rinhgeta Zathing.**
3. **Rama Chinzer.**

Present: **Smt. N. Talukdar, AJS**
Principal Magistrate,
Juvenile Justice Board,
Bongaigaon.

Advocates appeared:

For the Prosecution: **Mr. T. K. Bhowmik, Assistant PP.**

For the Defence: **Mr. N. I. Siddique.**

Argument heard on: **03.07.2014, 16.07.2014.**

Judgment pronounced & delivered on: **24.07.2014.**

J U D G M E N T

1. The prosecution case in brief is that on 23.08.2013 at about 3:05 PM on receipt of a secret information, informant SI Khargeswar Rabha of Bongaigaon Police Station carried out a mobile patrolling duty along with his staff at New Bongaigaon Railway Station and found five boys and two girls including three juveniles in conflict with law carrying with six no. of big size bags and on search found that there were some packets of tablets in six no. of bags which were

wrapped with blue and black colour plastic paper and carbon paper and the tablets were

Contd....P/

2.

JJB-33/13.

suspected to be Narcotic and Psychotropic substance. They found 85 packets in total. The informant informed the matter to the higher authority and accordingly Dy. SP(HQ), Bongaigaon arrived at the place of occurrence and as per authority received from the Dy. SP(HQ), Bongaigaon, after taking all necessary steps as per NDPS Act, the informant seized the tablets on the spot in connection with Bongaigaon PS GDE No.855/13 dtd. 23.08.2013 and prepared a sample seal packet of the tablets at the spot and sent the same to the FSL for examination. All the five boys and two girls were arrested by the police and they were sent to the judicial custody. After receiving report from Forensic Science Laboratory, it is found that the seized tablets gave positive test for Pseudo-ephedrine and the amount of Pseudo-ephedrine per tablet were 58.88 mg, 56.38 mg, 57.18 mg, 57.84 mg, 58.10 mg & 56.18 mg respectively. Thereafter, the informant lodged the FIR before the police. On the basis of the FIR, Bongaigaon PS Case No. 520/13 U/S.25-A/29 NDPS Act was registered and investigation was set into motion. On completion of investigation police submitted charge-sheet U/S.25-A/29 NDPS Act. Hence, the prosecution case has come up.

2. All the three juveniles in conflict with law namely Papua Hmar, Rinhgeta Zathing and Rama Chinzer were produced before the

JJB after their arrest and they were kept in the Observation Home, Boko. After filing of charge-sheet trial against the all three juveniles in conflict with law has been started. Copy was furnished to them. The particulars of the offence U/Ss.25-A/29 NDPS Act were explained to the aforesaid juveniles to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

Contd....P/

3.

JJB-33/13.

3. During trial, the prosecution has examined as many as 7 (seven) prosecution witnesses. All the three juveniles have been examined U/S.313 CrPC. Defence has examined none. Plea of defence is of total denial.

4. : **POINTS FOR DETERMINATION :**

(a) Whether the juveniles in conflict with law contravened an order made under section 9A of the Act, and thereby committed U/S.25-A NDPS Act ?

(b) Whether the juveniles in conflict with law abated, or was a party to a criminal conspiracy to commit offence punishable under Chapter IV, and thereby committed an offence punishable U/S.29 of NDPS Act ?

: **DECISION AND REASONS THEREOF :**

5. The prosecution to prove the case examined seven witnesses. PW1 is Sri Pintu Prasad who is a auto-rickshaw driver. In his evidence PW1 has deposed that on the date of occurrence at about 3:05 PM, he was proceeding to Bongaigaon from New Bongaigaon riding his auto-rickshaw. Near the Kendriya Vidyalaya, the informant stopped him and asked him to take some bags to the police station.

Accordingly, PW1 took about 5/6 bags in his auto-rickshaw to Bongaigaon Police Station and after handing over of other bags in the PS he left.

In cross-examination, PW1 has deposed that he did not know anything about the incident. The informant was accompanied by constable only. PW1 has deposed that he had not seen the seized bags in the Court. He did not know what was inside the bags and from where the police brought the bags.

Contd...P/

4.

JJB-33/13.

