

RESERVED
Court No 1

Form No. 4
{See rule 11(1)}
ORDER SHEET
ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

O.A. No. 309 of 2017

Col Vikram Chauhan
By Legal Practitioner for the Applicant

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>04.04.2022</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)</u></p> <p>Order pronounced. O.A. No. 309 of 2017 is dismissed. For order, see our judgment passed on separate sheets. Misc. Applications, pending if any, shall be treated as disposed of accordingly.</p> <p>(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) Member (A) rathore</p> <p>(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava) Member (J)</p>

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW**ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 309 of 2017**Monday, this the 04th day of April, 2022**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)**
Hon'ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)IC-53144K Col Vikram Chauhan, Commanding Officer, 16 Infantry Div
Ordnance Unit, Pin-909016 C/o 56 APO (Ganganagar).

..... Applicant

Learned counsel for the Applicant : **Shri Virat Anand Singh**, Advocate
: **Shri Indra Sen Singh**, Advocate
: **Shri Ravi Prakash Tripathi**, Advocate

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary, Ministry of Defence South Block, DHQ, PO- New Delhi-11.
2. The Chief of the Army Staff, Integrated Headquarters, Ministry of Defence (Army) South Block, New Delhi-11.
3. The Military Secretary, IHQ of MoD (Army), South Block, new Delhi-110011.
4. Lt. Gen Taranjit Singh, DG Recruiting, IHQ of MoD (Army), West Block IV, RK Puram, New Delhi-110011.

.....Respondents

Learned counsel for the Respondents. : **Shri Yogesh Kesarwani**, Advocate
Central Govt. Counsel
assisted by Lt Col Suchithra C, AMS
(Legal), MS Branch, Army HQ.

ORDER**“Per Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Member (J)”**

1. The instant Original Application has been filed under Section 14 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 for the following reliefs:-

- (a) *Call for the complete records of the case leading to the impugned order dated 06.06.2017 and, subject to the partial relief granted therein to the applicant, set aside the said order.*
- (b) *Call for the complete CR Dossier of the Applicant and, after perusal thereof, set aside the Applicant's impugned CR for the period 01.01.2014 to 31.08.2014 and grant all consequential reliefs flowing from setting aside the said CR including reconsideration for nomination to Higher Command Course; and*
- (c) *Pass such other order(s) or direction(s) as the Hon'ble Tribunal deems appropriate in the facts and circumstances of the case.*

2. The applicant, a 1994 batch officer of Army Ordnance Corps (AOC) was empanelled by No 3 Selection Board and was promoted to the rank of Colonel. During the period 01.03.2013 to 28.06.2016 while commanding 4 RAPID Ordnance Unit, the applicant earned six Confidential Reports (CRs). The applicant submitted statutory complaint dated 01.09.2015 (Annexure A-5) in which he assailed two of his CRs viz, January 2014 to August 2014 and September 2014 to March 2015. The Central Govt vide order dated 06.06.2017 (Annexure A-1) expunged the entire CR for the period September 2014 to March 2015 and held that CR for the period January 2014 to August 2014 being objective and technically valid, merits no interference.

3. Earlier, on 09.07.2014 Lt Col S Chowdhury of 4 RAPID Ord Unit submitted a written complaint to respondent No 4 labelling certain allegations against the applicant and in consequence thereof

an informal inquiry (one man inquiry) was conducted by IC-39275K Col SP Singh, SO (SD) of 4 RAPID on 14.07.2014 in which the applicant also participated as witness No 1. Thereafter, on recommendation of the said informal inquiry, a formal C of I was held vide convening order dated 20.09.2014 which found the applicant guilty on three charges. Based on findings of the C of I the applicant was issued a Show Cause Notice dated 02.06.2015 (Annexure A-3) and 'Severe Displeasure (recordable)' was awarded to him by General Officer Commanding, 1 Corps on 14.07.2015 (Annexure A-4). Applicant has filed this O.A. to set aside impugned CR for the period 01.01.2014 to 31.08.2014 as also set aside order dated 06.06.2017 less partial relief.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that applicant has served with complete dedication in all the units and that was the reason he was sent on deputation to Congo (UN Mission) in 1994. He further submitted that he was never graded below 'outstanding' in any of his CRs except those that were initiated by Maj Gen (Now Lt Gen) Taranjit Singh, respondent No 4, post a complaint made against him by Lt Col S Chowdhury of his unit during first week of Jul 2014. He further submitted that consequent to allegations by Lt Col S Chowdhury, a one man enquiry was conducted by Col SP Singh of 4 RAPID and on an informal report submitted by Col SP Singh, respondent No 4 taking cognizance of the said inquiry report issued orders for conduct of C of I to investigate the veracity of allegations made against the

