

## **IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT JUDGE, DHUBRI**

PRESENT : Shri A. Chakravarty, M.A., LL.M., AJS  
District Judge, Dhubri.

### **Misc. (P) Case No. 97 of 2013**

Shri Kishor Mahato... Petitioner

-Versus -

Shri Kalyan Kumar Das...Respondent

Application filed on : 29-08-2013

Evidence recorded on : 11-09-2015, 01-12-2015,03-03-2016,18-05-2016,  
15-07-2016, 16-08-2016, 27-01-2017

Arguments heard on : 08.02.2017

Judgment delivered on : 22.02.2017

### **Advocates who appeared in this case are:-**

Shri A.K. Fazlul Hoque, advocate for the petitioner

Shri Birendra Kumar Das, advocate for the respondent

## **J U D G M E N T**

**1.** This is an application filed under section 376 of the Indian Succession Act, 1925 by the petitioner Kishor Mahato (the executor) praying for issuance of probate in respect of the last Will of late Jnanada Das @ Jnanada Bala Das (the testatrix), bequeathing her movable and immovable properties mentioned in the said Will to her granddaughter Jyotishmita Das and grandson Nayanjyoti Das.

**2.** The case of the petitioner in brief is that the testatrix expired on 27-11-2012 at her residence at Dhubri town. During her lifetime, the testatrix executed the registered Will No. 45, dated 17-09-2012 bequeathing her movable and immovable properties mentioned in the said Will to her granddaughter Jyotishmita Das and grandson Nayanjyoti Das. The testatrix has left behind:-1. Shri Kalyan Kumar Das, son 2. Smt. Mira Das, daughter 3. Miss Jyotishmita Das, granddaughter and 4. Shri Nayanjyoti Das, grandson as her legal heirs and representatives. Her ordinary place of residence was at Ward No.1 of Dhubri town, within the local limits of the territorial jurisdiction of this Court. According to the said Will, grandson Nayanjyoti Das will get 6.5 lecha land covered by Dag No. 1106 Patta No. 479 New/ 579 Old, holding No. 106, situated at Dhubri town Khas Mahal, Ward No. 1, Circle and District Dhubri, with one Assam Type House as described in the Schedule- A of the petition and 50% of the deposits lying with the State Bank of India, Dhubri Branch and in the Savings Bank Account at the Dhubri Main Post Office, as described in the schedule- B of the petition and granddaughter Jyotishmita Das will get the remaining 50% of the deposits lying with the State Bank of India, Dhubri branch and in Savings Bank Account at the Dhubri Main Post Office.

**3.** On receipt of the notice of the proceeding, Shri Kalyan Kumar Das contested the case by filing a written statement and the Smt. Mira Das supported the case of the petitioner. In his written statement, Shri Kalyan Kumar Das has taken all the routine pleas, denied the case of the petitioner and has prayed for dismissal of the probate petition. On merit, he has averred that the land mentioned in the Will has not yet been partitioned amongst the members of their joint family under any family arrangement. The land measuring 1K-6L, with houses situated therein was never partitioned under any family arrangement amongst the legal heirs of late Dinesh Ch. Das, the original owner of the said land. Therefore, the testatrix had no right to bequeath her undivided share in the said land to anybody. The alleged Will is a fake and manufactured one and the same was not executed and attested by the testatrix. The testatrix had no intention to execute the alleged Will. In collusion with the attesting witnesses and the scribe, with intent to grab the landed property and the money lying in the bank account/postal savings account of the testatrix, the petitioner has manufactured the alleged Will. Therefore, he has prayed for dismissal of the petition.

4. Upon pleadings, the following issues were framed by my learned predecessor:-
- I) Whether the petition for probate is maintainable?
  - II) Whether the Will dated 17-09-2012 is the last will or testament of the deceased Jnanada Bala Das?
  - III) Whether the Will is legal & valid?
  - IV) Whether the petitioner is entitled to get probate of the Will as applied for?
  - V) Whether the Will dated 17-09-2012 was executed and attested by deceased Jnanda Bala Das?

