

**HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH  
AT SRINAGAR**

**CRM(M) 116/2022  
CrlM(401/2022)**

**Reserved on: 19<sup>th</sup> May, 2026.  
Pronounced on: 21<sup>st</sup> May, 2026  
Uploaded on: 22<sup>nd</sup> May, 2026  
Whether operative part or full  
judgment has been pronounced: **Full****

**1. Mr. S.D. Mevada (age 62 year) ...Petitioner(s)**  
Assistant Manager (QA)  
S/o Dayabhai Maganbhai  
R/o Banskantha Gujarat,  
Nominee for M/s BA/Banaskantha,  
District Coop. Milk Producers Union  
Ltd. Palanpur Gujrat-385001.

**2. Kamraj Ramsang Bhai Chaudary**  
(age 55 years)  
S/o Ramsang Bhai  
R/o Vadgam Edrana Banaskantha  
Gujrat  
Incharge Managing Director for M/s  
BA/ Banaskantha, District Coop. Milk  
Producers Union Ltd. Palampur Gujrat-  
385001

Through: Mr. Reyaz Ahmad Mir, Advocates.

**Union Territory of Jammu & Kashmir, ...Respondent(s)**  
through Food Safety Officer, Block Shopian.

Through: Mr. Hakim Aman Ali, Dy. AG.

**CORAM:**

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Wasim Sadiq Nargal, Judge.**

**JUDGMENT**

**1)** Through the medium of the instant petition filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure has sought the following relief(s):

*“In the premises it is therefore prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to quash and set aside the complaint titled State through Food Inspector u/s S.D. Mevada and others pending before Chief Judicial Magistrate) along with the cognizance order dated 07.10.2021 passed by the Hon'ble Court.*

*Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit in the circumstances of the case may also be passed in favour of the petitioners and against the respondents in the interest of equity.”*

**BRIEF FACTS:**

2) The petitioners claim to be the authorised representatives of M/s BA/Banaskantha District Cooperative Milk Producers' Union Ltd., Palanpur, Gujarat (hereinafter referred to as the “Society”), which is a non-portable undertaking set up for the purpose of production of milk and milk products. The Society plays a vital role in enhancing the economy of the country, besides catering to the needs of its countrymen.

3) The petitioners are aggrieved by the cognizance order passed by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Shopian on 07.10.2021, by virtue whereof summons were directed to be issued against the accused persons, and the same has been called in question through the medium of the instant petition filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

**ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF PETITIONERS:**

4) It is the specific case of the petitioners that the respondent/complainant had taken a sample of Homogenized Toned Milk (Amul Taza) and, after completion of requisite

formalities, the sample was finally sent to the Food Analyst for analysis. It is submitted that the Food Analyst tested the sample and issued report bearing No. FSSA/K/FA/2020-21/P-500 dated 27.10.2020, declaring the sample as standard quality. A copy of the initial analytical report dated 27.10.2020 has been placed on record along with the instant petition.

5) The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that, without consulting the petitioners' company, the respondent treated the report as erroneous for reasons best known to them and sent the sample to the Referral Laboratory without giving any reasonable opportunity of being heard to the petitioners. The learned counsel further submits that, upon receiving the analytical report from the Referral Laboratory declaring the sample as unsafe, a complaint was filed before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Shopian through the Food Safety Officer, Shopian.

6) The further case of the petitioners is that, before receiving the amended analytical report from the Referral Laboratory, some unknown report had come before the respondents, which they neither appended with the complaint nor provided a copy thereof to the petitioners, which, according to the learned counsel for the petitioners, creates doubt and suspicion upon the whole process initiated by the respondents against the petitioners. Upon filing of the complaint, the petitioners were put to notice along with three other accused persons by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Shopian, and the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, in terms of law, was supposed to conduct an enquiry as mandated under Section 202 CrPC. Since the Magistrate failed to follow the law in its correct perspective, the Magistrate deviated from the prescribed procedure, which has resulted in miscarriage of justice.