6. PW2 Sri Chandra Sekhar Chouhan who is also an auto-rickshaw driver. In his evidence PW2 has deposed that on the day of occurrence at about 2:00-2:30 PM, he was proceeding towards Bongaigaon from New Bongaigaon. Near Kendriya Vidyalaya he had found gathering of people and then he stopped his auto-rickshaw and proceeded towards the place of occurrence. At the place of occurrence, PW2 has found the informant opening some packets. There were several packets wrapped by black papers inside the bag. There were small tablets inside the packets. PW2 had seen the juveniles at the place of occurrence. The informant took signatures of PW2 in some papers. Exts-1, 2, 3 & 4 were the certified copies of those papers and Exts-1(1), 2(1), 3(1) and 4(1) were the signatures of PW2. Exhibits were exhibited under objection.

In cross-examination, PW2 has revealed that Exts-1 to 4 are the photostat copies. PW2 has also revealed that he had seen about 10/15 persons in the place of occurrence. While he arrived at the place of occurrence, he had seen that the police personnel were

opening the bags. He had not seen as to what happened at the place of occurrence prior to opening of the bags. PW2 has denied the suggestion that he had not seen the juveniles at the place of occurrence. He has also denied the suggestion that he had not seen any tablets in the packets.

7. PW3 is Madan Gopal Shah. In his evidence, PW3 has deposed that on the date of occurrence while he was proceeding to Bongaigaon from Dangtola by his auto-rickshaw, he had seen gathering

Contd...P/

5.

JJB-

33/13.

of people near the Kendriya Vidyalaya and then he stopped his vehicle. PW3 had seen the juveniles and some bags at the place of occurrence. The informant opened the bags in front of PW3 and other persons and there they have seen white colour tablets. The police seized the bags containing the tablets in presence of PW3. Exts-1 to 4 are the seizure lists. Exts-1(1) to 4(1) are the signatures of PW3 (under objection). Thereafter, PW3 left the place of occurrence.

In cross-examination, PW3 has revealed that he learnt about the contents of Ext-1 to 4 from the police. Exts-1 to 4 are photostat copies. He has not seen whether Exts-1 to 4 are the photocopies of papers signed by him. He has seen about 10/15 persons at the place of occurrence. He has seen the informant taking tablets from the bags. PW3 could not say about the owner of the bags. He has denied the suggestion that he had not seen the informant taking out tablets from the bags.

8. PW4 is Md. Billal Hussain. In his evidence, PW4 has deposed that about 2/3 months back at about 2:30 PM while he was proceeding from Bongaigaon to New Bongaigaon Railway Station by his auto-rickshaw, he has seen gathering of people near Kendriya Vidyalaya. Then, he stopped his vehicle and proceeded towards the place of occurrence. He has seen about 4/5 trolley bags at the place of occurrence. He had also seen the juveniles there. PW4 has seen the informant keep one bag opened. There were some packets inside the bag wrapped by black tap. When the packets were opened, PW4 had seen white tablets inside it.

Contd...P/

6.

JJB-33/13.

In cross-examination, PW4 has revealed that he came to the place of occurrence seeing the gathering of people. There were about 10/15 persons at the place of occurrence. PW4 did not know who had opened the bags. PW4 did not know as to what happened at the place of occurrence prior to opening of the bags. PW4 has denied the suggestion that he had not seen the juveniles at the place of occurrence. He has also denied the suggestion that he has adduced false evidence.

9. PW5 is the informant Sri Khargeswar Rava. In his evidence, PW5 has deposed that on 23.08.2013 he was working as TSI at Bongaigaon Police Station. On that day, he was in-charge of the police station. On the date of occurrence, at about 3:05 PM, one Khargeswar Ray informed in the police station over telephone that