5. During the course of hearing, the petitioner examined seven witnesses including himself (PW-1), the PW-2 Mira Das, the aforesaid daughter of the testatrix, PW-3 Probir Neogi and PW-4 Mostofa Hussain Laskar, the attesting witnesses of the Will, PW-5 Iskandar Azad, the scribe of the Will, PW-6 Kumar Ranjan Roy, the Post Master of the Dhubri Main Post Office and the PW-7 Nareswar Barman, the Chief Manager of the State Bank of India, Dhubri Branch. The petitioner also exhibited the Will as Exhibit-1. The contesting Opposite Party examined only himself as his witness.

### **DECISION AND REASONS THEREOF**

6. I have carefully examined the evidence on record, gone through the relevant documents on record and after hearing the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for both the sides, give my decision on the above issues as follows:

#### **ISSUE NO. I**

7. To prove that the land mentioned in the schedule-A of the petition and said to have been bequeathed was their ancestral and joint family property and that the testatrix had no right to bequeath the same, the respondent Kalyan Kumar Das examined only himself as his witness. He has deposed that the land measuring 0B-1K-6L, with houses situated therein; covered by Dag No.1106, Patta No. 479 (New) 579 (Old), Holding No.106, Ward No.1, Dhubri Town KhasMahal, under Dhubri Revenue Circle, is their joint family property. Every co-sharer, including him, has

right, title and interest over the said land and house. The said land was never partitioned between them. Therefore, the testatrix had no right to bequeath the said land. The land mentioned in the alleged Will with specific boundary is not legal and valid. The testatrix had no intention to execute the alleged Will. The Will is manufactured and the petitioner is not entitled to get probate of the said Will.

**8.** In the cross-examination, he has stated that the testatrix was his mother. She has left behind him, her daughter Smt. Mira Das and son Kulendra Kumar Das (since deceased), as her legal heirs and representatives. Since last seventeen years, he has been residing at village-Baitamari, under Abhayapuri Police Station. He does not know the Dag No. and Patta No. of the land bequeathed by his deceased mother to Jyotismita Das, daughter of his deceased brother Kulendra Kumar Das. His deceased mother bequeathed her share of the land to the said Jyotismita Das. He has read the Exhibit.1 Will. Vide Exhibit.1 Will; his deceased mother had bequeathed her landed properties to Nayan Jyoti Das and the money lying in her bank account to Nayan Jyoti Das and Jyotismita Das.

**9.** Therefore, the main thrust of the objection of the respondent is that the testatrix had no right to bequeath the land mentioned in the schedule of the Will as the same is their undivided joint family property. He has not stated anything about bequeathing the money lying with the State Bank of India, Dhubri Branch and in the Savings Bank Account of the Dhubri main Post Office, as described in the Schedule- B of the succession petition. He also has not taken the plea that the testatrix would not have got equal share in their undivided joint family property had the same been partitioned. Therefore, the testatrix had the right to bequeath her share in the undivided joint family property, even if the same was not partitioned at the relevant time. Therefore, the Probate petition is maintainable. The issue No. I is decided in the affirmative, accordingly.

#### **ISSUE NOS. II, III, V**

**10.** These issues are co-related. Hence these issues are discussed and decided jointly.

**11.** In the case in our hand, Section 63 of the Indian Succession Act, 1925 and section 68 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 have decisive bearing in adjudicating the dispute between the parties.