7) The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that, in terms of Rule 2.4.3 of the Food Safety and Standards Rules, 2011

(for short “the Rules of 2011”), if, after considering the report, the Designated Officer is of the opinion, for reasons to be recorded in writing, that the report delivered by the Food Analyst under Rule 2.4.2(5) is erroneous, he shall forward one of the parts of the sample kept by him to the Referral Laboratory for analysis, and if the analysis report of such Referral Laboratory is to the effect that the article of food is unsafe or sub-standard or misbranded or contains extraneous matter, the provisions of Rule 3.1 shall, so far as may be, apply.

8) The learned counsel for the petitioners, placing reliance upon the aforesaid statutory provisions of the Act of 2011 and the Rules framed thereunder, submits that the Designated Officer was under a legal obligation qua the petitioners to record reasons that the report delivered by the Food Analyst under Rule 2.4.2(5) was erroneous, and only in that eventuality could the sample have been referred to the Referral Laboratory for further analysis.

9) Relying upon the aforesaid Rules, the learned counsel submits that no opinion/reasons were recorded by the Designated Officer and the matter was referred to the Referral Laboratory and, as such, the very cognizance taken by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate fails, and the complaint ought to have been dismissed at the very threshold, which has not happened in the instant case and, feeling aggrieved thereof, the petitioners have preferred the instant writ petition.

10) In addition, the learned counsel for the petitioners has also submitted that the learned Magistrate, while passing the cognizance order against petitioner No. 2, i.e., the Managing Director, failed to appreciate the proviso to Section 66 of the Food Safety and Standards Act, 2006, which contemplates that where a company has different establishments or branches or different units in any establishment or branch, the concerned head or the

person in charge of such establishment, branch or unit nominated by the company as responsible for food safety would be liable for contravention in respect of such establishment, branch or unit. As such, the proceedings and taking of cognizance are vitiated in law and deserve to be quashed.

11) Lastly, the learned counsel for the petitioners submits that it is a settled proposition of law that when a statute requires a particular thing to be done in a particular manner, the same is required to be done in the said manner alone, and any departure therefrom cannot sustain the test of law and is liable to be quashed/set aside when it is proved beyond any shadow of doubt that there has been an infraction in complying with the statutory provisions of law.

**ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT:**

12) *Per contra*, status report stands filed on behalf of the Food Safety Officer, Block Shopian, a perusal whereof reveals that, in the instant matter, since the complaint has been filed by a Government Officer under the provisions of the Act of 2011, which is a Central legislation, the learned Magistrate was not required to conduct any enquiry under Section 202 CrPC.

13) The respondents have taken a specific stand in the status report that the Designated Officer, after going through the report of the first analyst, i.e., the Food Analyst, Kashmir Division, found that all the testing parameters had not been conducted and hence decided, under Rule 2.4.3, to send the second part of the sample to the Referral Laboratory, for which no opportunity of being heard was required to be given to the petitioners under the provisions of the Food Safety and Standards Act. The Designated Officer, in the instant matter, exercised his powers under Rule 2.4.3 and hence sent the second part of the sample to the Referral Laboratory.

14) With a view to vindicate the stand taken by the respondents, Mr. Hakim Aman Ali, learned Deputy Advocate General, has drawn the attention of this Court to the reasons recorded by the Designated Officer, Shopian, which paved the way for referring the matter to the Referral Laboratory. For facility of reference, the same is reproduced as under:

*“I have gone through the analytical report of Food Analyst Kashmir issued vide No FSSA/K/FA/20-21/P500, dated: 27.10.2020 and have been found that only 8 parameters have been conducted while as some important parameters like detection of antibiotic residue, pesticide residues and detection of heavy metals have not been conducted. As the department has the facility available to conduct all these tests from NATIONAL DIARY DEVELOPMENT BOARD ANAND GUJARAT which is referral Food Lab, to conduct tests of milk and milk products, it is therefore decided that 2nd part of the sample bearing Code No. DO/FSSA/SPN/167 be dispatched to this Referral Food Laboratory.”*

15) The learned counsel further submits that the reasons which were required to be recorded by the Designated Officer in conformity with the aforesaid Rule have, in fact, been recorded, and the Rule has been followed in its letter and spirit. After recording the reasons and feeling prima facie satisfied, the Designated Officer referred the matter to the Referral Laboratory and, thus, the plea raised by the petitioners in the instant petition that the reasons had not been recorded is contrary to the record and liable to be rejected outrightly in the light of the record produced by the learned counsel which has been examined by this Court.