three boys and two girls found carrying six big bags from Rajdhani Express train. He also informed that there might be suspected articles in the said bags. Then, PW5 endorsed GDE No. 855 and proceeded to New Bongaigaon Railway Station along with his staff. While they were proceeding towards the railway station, in front of Kendriya Vidyalaya, they found the juveniles including three boys and two girls carrying the bags. Then, PW5 in presence of witnesses checked the bags found in possession of the juveniles and other boys and girls. There were some packets inside the bags wrapped by black polythene paper and blue carbon paper. There were small white tablets inside those packets. When PW5 suspected those tablets as contraband, he immediately informed the Superintendent of Police, Bongaigaon about the incident. Then, the Supdt. of Police, Bongaigaon sent the DSP(Hq), Bongaigaon to the place of occurrence for following necessary instruction as per rule of NDPS Act. The DSP(Hq) arrived at the place of occurrence and issued authority letter to PW5 to take action under the NDPS Act. After issuance of authority letter, PW5 brought the Digital Weight Measurement Machine from Motilal Shah to take weight of the suspected tablets. PW5 seized the said Digital Weight Measurement Machine by preparing seizure lists. Ext-1 is the certified copy of the said seizure list and Ext-1(3) is the signature of PW5 (under objection). Thereafter, PW5 seized the packets of tablets along with the bags in presence of the juveniles and other accused persons and in presence of witnesses. PW5 has deposed that from juvenile Papuia, he seized one red colour bag containing 14 nos. of packets weighing 18.93 Kgs, from juvenile Rama he seized one purple colour bag containing 12 nos. of packets weighing 15.865 Kgs and from juvenile Ringheta, he seized one purple colour bag containing 15 nos. of

packets weighing 20.25 Kgs. Ext-4 is the certified copy of seizure list and Ext-4(3) is the signature of PW5 (under objection). PW5 has also deposed that DSP(Hq) has authorized him to seize the contraband. Ext-5 is the authority letter and Ext-5(1) is the signature of DSP(Hq), Bongaigaon Sri Ram Chandra barman, APS, whose signature is familiar to PW5. PW5 has also deposed that after receiving positive result of drugs from the FSL, PW5 lodged the FIR. Ext-6 is the photocopy of the said FIR (under objection).

In cross-examination, PW5 has revealed that at the time of occurrence, he was working as TSI of Bongaigaon PS. He received the information over telephone from pone driver namely Khargeswar Ray. Immediately, he recorded the GDE at about 3:15 PM. He accompanied by his PSO staff and women constable went to the place of occurrence. The name of staff was not mentioned in the GDE. While they were

Contd....P/

8.

JJB-33/13.

interrogating the juvenile people gathered at the place of occurrence. The juveniles and their companions were proceedings towards Bongaigaon carrying their bags. PW5 stopped the juveniles and thereafter he informed his superior officer about the incident through telephone. When the senior police officer arrived at the place of occurrence, then he searched the juveniles and their companions. He did not give any written information to the juveniles as required U/S.50 of the NDPS Act, though he informed orally about the same to the juveniles. PW5 has also deposed that in the case diary, he mentioned in detail about the bags was recovered from the juveniles. PW5 has

also deposed that he took weight of the bags at the place of occurrence and prepared the seizure list on the spot. He has denied the suggestion that he did not take the signature of DSP(Hq), Bongaigaon in the seizure list as witness. He did not take account of the tablets taken up for sample. He took samples of each of the bags, but he did not take sample from each one of the packets as every packets were containing the same tablets. He produced the seized articles before the Magistrate on the next date as it became evening on the date of occurrence because of following the procedure. He sent the contraband to the SP Office within 72 hours. Prior to that, the samples were kept in the Malkhana of PS. He did not produce the sample before the Magistrate for seen. In his MCD, it was written as to when the sample was sent to SP Office. PW5 has denied the suggestion that Ext-5, the authority letter was not given to him at the time of seizure. There is no seal of DSP(Hq) in Ext-5 as the seal was in the office. PW5 has denied the suggestion that he did not properly conducted the investigation of the case and that he did not

Contd...P/1

0.

JJB-33/13.

collect the sample in presence of witnesses. He also denied the suggestion that he did not recover any bag from the possession of the three juveniles.

- 10.** PW6 is SI Khirod Dey. In his evidence, PW6 has deposed that on 19.10.2013 while he was working as Second officer of Bongaigaon PS, he was entrusted by the O/C, Bongaigaon PS to completed the investigation Bongaigaon PS GDE No.855/13.

Thereafter, on perusal of the CD, he found that the investigation of the case has already been completed and no further investigation is required. Thereafter, he submitted charge-sheet on 31.10.2013 U/S.25-A/29 NDPS Act against the juveniles along with other accused persons. Ext-7 is the charge-sheet and Ext-7(1) is his signature.

In cross-examination, PW5 was declined by the defence.