applicant. It was further submitted that while the matter was still pending at HQ 1 Corps to decide whether or not a C of I should be ordered against him, the applicant's CR for the period 01.01.2014 to 31.08.2014 became due for initiation by the IO on 01.09.2014, which was initiated on 16.09.2014. He further submitted that he was issued with a Show Cause Notice on 02.06.2015 which was replied by him on 18.06.2015 negating all the allegations made against him. His other submission is that disregarding the points urged by him in reply dated 18.06.2015, GOC 1 Corps awarded him 'Severe Displeasure (recordable)' on 14.07.2015. He further submitted that due to this impugned CR his nomination to the prestigious Higher Command Course (HCC) was rejected. Against Censure Order dated 14.07.2015, applicant had submitted a statutory appeal dated 01.09.2015 to respondent No 1 which when not decided, he filed O.A. No 230 of 2017 in AFT, Principal Bench, New Delhi, challenging the validity of the said Censure Order, which is still pending. Applicant had also preferred statutory petition dated 30.04.2016 against his CRs for the period 01.01.2014 to 31.08.2014 and 01.09.2014 to 01.03.2015 and in the said petition partial redressal was given vide order dated 06.06.2017 expunging CR for the period 01.09.2014 to 01.03.2015 on tech grounds. Applicant's further contention is that he was involved in a disciplinary case for which an informal C of I was ordered on 14.07.2014 and based on report of this informal C of I a formal C of I was conducted vide order dated 20.09.2014 and he was awarded

'Severe Displeasure (recordable)' on 14.07.2015. His submission is that as per para 34 (b) of AO 45/2001/MS, since he was subject to a disciplinary case w.e.f. the date of informal C of I i.e. 14.07.2014, his CR for the period 01.01.2014 to 31.08.2014 should not have been initiated by the IO from the date on which formal cognisance of an offence was taken against him as he was under DV ban. His further submission is that, in terms of para 32 (b) of AO 45/2001/MS as the disciplinary proceedings were going on, his confidential report could only be initiated after taking permission from the SRO which was not done. His other submission is that since the disciplinary proceedings completed on award of 'Recordable Censure' on 14.07.2015, his CR for the period 01.01.2014 to 31.08.2014 could only be initiated after the DV Ban was lifted. Applicant's contention is that his other CRs, prior to initiation of the CR covering the period 01.01.2014 to 31.08.2018, were outstanding therefore there is inconsistency in the impugned CR which was initiated after an informal C of I was ordered, meaning thereby that the CR for the period 01.01.2014 to 31.08.2014 is subjective and not performance based which needs to be expunged. In support of his contention learned counsel for the applicant has relied upon order dated 31.03.2017 passed by this Tribunal in O.A. No. 155 of 2016, **Brig HMS Chatwal vs UOI & Ors.**

5. On the other hand learned counsel for the respondents submitted that on receipt of a complaint dated 09.07.2014 made by