16) With a view to rebut the second allegation of the petitioners, the learned counsel further submits that the nominated person of the company is the Assistant Manager, Quality Control, whose responsibility is restricted, whereas the Managing Director is overall responsible for managing the affairs of the company, including the quality of food products that are put into the market for consumption by the general public. Therefore, the Managing Director is vicariously liable for any wrong done by the company and was, therefore, rightly impleaded in the complaint.

17) The respondents, while filing the status report, have taken a specific stand that no contradictory report had been obtained, whereas the fact of the matter is that, after receipt of the report from the Food Analyst, Srinagar regarding the food article “Amul Taza Homogenised Toned Milk” declaring the sample to be of standard quality, the Designated Officer, after scrutiny of the report and acting in conformity with the powers vested under Rule 2.4.3, sent the second part of the sample to the Referral Food Laboratory, Gujarat after recording reasons, which is borne out from the record supplied to this Court by the learned counsel for the respondents. The Referral Laboratory, Gujarat thereafter declared the sample as unsafe under Section 26(1) and 26(2)(i), read with Section 3(1)(zz)(xii), punishable under Section 59 of the Food Safety and Standards Act and, therefore, the report of the Referral Laboratory, National Dairy Development Board, Gujarat, has an overriding effect over the report obtained from the first laboratory, i.e., the Food Laboratory, Srinagar.

18) The learned counsel for the respondents further submits that once the report of the Referral Laboratory is received, the report of the first laboratory loses its significance and, therefore, the plea regarding contradiction does not arise, as projected by the petitioners in the instant petition.

19) Lastly, the learned counsel for the respondents submits that the procedure prescribed under the Food Safety and Standards Act and the Rules framed thereunder has been strictly followed in the instant matter. The learned Magistrate has acted strictly in consonance with law and, therefore, the challenge thrown to the impugned complaint cannot sustain in law. Accordingly, the learned counsel for the respondents has prayed that the instant petition, being misconceived, false and frivolous, be dismissed, as the grounds projected in the instant petition are not tenable, being contrary to the record and against law.

**LEGAL ANALYSIS:**

20) *Heard learned counsel for the parties at length and perused the material on record.*

21) This Court is of the considered opinion that the instant petition does not merit interference in exercise of inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 CrPC.

22) At the very outset, it needs to be observed that the powers under Section 482 CrPC are extraordinary in nature and are required to be exercised sparingly, carefully and only in exceptional circumstances where continuation of criminal proceedings would amount to abuse of process of law.

23) The core contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioners is that the Designated Officer referred the sample to the Referral Laboratory without recording reasons in writing as contemplated under Rule 2.4.3 of the Food Safety and Standards Rules, 2011 and, therefore, the entire proceedings stand vitiated.

24) The purpose behind Rule 2.4.3 of the Food Safety and Standards Rules, 2011 has been enacted with the clear object of ensuring immediate, effective and comprehensive scientific examination of food samples in cases where the initial report

appears incomplete, deficient or erroneous. The Rule forms an important part of the statutory mechanism created under the Food Safety and Standards Act, 2006 to safeguard public health and ensure that unsafe food articles do not escape proper scientific scrutiny. For the facility of reference same is reproduced as under:

*“2.4.3: Action by Designated Officer on the report of Food Analyst. If, after considering the report, the Designated Officer is of the opinion for reason(s) to be recorded in writing, that the report delivered by the Food Analyst under Rule 2.4.2 (5) is erroneous, he shall forward one of the parts of the sample kept by him to referral laboratory, for analysis and if the analysis report of such referral laboratory is to the effect that the article of food is unsafe or sub-standard or mis-branded or containing extraneous matter, the provisions of Rule 3.1 shall, so far as may be, apply.”*

25) A plain reading of Rule 2.4.3 makes it evident that the legislature has consciously empowered the Designated Officer to refer the sample to the Referral Laboratory once he forms an opinion, for reasons to be recorded in writing, that the report of the Food Analyst is erroneous. The very purpose behind conferring such power is to ensure that public health is not jeopardized merely because the first report may have omitted examination of important safety parameters.