11. PW7 is Dr. Dhruba Jyoti Hazarika, Dy. Director, Drugs & Narcotic Division, FSL. In his evidence, PW7 has deposed that on 29.08.2013 he was working as Senior Scientific Officer, Drugs and Narcotic Division, FSL. On that day, he received a parcel from the Director in connection with Bongaigaon PS GDE No.855 dtd.23.08,.13. The parcel consisting of six exhibits enclosed in an envelope cover and the facsimile of the seal was found to be "SUPDT OF POLICE BONGAIGAON". The description of the articles are given below in the following manner :

Six sealed envelopes marked as 'A', 'B', 'C', 'D', 'E' & 'F' having six paper packets containing :

Contd...P/10.

JJB-

33/13.

- a) 24 (twenty four) loose white tablets, marked by me as DN-343/2013 (a).
- b) 28 (twenty eight) loose white tablets, marked by me as DN-343/2013 (b).
- c) 28 (twenty eight) loose white tablets, marked by me as DN-343/2013 (c).
- d) 28 (twenty eight) loose white tablets, marked by me as DN-343/2013 (d).
- e) 28 (twenty eight) loose white tablets, marked by me as DN-343/2013 (e).

DN- f) 25 (twenty five) loose white tablets, marked by me as 343/2013 (f) respectively.

In cross-examination, PW7 has deposed that Exhibits DN-343/2013 (a) to DN-343/2013 (f) gave positive tests for Pseudo-ephedrine and amount of Pseudo-ephedrine per tablet were found to be 58.88 mg, 56.38 mg, 57.18 mg, 57.84 mg, 58.10 mg & 56.18 mg respectively. Ext-8 is the photocopy of the said report. PW7 also deposed that his report was forwarded by his Director in-charge Mr. M.N. Borah. Ext-9 is the photocopy of the said forwarding letter.

12. Ld. Counsel for the prosecution has submitted that prosecution has proved the case beyond all reasonable doubts. There is a cogent and credible evidence that contraband were seized from the bags carried by the juveniles. He has also submitted that compliance of Section 50 NDPS Act is not attracted in the instant case.

13. On the other hand, Ld. Defence Counsel has submitted that prosecution has failed to prove the case. The GDE of the case was not exhibited by the prosecution. There was no superior police officer at the time of seizure. The prosecution witnesses have deposed that the

Contd....P/1

1.

JJB-33/13.

informant was accompanied by only constable at the time of search and seizure. The prosecution witnesses did not know from whom the bags were seized. They did not know what had happened prior to opening of the bags. Hence, there is no evidence that the bags were containing contraband were carried by the juveniles and the contraband seized

from their possession. Ld. Defence Counsel has also submitted that Section 50 of the NDPS Act was not followed in the instant case. He has also submitted that the samples were not collected and sent to the FSL as per provision of NDPS Act and the same is fatal to the prosecution case. He has also submitted that there was no seal of the officer concerned in Ext-5, Authority Letter. Further, the DSP(Hq), Bongaigaon was not made witness in the charge-sheet. Ld. Defence Counsel has submitted that in the instant case authority was made before authorization. It has also been contented that the persons in whose custody the sample of seized tablets were kept and who took the FSL were not examined. As such it has not proved that the seized samples were sent to the FSL.

14. It has further been contended by the learned counsel for the defence that section 41 of NDPS Act has not been followed by the informant while conducting the search. Before search and seizure was made, no search warrant was obtained and therefore, the search and seizure is vitiated.

15. In this regard the Board has gone through a decision of M.P. High Court in **Nand Kishor -versus- Central Bureau of Narcotics, Neemuch [2005(35) A.I.C. 347]**. In Nand Kishor -versus- Central Bureau

Contd....P/1

2.

JJB-

33/13.

of Narcotics(Supra) Hon'ble M.P. High Court stated that, it has come in the evidence of Rajendra Kumar(P.W.6) that before making search of the house of the appellant he was not having any search warrant. However, this fact can not be marginalized and blinked away that the officers of Narcotic Department headed by their Superintendent of their department P.K. Sinha (P.W.7) and if that is position, according to me, under Sub-section 2 of section 42 of the Act, there was no necessary of obtaining search warrant. Further, relying on the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in **M. Prabhulal,[(2003) Cri.L.J.) 4996 (Supra), T. Thomson(Supra), and Jarnail Singh**, it has been further held that thus, even if prior search warrant was not obtained , it can not be said that there is noncompliance of section 41 of the Act.