**12.** Section 63 of the Indian Successions Act, 1925 reads as follows:-

**“63. Execution of unprivileged Wills :-** Every testator, not being a soldier employed in an expedition or engaged in actual warfare or an airman so employed or engaged or a mariner at sea, shall execute his will according to the following rules :

- (a) The testator shall sign or shall affix his mark to the will, or it shall be signed by some other person in his presence and by his direction.
- (b) The signature or mark of the testator or the signature of the person signing for him shall be so placed that it shall appear that it was intended thereby to give effect to the writing as a will.
- (c) The will shall be attested by two or more witnesses, each of whom has seen the testator sign or affix his mark to the will or has seen some other person sign the will, in the presence and by the direction of the testator, or has received from the testator a personal acknowledgment of his signature or mark or of the signature of such other person; and each of the witnesses shall sign the will in the presence of the testator but it shall not be necessary that more than one witness be present at the same time, and no particular form of attestation shall be necessary”.

Section 68 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 reads as follows:-“68. Proof of execution of document required by law to be attested- If a document is required by law to be attested, it shall not be used as evidence until one attesting witness at least has been called for the purpose of proving its execution, if there be an attesting witness alive, and subject to the process of the Court and capable of giving evidence.

[Provided that it shall not be necessary to call an attesting witness in proof of the execution of any document, not being a Will, which has been registered in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Registration Act, 1908 (16 of 1908), unless its execution by the person by whom it purports to have been executed is specifically denied]”

**13.** It can be seen from the contents of the Section 63 of the Indian Successions Act, 1925, that to execute the Will, the testatrix would have to sign or affix her mark on it or the same has to be signed by some other person in her presence and on her direction. Further the signature or mark of the testatrix or the signature of the person signing the Will for her has to be so placed that it would appear that it was intended to give effect to the writing as Will. Further the Will shall have to be attested by two or more witnesses, each of whom has seen the testatrix sign or affix her mark on it or has seen some other persons sign it, in the presence and on the direction of the testatrix, or has received from the testatrix, personal acknowledgement of a signature or mark, or the signature of such other persons and that each of the witnesses has signed the Will in the presence of the testatrix. The same are mandatory in nature.

**14.** According to Section 68 of the Evidence Act, 1872, the Will cannot be used as evidence unless one attesting witness, at least, if alive, and is subject to the process of the court and capable of giving evidence proves its execution.

**15.** In the case in our hand, to prove that the Exhibit. 1 Will was duly executed, P.W.-1 Kishor Mahato, the petitioner has deposed that the testatrix Jnanada Das @ Jnanada Bala Das, wife of late Dinesh Ch. Das of Dhubri Town under P.S. Dhubri in the District of Dhubri, Assam executed her last Will No. III/45/2012, Sl. No. 1780/2012, on 17-09-2012, at the office of the Sr. Sub-Registrar, Dhubri in presence of attesting witnesses, namely Shri Prabir Neogi, S/o. Anil Ch. Neogi, r/o Ward No. XI, Dhubri Town, and Shri Mostofa Hussain Laskar, s/o Late Abdul Kuddus Laskar, resident of Ward No. IX, Bidyapara, Dhubri Town. The Will was written by Shri Iskandar Azad, Dhubri. The testatrix was known to all of them and she put her signatures in their presence and in presence of the Sr. Sub-Registrar, Dhubri. He was appointed executor of the Will by the testatrix. The testatrix expired on 27-11-2012. The Exhibit-1 is the said last Will of the Testatrix (proved in original). The Exhibit-3 is her death certificate.

**16.** In the cross-examination, he has denied the suggestion that the probate petition is not maintainable. He has stated that he has prayed for granting probate in respect of joint family property. He has denied the suggestion that the executor had no right to bequeath the properties shown in the schedules of the Will. He has denied the suggestion that the Exhibit-1 Will is a forged document. He has denied the suggestion that late Jnanada Das had not executed the said Will. He has