26) In the present case, the record clearly reveals that the Designated Officer found that important parameters relating to antibiotic residues, pesticide residues and heavy metals had not been tested in the first analysis. Therefore, in order to ensure complete and accurate scientific examination, the sample was referred to the Referral Laboratory in accordance with Rule 2.4.3 after recording reasons in writing.

27) This Court is of the view that the said action was not only permissible under law but was necessary in larger public interest. The provision is intended to protect public health and safety and not merely individual commercial interests. The authorities entrusted with implementation of the Food Safety and Standards Act cannot be expected to mechanically accept an incomplete report when important safety parameters affecting human health remain unexamined.

28) It is a settled proposition of law that where a statute requires a thing to be done in a particular manner, it has to be done in that manner alone and in no other manner. The said principle was laid down in **Mackinnon Mackenzie Ltd vs Mackinnon Employees Union** reported as 2015 (4) SCC 544 wherein, it was held that:

*“Whenever a statute prescribes that a particular act is to be done in a particular manner and also lays down that failure to comply with the said requirement leads to a specific consequence, it would be difficult to hold that the requirement is not mandatory and the specified consequence should not follow.”*

29) Therefore, this Court is of the opinion that the Designated Officer has acted precisely in the manner contemplated by the statute and the procedure prescribed under Rule 2.4.3 was duly followed and reasons were recorded in writing before referring the sample to the Referral Laboratory. The action of the respondents cannot be said to be arbitrary, illegal or contrary to law so as to warrant interference by this Court under Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

30) The second contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioners is that the sample was referred to the Referral

Laboratory without granting any opportunity of hearing to the petitioners.

31) This Court finds no substance in the aforesaid contention as well. Neither the provisions of the Food Safety and Standards Act, 2006 nor the Rules framed thereunder contemplate grant of any pre-decisional hearing before exercise of powers by the Designated Officer under the relevant Rules. Once the statute itself empowers the Designated Officer to refer the sample after recording reasons, absence of prior hearing cannot render the proceedings illegal.

32) The further contention of the petitioners regarding existence of some “unknown report” also appears to be wholly speculative and unsupported by any material on record. The stand taken by the respondents is categorical that no other report existed except the initial report of the Food Analyst and the subsequent report of the Referral Laboratory. The sequence of events borne out from the record clearly demonstrates that upon finding the first report incomplete, the sample was referred for comprehensive scientific analysis and thereafter the Referral Laboratory declared the sample unsafe. Therefore, the plea regarding any concealed or undisclosed report is without any factual foundation.

33) This Court also finds merit in the submission of learned counsel for the respondents that once, the report of the Referral Laboratory is received, the earlier report loses its significance. The Referral Laboratory under the statutory framework is the final scientific authority and the opinion rendered by such expert body carries overriding effect. In the present case, the Referral Laboratory at National Dairy Development Board, Anand, Gujarat, after conducting detailed analysis, declared the sample unsafe under the provisions of the Food Safety and Standards Act.

34) The Hon'ble High Court of Madras in case titled A. Venkatrama vs The Food Safety Officer bearing CrI.O.P. Nos. 14595 and 22925 of 2016 decided on 13.04.2023 has held that:

*“14. Accordingly, one part of the sample to be sent for analysis to the Food Analyst under the intimation to the Designated Officer and another part of sample to be sent to an accredited laboratory. If both reports found to be variance, the Designated Officer shall send one part of the sample to the referral laboratory. The report of the referral laboratory shall be final and on the basis of the said report, complaint has to be filed.”*

35) Applying the aforesaid principle to the present case, this Court is of the considered opinion that once the sample was referred to the Referral Laboratory after recording reasons in writing and the Referral Laboratory thereafter declared the sample unsafe, the respondents were fully justified in proceeding further on the basis of the said report. The earlier report of the Food Analyst, which admittedly did not test all important parameters, loses its significance once a conclusive report is received from the Referral Laboratory.

36) At this stage, it also becomes necessary to refer Section 26 and Section 3(1)(zz)(xii) of the Food Safety and Standards Act, 2006.