16. Following the view of the decision in Nand Kishor(Supra) the contention raised by the learned counsel for the defence regarding the search and seizure vitiated on account of not obtaining search warrant prior to search, can not be accepted. In the instant case, the provisions of section 41 of the N.D.P.S. Act are not attracted for the reason that it was not a search of any building, conveyance or place but the search was carried out by P.W.5 in presence of DSP(Hq), a Gazetted officer, of the bags which the juveniles were carrying.

17. Learned counsel for the defence has further canvassed that section 50 of the N.D.P.S. Act has not been complied with.

18. This controversy came to be considered by
Hon'ble Apex

Contd...P/1

3.

JJB-33/13.

Court in the decision reported as **State of H.P. -versus- Pawan Kumar, [(2005)4 S.C.C. 350**, wherein Hon'ble Apex Court while examining the scope and applicability of the section 50 of the Act has held as under:-

"The word "person" has not been defined in the Act. In view of the basic principles of interpretation of statutes, it becomes necessary to look to dictionaries to ascertain the correct meaning of the word "person" Having regard to the scheme of the Act and conducts in which it has been used in the section it naturally means a human being or a living individual unit and not an artificial person. The word has to understood in a broad common-sense manner and, therefore, not a naked or nude body of a human being but the manner in which a normal human being well move about in a civilized society. Therefore, the word "person" would mean a human being with appropriate covering and clothings and also footwear".

19. It has been further held by Hon'ble Supreme Court as under **[(2005) Cri.L.J. 2208 Para 10)]:-**

"A bag, briefcase or any such article or container, etc. can, under no circumstances, be treated as body of a human being. They are given a separate name and are identified as such. They can not even remotely be treated to be part of the body of a human being. Depending upon the physical capacity of a person, he may carry any number of items like bag, a briefcase, a suitcase, a tin box, a thaila, a jhola, a gathri, a holddall, a carton, etc. of varying size, dimension or weight. However, while carrying or moving along with them, some extra effort or energy would be required. They would have to be carried either by the hand or hung on the shoulder or back or placed on the head. In common parlance it would be said that a person is carrying a particular article, specifying the manner in which it was carried like hand, shoulder, back or head, etc. Therefore, it is not possible to include these articles which the ambit of the word "person" occurring in section 50 of the Act."

Thus, in view of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in State of H.P.-versus- Pawan Kumar the contention regarding noncompliance of Section 50 of the Act also warrant no acceptance.

20. All the three juveniles were found in possession of bags containing packets of tablets containing contraband pseudo-ephedrine.

Contd....P/1

4.

JJB-33/13.

The juveniles have failed the onus of proof as envisaged under section 35 of the N.D.P.S. Act. Section 35 of the N.D.P.S. Act provides that in any prosecution for an offence under this Act which requires culpable mental state of the accused the court shall presume the existence of such mental state but it shall be defence for the accused to prove the fact that he had no such mental state with respect to the charge as an offence in that prosecution. The Explanation to section 35 provides that in the section "culpable mental state" includes intention, motive, knowledge of a fact and belief in, or reason to believe, a fact. He has relied on a decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Karnal Singh -versus- State of Rajasthan [(2000 S.C.C.(Cri.) 1437)]** wherein Hon'ble Apex Court has held that appellant therein had not discharged the burden of proof in any manner to rebut the presumption as envisaged under section 35 of the Act and, therefore, he has been proved that appellant was transporting Opium with a conscious mind and full knowledge. All the ingredients of the offence with which the appellant had been convicted and sentenced had been proved by the prosecution. The three juveniles were found in possession of pseudo-ephedrine as noticed above and have failed to account for the possession of the same satisfactorily and, therefore, the presumption under section 54 of the N.D.P.S. Act goes against the juveniles.

21. On close assessment of the evidence on record discussed herein above, it has been established beyond reasonable doubt that P.W.5, SI Khrgeswar Rava received an information to the effect that the juveniles were found alongwith others carrying bags containing suspected articles. The information was recorded vide G.D.

Contd....P/1

5.

JJB-

33/13.