Lt Col S Chowdhury against the applicant, respondent No 4 ordered one man inquiry on 14.07.2014 to investigate the allegations made in the aforementioned complaint. Thereafter, since staff C of I was convened on 20.09.2014, therefore applicant came under disciplinary proceedings, as explained in para 34 of AO 45/2001/MS, only on 20.09.2014 **after initiation** of the impugned CR on 16.09.2014. He further submitted that in view of the facts explained above, as such there was no requirement of taking prior sanction of SRO. The learned counsel further submitted that the applicant on being found guilty was awarded 'Severe Displeasure (recordable)' by the GOC 1 Corps on 14.07.2015. His other submission is that vide order dated 06.06.2017 partial redressal was granted to the applicant on a statutory complaint submitted on 30.04.2016. His other submission is that the applicant was awarded above average grading in the impugned CR therefore there is no inconsistency in the CR as alleged by the applicant. Refuting arguments of learned counsel for the applicant on one man inquiry, learned counsel for the respondents submitted that one man inquiry has not been explained in any of Army Orders/Instructions. This is an informal preliminary fact finding inquiry to assist the Commanding Officers/Commanders and does not supplant the investigation under Army Rule 22 pertaining to C of I. Replying to para 4 (j) of the O.A. learned counsel for the respondents submitted that no cognizance can be taken based on one man inquiry and cognizance based on investigation can only be

based on a C of I. On the date when the CR was initiated, neither any C of I was ordered to be assembled nor any formal cognizance of the offence/misconduct was taken by the competent authority. He pleaded for dismissal of O.A. on the ground that since the impugned CR for the period 01.01.2014 to 31.08.2014 is objective as assessed vide order dated 06.06.2017, this needs no interference.

6. We have heard Shri Indra Sen Singh, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri Yogesh Kesarwani, learned counsel for the respondents assisted by Lt Col Suchithra C, AMS (Legal), MS Branch, Army HQ and perused the material placed on record. We have also perused the original records brought by AMS (Legal).

7. The controversy involved in the present Original Application is prima-facie with regard to his confidential report covering the period 01.01.2014 to 31.08.2014 which was initiated by Maj Gen (now Lt Gen) Taranjit Singh, the then GOC 4 RAPID. Lt Col S Chowdhury, a subordinate officer of the applicant, submitted a complaint against the applicant alleging malpractices during EWT in March 2014. Based on this complaint, one man inquiry was convened on 14.07.2014 which was completed on 25.08.2014. On the basis of informal one man inquiry, a Staff Court of Inquiry was ordered on 20.09.2014 in which applicant also took part. After findings being recorded in the C of I a Show Cause Notice dated 02.06.2015 was served upon the applicant and on receipt of reply dated 18.06.2015 'Censure' was awarded to the applicant by the

GOC, 1 Corps on 14.07.2015. For convenience sake Show Cause Notice dated 02.07.2015 and Censure Order dated 14.07.2015 are reproduced as under:-

"SHOW CAUSE NOTICE DATED 02.07.2015

1. A Court of Inquiry was held vide Head quarters 4 RAPID convening order Number 825/Complaint/ROU/A1 dated 20 September 2014 to investigate the allegation leveled against you by IC-58903H Lieutenant Colonel Suprajit Chowdhury of 4 RAPID Ordinance Unit vide his letter Number 58903/Disp/1 dated 09 July 2014.

2. Proceedings of the Court of inquiry were placed before General Officer Commanding 1 Corps, who on perusal found you blameworthy for the following:-

(a) Introducing Ms Priya Singh, a civilian as your wife to officers of your unit and allowing her to take part in official function in October 2013 as first lady, an act which is unbecoming of an officer.

(b) Improperly allowing Ms. Priya Singh to stay in government married accommodation off and on, as allotted to you without any established relationship.

(c) Reflecting an unprofessional approach to training by permitting Ms. Priya Singh to visit unit in EWT location, in direct violation of instructions on the subject issued vide Headquarters South Western Command letter Number 23301/BGS(SD &Trg) dated 17 May 2012.

3. The General Officer Commanding is of the opinion that a censure in an appropriate form should be conveyed to you for your said act of omission /commission. You are, therefore, afforded an opportunity to explain your conduct and show cause as to why a censure in an appropriate form should not be conveyed to you.

4. A copy of said Court of Inquiry proceedings less findings and opinion is enclosed herewith. The same may please be returned to this HQ along with your reply.

5. You should submit your reply within 30 days of receipt of this show cause notice failing which it shall be assumed that you have no grounds to urge against the proposed action and an ex-parte decision will be taken.