*“Section 26(1) provides that every food business operator shall ensure that food articles satisfy the requirements of the Act at all stages of production and distribution.*

*Section 26(2)(i) specifically provides that no food business operator shall manufacture, store, sell or distribute any article of food which is unsafe.*

*Similarly, Section 3(1)(zz)(xii) defines unsafe food as food whose nature, substance or quality renders it injurious to health."*

37) In the present case, the Referral Laboratory at National Dairy Development Board, Anand, Gujarat declared the sample unsafe under Section 26(1) and Section 26(2)(i) read with Section 3(1)(zz)(xii) of the Act.

38) Once a final opinion has been rendered by a statutory expert laboratory constituted under the Act itself, this Court, while exercising limited jurisdiction under Section 482 CrPC, cannot sit in appeal over the scientific determination rendered by experts in the field. Matters relating to food safety involve technical and scientific evaluation which are best left to specialized expert bodies. Judicial review cannot extend to substitution of scientific opinion unless the decision-making process itself is shown to be arbitrary, mala fide or contrary to law, which is not the case herein.

39) The argument regarding contradiction between the first report and the report of the Referral Laboratory is equally misconceived. The first report admittedly covered only limited parameters whereas the Referral Laboratory undertook comprehensive examination including crucial safety parameters which had not been tested earlier. Therefore, the subsequent report cannot be termed contradictory in the strict sense but rather a conclusive and final determination under the statutory mechanism.

40) Neither the Food Safety and Standards Act, 2006 nor the Rules framed thereunder provide for any prior notice or hearing before the sample is referred to the Referral Laboratory. The legislature in its wisdom has consciously not incorporated such requirement.

41) Therefore, the contention of the petitioners regarding contradiction between the reports or illegality in referral of the sample deserves to be rejected.

42) The other contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioners is regarding non-compliance of Section 202 CrPC before issuance of process by the learned Magistrate.

43) The complaint in question has been filed by a public servant in discharge of official duties under a legislation enacted for protection of food safety and public health. At the stage of issuance of process, the learned Magistrate was only required to examine whether prima facie material existed for proceeding against the accused persons.

44) Similarly, the plea raised by petitioner No. 2 regarding immunity under Section 66 of the Food Safety and Standards Act also deserves to be rejected.

45) Section 66 of the Act specifically provides that where an offence under the Act has been committed by a company, every person who at the time of commission of offence was in charge of and responsible to the company for conduct of its business shall be deemed guilty of the offence.

46) The proviso to Section 66 merely provides that where a company has different establishments or units, the person nominated for food safety in such unit shall also be liable. The said proviso does not grant absolute immunity to the Managing Director or persons in overall control of the affairs of the company. For facility of reference same is reproduced as under:

*“66. Offences by companies.-(1) Where an offence under this Act which has been committed by a company, every person who at the time the offence was committed was in charge of, and was*

*responsible to, the company for the conduct of the business of the company, as well as the company, shall be deemed to be guilty of the offence and shall be liable to be proceeded against and punished accordingly: Provided that where a company has different establishments or branches or different units in any establishment or branch, the concerned Head or the person in-charge of such establishment, branch, unit nominated by the company as responsible for food safety shall be liable for contravention in respect of such establishment, branch or unit: Provided further that nothing contained in this sub-section shall render any such person liable to any punishment provided in this Act, if he proves that the offence was committed without his knowledge or that he exercised all due diligence to prevent the commission of such offence. (2) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1), where an offence under this Act has been committed by a company and it is proved that the offence has been committed with the consent or connivance of or is attributable to any neglect on the part of, any director, manager, secretary or other officer of the company, such director, manager, secretary or other officer shall also be deemed to be guilty of that offence and shall be liable to be proceeded against and punished accordingly."*

47) In the present case, petitioner No. 2 admittedly occupies the position of Managing Director and is overall in charge of the affairs and functioning of the company. Whether the offence was committed with his knowledge, consent or due to neglect is a matter which requires evidence and cannot be conclusively determined in proceedings under Section 482 CrPC.

48) At this stage, the Court is only required to see whether prima facie allegations exist showing involvement of the accused persons in the affairs of the company. The Court cannot conduct a mini trial while exercising inherent jurisdiction.