Entry No.855. In compliance of sub-section(2) of section 42 the information was sent to the higher police officer Deputy Superintendent of Police(H.Q.). Then Deputy Superintendent of Police(H.Q.) reached the place of occurrence and he issued authorization (Ext.5) to PW 5 to seize the suspected contraband. The juveniles were found carrying bags containing suspected contraband. The search and seizure was made in presence of Deputy Superintendent of Police(Head Quarter), Bongaigaon who is a Gazetted Officer. Though other witnesses have not seen from whom the bags were recovered but they have witnessed the seizure. There is clear and cogent evidence in this regard. The testimony of PW 5 is consistent and trustworthy and defence has failed to demolish the credibility of his testimony. The tablets and the samples taken therefrom were sealed on the spot and the samples were immediately sent to the Forensic Science Laboratory, Kahilipara, Guwahati for expert opinion without any delay which has been established from the statement of P.W.7 who stated in his evidence that on 29.08.2013, he received the samples on examination found positive test for pseudo-ephedrine. The juveniles have failed to account for the

possession of the tablets containing pseudo-ephedrine and, therefore, presumption under section 35 and 54 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 can be raised against him. Moreover, there is clear, cogent and reliable evidence on the record that the samples were intact and no suggestion in cross examination has been put to the prosecution witnesses that the case property has been tampered with and, therefore, in my considered opinion, there is rigid compliance of section 55 of the N.D.P.S. Act.

Contd....P/1

6.

JJB-

33/13.

22. In the decision reported in 2009 CriLJ 446, Rafael Palafox Garcia Vs. The Union of India (UOI) and Anr., the Honorable Bombay High Court stated as follows:

“Section 9A of the NDPS Act deals with the power to control and regulate controlled substance. "Controlled substance" means any substance which the Central Government may, having regard to the available information as to its possible use in the production or manufacture of narcotic drugs or psychotropic substances or to the provisions of any international Convention, by notification in the official Gazette, declare to be a controlled substance. The Ministry of Finance Department of Revenue vide its notification dated 28th December, 1999 has declared **pseudo-ephedrine** a controlled substance under the Act. The Central Government being of the opinion that having regard to the use of the controlled substances in the production or manufacture of any narcotic drug or psychotropic substance, it is necessary or expedient so to do in the public interest, in exercise of powers conferred by Section 9A of the Act has made the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (Regulation of Controlled Substance) Order, 1993, which has come into force w.e.f. 15th April, 1993.”

Thus it is found that pseudo-ephedrine is a controlled substance under the NDPS Act and the juveniles have failed to produce

any permit or license to possess the said substance. and thus, the prosecution has proved the case against the accused beyond any manner of doubt for the contravention of the provisions under section 9
A of the N.D.P.S. Act.

23. In the result, I find that the prosecution has proved the case against the juveniles U/S.25-A of NDPS Act beyond all reasonable doubts. The prosecution has failed to prove its case against juveniles U/S.29 of NDPS Act and they are hereby acquitted from the sec.29 of NDPS Act levelled against them.

Contd....P/1

7.

JJB-

33/13.

24. On the point of sentence, the juveniles are heard. The Board has also gone through the Counseling Reports of the juveniles submitted from the Observation Home, Boko. It is found that the juveniles are studying in School. Upon going through the Counseling reports and hearing the juveniles, the Board has decided to pass an order directing all the three juveniles namely Sri Papua Hamar, Sri Rama Chinzer and Sri Rinhgeta Zathing to be sent to a Special Home for a period of 1(one) year under Section 15(g) of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000. Considering that the juveniles are students, the Board has decided to reduce 3(three) years period of staying in the Special Home as per provision of Section 15(g) of the Act to 1(one) year. The period from which all the three juveniles were kept in the Observation Home, shall be set off from their period of stay in the Special Home. Accordingly this case is disposed of.

25. Let a copy of this Judgment be furnished to the juvenile at free of cost.

26. The Judgment is given under my hand and seal of the Board on this **24th day of July, 2014.**

Sd/-
(Smt. N. Talukdar)
Principal Magistrate
J.J.B, Bongaigaon

Basak)

Sd/-
(Sri Dulal Chadra

Member
J.J.B, Bongaigaon

Contd....P/18.

JJB-33/13.

Choudhury)

Sd/-
(Smt. Ranu

Member
J.J.B, Bongaigaon

Dictated and Corrected by me.....

Sd/-
(Smt. Nirmali Talukdar)
Principal Magistrate
J.J.B, BONGAIGAON.

V.V.V.V.V.V.V