6. Please return one copy of the Show Cause Notice duly received."

"Severe Displeasure (Recordable)

1. I have considered the reply of the Show Cause Notice submitted by IC-53144K Colonel Vikram Chauhan, Commanding Officer 4 RAPID Ordnance Unit.

2. I have concluded that he has lapsed on the following counts:-

(a) Introducing Ms. Priya Singh, a lady friend as his wife to officers of his unit and allowing her to take part in official function in October 2013 as first lady an act which is unbecoming of an officer.

(b) Allowing Ms. Priya Singh to stay in government married accommodation off and on as allotted to him without any established relationship.

(c) Reflecting an unprofessional approach to training by permitting Ms. Priya Singh to visit unit in EWT location.

3. Whereas I have considered the reply by the officer Vis-à-vis the records of the Court of Inquiry. Colonel Vikram Chauhan in his reply has admitted the allegation 2© of Show Cause Notice wherein he has stated that Ms. Priya Singh had visited his unit location during EWT and he even allowed her to attend official function of his unit in October 2013, which was direct violation of instructions on the subject issued vide Headquarters South Western Command letter No. 23301/BGS(SD & training) dated 17May 2012.

4. Colonel Vikram Chauhan denied the petition of the allegation levied in Para 2 9a) of Show Cause Notice of introducing Ms. Priya Singh, a civilian, as his wife to officers of his unit. The officer's contention that he has never introduced Ms. Priya Singh as his wife should be seen in light of shaped environment as prevailed in the unit as that point in time and that rationale behind the same for which Colonel Vikram Chauhan can not absolve himself.

5. Colonel Vikram Chauhan, also denied the allegation 2(b) allowing Ms. Priya Singh to stay in government married accommodation as allotted to him without any established relationship. The contention of the officer lacks substance, he had cross examined the witnesses as per Army Rule 180 and it was proved well beyond doubt that the lady off and on stayed in the government married accommodation allotted to Colonel Vkiram Chauhan in contravention to para 1016 of Defence Service Regulations Volume II (Revised Edition 1987).

6. The reply of the officer has been analysed viz-avis the findings of the Court of Inquiry The material on record clearly establishes the Colonel Vikram Chauhan is blameworthy

on the above charges. As Commanding Officer of a military unit, he was expected to set high standard of morality and security norms for his unit , he was expected to set high standard of morality and security norms for his unit, whereas he was found to be flouting the same, which were direct violation of instructions on the subject issued vide Headquarters South Western Command letter no. 23301/BGS/(SD & Training)dated 17May 2012. The portion of lapses, which the officer has admitted and contended that it was due to his error of judgment , where as records suggest it was not an error but due to non adherence of laid down service norms expected from a Commanding Officer. The conduct of the aforesaid officer was not befitting his seniority and appointment.

7. I therefore, direct that my 'Severe Displeasure (Recordable)' be conveyed to IC-53144K Colonel Vikram Chauhan, Commanding Officer 4 RAPID Ordnance Unit."

8. Perusal of aforesaid Show Cause Notice and 'Severe Displeasure (recordable)' indicates that the applicant was held blame worthy on the charges labelled against him.

9. On submission being made by learned counsel for the applicant that consequent to one man inquiry by order dated 15.07.2014 the applicant was to be construed as being under DV ban with effect from the date of this one man inquiry and therefore his CR ought not to have been initiated without taking prior permission from SRO in terms of para 32 (b) of Army Order 45/2001/MS, learned counsel for the respondents submitted that one man enquiry is not covered under Army Rules or Regulations but it is custom of service and is carried out informally and does not have a status of investigation. We find that the GOC had first found out about the veracity of the allegations by ordering an informal investigation. When some substance was found, a staff C

of I was ordered. In the said C of I the applicant was found blame worthy on the following counts:-

(a) Introducing one Ms Priya Singh, a lady friend as his wife to the officers of his units and allowing her to take part in official functions as such in October, 2013 as first lady—an act which is unbecoming of an officer.

(b) Improperly allowing Ms Priya Singh to stay in government married accommodation off and on, as allotted to him without any established relationship.

(c) Reflecting an unprofessional approach to training, by permitting Ms Priya Singh to visit unit in EWT location, in direct violation of instructions on the subject issued vide headquarters South Western Command policy letter dated 17.05.2012.