49) This Court is of the considered opinion that petitioner No. 2 cannot claim blanket immunity merely because another officer may have been nominated for quality control or food safety purposes. The question whether petitioner No. 2 exercised due diligence or had no knowledge of the alleged contravention is essentially a matter of defence which can only be examined during trial upon appreciation of evidence.

50) This Court cannot lose sight of the fact that the public health is of paramount importance and must prevail over private commercial interests. The present case relates to the safety of milk, which is consumed every day by children, infants, pregnant women, elderly persons, patients and general public. Contaminated milk product has the potential to seriously affect human health and may cause long-term and irreversible consequences, particularly upon children whose physical growth and immunity depend upon safe and nutritious food. Therefore, issues concerning food safety cannot be treated lightly or decided merely on technical considerations.

51) The Food Safety and Standards Act, 2006 has been enacted with the object of ensuring safe and wholesome food for human consumption and to protect the public from unsafe food articles.

52) The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Vincent Panikurlangara v. Union of India** reported as **1987 SCC (CRI) 329** held that

*“As pointed out by us, maintenance and improvement of public health have to rank high as*

*these are indispensable to the very physical existence of the community and on the betterment of these depends the building of the society of which the Constitution makers envisaged. Attending to public health, in our opinion, therefore, is of high priority perhaps the one at the top."*

53) The observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court clearly emphasize that maintenance and improvement of public health is not merely an administrative concern but a constitutional obligation of the highest importance. Therefore, while exercising jurisdiction under Section 482 CrPC, this Court cannot adopt an approach which may dilute the statutory safeguards enacted under the Food Safety and Standards Act, 2006 for protection of consumers.

54) In the present case, once the statutory Referral Laboratory, after detailed scientific examination, declared the sample unsafe, the matter ceased to remain a mere dispute between the parties and became an issue directly affecting public health and public safety. This Court cannot permit dilution of statutory safeguards enacted for protection of consumers, particularly when the food article involved is milk consumed largely by children and infants. Any leniency in such matters may adversely affect the health and safety of the public at large.

55) Contaminated products can have serious and irreversible effects upon human health, particularly the health of children whose growth and development depend upon safe nutritional intake.

56) This Court is also not inclined to continue the interim stay even for a single day more as the interim order which was passed by this Court way back on 21.04.2022 continues to be operative even as on today, seriously jeopardizing the health of the public.

The petitioners have already enjoyed protection for a considerable period of time while the proceedings involving serious allegations relating to unsafe food products. The matter concerns public health and safety and, therefore, cannot be permitted to linger indefinitely.

57) The material placed on record prima facie discloses commission of offences punishable under Section 59 of the Food Safety and Standards Act requiring full-fledged adjudication before the competent trial Court.

**CONCLUSION:**

58) In the light of the stand taken by the respondents and the material placed on record this court is in agreement with the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the respondents that the reasons which were required to be recorded by the Designated Officer in conformity with the aforesaid Rule have, in fact, been recorded and, after recording the reasons and feeling prima facie satisfied, the respondents referred the matter to the said referral laboratory. Thus, the plea raised by the petitioners in the instant petition is contrary to the record and liable to be rejected.

59) For the foregoing reasons, this Court finds no illegality, perversity or jurisdictional error in the complaint and also in the cognizance order dated 07.10.2021 passed by the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Shopian. Accordingly, the instant petition, being devoid of merit, is *dismissed* along with all connected applications. Interim direction(s), if any, shall stand vacated forthwith.

60) The learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Shopian, shall proceed with the complaint strictly in accordance with law and make all possible endeavours to conclude the proceedings

expeditiously, preferably within a period of six months from the date copy of this order is made available before the Court. Any observation made by this Court while dealing with the instant petition shall not be construed as an expression of opinion while deciding the complaint pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Shopian, and the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate shall proceed in the matter in accordance with law, without being influenced by any observation made by this Court in this order.

**61)** Both the parties shall appear before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Shopian on 10.07.2026.

**62)** The record so produced by Mr. Hakim Aman Ali, learned Deputy Advocate General, be returned to him by the Registry against proper receipt.

(Wasim Sadiq Nargal)  
Judge

**SRINAGAR:**

21.05.2026

"HAMID"