10. **Technical Validity of Impugned CR.** Applicant's CR for the period 01.01.2014 to 31.08.2014 was initiated by Maj Gen (Now Lt Gen) Taranjit Singh who was commanding 4 RAPID. We have perused the CR Dossier of the applicant and we find that the CR was initiated on 16.09.2014 and no prejudice was done to the applicant. The convening order for Staff Court of Inquiry was issued on 20.09.2014 which implies that on the date when CR was initiated, the officer was not involved in any formal disciplinary proceedings whereupon the need to take prior permission from SRO for initiation of his CR, did not exist. The CR for the period 01.01.2014 to 31.08.2014 is technically valid as held vide order dated 06.06.2017, which for convenience sake, is reproduced as under:-

"No 36501/16188/AOC/2016/MS-19/138/SC/2017/D(MS)

Government of India

Ministry of Defence

New Delhi, the 06 June, 2017

ORDER

1. IC-53144K Col Vikram Chauhan, AOC, has submitted a Statutory Complaint dated 30 Apr 2016 against CRs 01/14-08/14 & 09/14-03/15. The main points of this complaint are :-

(a) The officer has highlighted his service profile in brief including regimental service, tenure in Assam Rifles and UN Mission in Congo. The officer states that he has maintained an excellent profile throughout his career and has performed well on courses and therefore his non-nomination on HC Course was a rude shock to him. He attributes this to biased, inconsistent and arbitrary/non-objective assessment in CRs for the period 01 Jan 14 to 31 Aug 2014 and 01 Sep 14 to 26 Mar 15.

(b) The officer states that in the first week of Jul 14, Lt Col S Chowdhury of his unit had complained verbally to the then GOC 4 RAPID, alleging financial fraud to the tune of approx 9 lakhs in establishing of two gymnasiums in the station. The officer states that in the checking of documents at Div HQ by Lt Col Chowdhury in the presence of Dy GOC and Col A, no irregularity was found. However, no action was taken against the officer for baseless allegations. On the contrary the GOC appeared to have made up his mind against him which was reflected in his curt attitude towards him.

(c) The officer states that on 09 Jul 14, Lt Col S Chowdhury forwarded another complaint against him wherein besides the earlier allegation he made additional allegations against him. The GOC initially ordered an 'One Man Enquiry' which did not find any truth in the allegation. However, the GOC further referred the matter to HQ 1 Corps. The officer's request to place Lt Col Chowdhury on Adverse Report w.e.f. 19 Aug 14 for misconduct, misdemeanour and dereliction of duty was turned down by the GOC 4 RAPID as it seemed that he had already developed a negative bias against him and wanted to remove him from command of the unit.

(d) The officer avers that in view of the above facts CR 01/14-08/14 initiated by the GOC was biased and subjective. Elaborating on the bias by GOC he states that the GOC encouraged Lt Col Chowdhury and other officers of the unit whereas he was warned and cautioned not to take action against officers of his unit. In Nov 2014 he was directed by HQ 4 RAPID not to initiate the CRs of the officers of the unit even though no case had been taken by the formation HQ for debarring him under the provisions of AO 45/2001 and the case was taken up later in Jan/Feb 2015 and MS Br accorded sanction in Mar 2015. He avers that the GOC even influenced the Court of Inquiry ordered to investigate into the allegation against him. The GOC did not take any action against his request for seeking 'Redressal Against Perceived Wrongs' forwarded vide letter dt 20 Sep 2014. He also states that the CR 01/14-08/14 is technically invalid as prior sanction of SRO was not taken under provisions of para 32 to 38 of AO 45/2001/MS as AR 180 had been invoked against him in the Court of Inquiry.

(e) The officer avers that even CR 9/14-03/15 was initiated when AR 180 was in vogue against him as the Court of Inquiry was finalised in Mar 2015 and he was placed under DV Ban wef 21 Mar 2015. The officer states that, since no SRO sanction was obtained by the IO before initiating the CR, the same was set aside by HQ 1 Corps, however, strangely the CR was re-initiated again after obtaining SRO sanction of which the extracts was received by the officer in Nov 2015. In the ibid CR he was graded below his past profile of 20 years. The officer avers that the aim of obtaining SRO's sanction is not a mere technical formality but to present miscarriage of justice due to bias or prejudice and which is apparent in the CR initiated by the IO. The officer avers that both the CRs are tech invalid, inconsistent, biased and subjective.

(f) The officer states that his CRs initiated immediately prior and subsequent to the two impugned CRs, in the same appointment and same environment are 'Outstanding'/'Nearly Outstanding' CRs. Thus he feels that the impugned CRs stand out as an aberration in his overall profile.

(g) The officer has requested for the following:-

(i) CR 01/14-08/14 & CR 09/14-03/15 be set aside on grounds of bias, inconsistency, non-objectivity, arbitrariness, not being performance based and being tech invalid.

(ii) After due redress, he be considered afresh for nomination to Higher Command Course by comparing his modified comparative merit with the bench mark merit of his original batch.

3. The Statutory Complaint of the officer has been examined in the light of his overall profile, comments of Reporting Officers, other relevant documents and recommendations of AHQ. After consideration of all aspects of the complaint and viewing it against the redress sought, it has emerged that the impugned CR 01/14-08/14 is objective, performance based, well corroborated, and technically valid. Hence it does not merit any interference. However, CR 09/14-03/15 is found to be technically invalid and hence merits interference.

4. The Central Government, therefore, orders for grant of partial redress to the officer by way of expunction of entire CR 09/14-03/15 on grounds of technical invalidity.

5. Subject to the partial redress ordered at para 4 above, the Central Government disposes of the Statutory Complaint dated 30 Apr 2016, submitted by IC-53144K Col Vikram Chauhan, AOC, against CRs 01/14-08/14 & 09/14-03/15."

11. Thus, from the aforesaid an inference may be drawn that CR pertaining to the period 01.09.2014 to 26.03.2015 was expunged

being technically invalid and CR for the period 01.01.2014 to 1.08.2014, being objective, performance based, well corroborated and technically valid, was not interfered.

12. Further, when we see the pen picture awarded by the Initiating Officer (IO) in CR for the period 01.01.2014 to 31.08.2014 we find that in pen picture the IO has praised him for his management in the unit and also for welfare of troops and families. The IO has also recommended him for foreign assignments and career courses.

13. **Chronology of Events**

Timelines of initiation of CR and disciplinary proceedings in respect of the applicant is as under:-

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| (i) Impugned CR period | :01.01.2014 to 31.08.2014 |
| (ii) Initiated by IO | :16.09.2014 |
| (iii) Court of Inquiry ordered on | :20.09.2014 |
| (iv) Imposition of DV Ban | :21.03.2015 |
| (v) Severe Displeasure awarded | :14.07.2015 |

14. From the aforesaid chronology of events it is clear that the applicant became a subject to disciplinary case on 20.09.2014, the day C of I was ordered against him and Army Rule 180 was invoked i.e. after the due date of CR (31.08.2014). Hence para 35 and not para 32 (b), as referred by the applicant in O.A., of AO 45/2001/MS is applicable in this case. Para 35 of ibid AO states as under:-

"In case, the date of initiation of CR, endorsement by affected reporting officers in respect of those CRs, which have not been initiated and processed to the next level may be debarred by the SRO. The CRs which are already initiated before the date of taking cognisance, will be commented upon

for objectivity, by the higher reporting officers and all such CRs will be endorsed by the SRO. However, CRs having reached the MS Branch without the endorsement of the SRO, may be accepted without SRO's endorsement, as per procedures of MS Branch."

15. We have found that the impugned CR is above average with laudatory/positive pen picture in which the applicant has also been recommended for foreign assignment and career courses. The bias contended by the officer is not evident. The CR, being objective, well corroborated, consistent with his overall profile, performance based and technically valid, needs no interference.

16. In view of the above, O.A. lacks merit and liable to be dismissed. It is accordingly, dismissed.

17. No order as to costs.

18. Miscellaneous application(s), pending if any, stand disposed of.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

Dated: 04.04.2022

rathore