denied the suggestion that the testatrix Jnanada Das was not in a proper frame of mind at the time of execution of the Will. He has denied the suggestion that Exhibit-1 (1), 1(2), 1(3) 1 (4) are not the signatures of the testatrix. He has denied the suggestion that the Exhibit-1 Will had been executed by playing fraud. He does not know the name of the legatee, but was aware that the land had been bequeathed in the name of grandson. He has denied the suggestion that since the Will had not been executed in his presence and since the Willis forged, he does not know the name of the legatee. The property that was intended to be bequeathed to the legatee comprises a kitchen, latrine and an Assam-type house. He has denied the suggestion that apart from the house, the surrounding land is vacant land. Since there was thatched house on the land for storing purposes, there is no dwelling house on the said land. The property is located on the backside of the residence of the Deputy Commissioner, Dhubri. Apart from the legatee, the deceased Jnanada Bala Das has many relatives in Dhubri town. He has denied the suggestion that being a mason, he is not aware of the antecedents of the executants and the legatee and that is why he has been made a witness. He has denied the suggestion that the Willis fabricated.

**17.** PW-2 Mira Das has deposed that the testatrix was her mother. Her mother was the owner and was in actual physical possession of the land and houses bequeathed to granddaughter Jyotishmita Das and grandson Nayanjyoti Das. She and the beneficiaries of the Will are residing at the said house. Her mother expressed her desire to bequeath the said land and house to the beneficiaries before her death and executed the Exhibit-1 Will. Her deceased mother executed the said Will without any influence or fear. She knows the signature of her deceased mother. The Exhibit-1 (1), Exhibit-1 (2), Exhibit-1 (3), Exhibit-1 (4) and Exhibit-1 (5) are the signatures of her deceased mother in the Exhibit-1 Will. Her father late Dinesh Ch. Das was the owner of 1 Katha, 6 Lecha land, covered by dag No.1106, patta No.479 (new), 579 (old) situated at Dhubri town khas mahal. After his death, the said land devolved upon her, her two brothers, namely Kalyan Kr. Das and Kulendra Kr. Das and mother Smti. Jnanada Das @ Jnanada Bala Das, the testatrix. The said 1 Katha, 6 Lecha land was amicably partitioned between them and each of them received @ of 6.5 Lecha land and they have been possessing their respective shares. Her deceased mother bequeathed her share of 6.5 Lecha land to the beneficiaries by the said Will.

**18.** In the cross-examination, she has denied the suggestion that the Exhibit-1 Will is a fake Will. Her deceased mother voluntarily bequeathed the properties, that is, the aforesaid 6.5 lecha land and cash in favour of Jyotismita Das and Nayan Jyoti Das. She was present at the time of execution of the Will. It was a joint family property. There are houses on the land which she has stated to have been bequeathed. The remaining portion of the land is vacant land. She has denied the suggestion that in collusion with her brother, she has created the said Will. She has denied the suggestion that she has falsely stated that the land has been partitioned. Since it is a joint family property, no Will can be executed in respect of the said land by her deceased mother in favour of Jyotishmita Das and Nayan Jyoti Das. She has denied the suggestion that no Will had been executed by her deceased mother Jnanada Das @ Jnanada Bala Das.

**19.** PW-3 Prabir Neogi, an attesting witness of the Will has deposed that he knows the parties of the probate proceeding. He knew the deceased. The deceased testatrix asked him to remain as a witness of the Will and the testatrix appointed the petitioner executor of the said Will. At the time of execution of the Will, the testatrix was in sound condition of mind. The Exhibit-1 is the said Will. The testatrix signed in the Will in presence of witnesses. Exhibit-1 (VII) and Exhibit-1 (VIII) are his signatures in the Exhibit-1 Will. They all, including the testatrix, put their thumb impressions in the Exhibit-1 Will. Exhibit-2 is their photograph and finger prints.

**20.** In the cross-examination, he has stated that the scheduled property of the will is located at Ward.No.1, Municipality Board, Dhubri Town. His house is situated at ward No.11. The Ward No.1 is about two kilometers away from Ward No.11. It is a thickly populated area. Apart from Mira Das, there are no witnesses from ward No.1 in the Will. The executor Kishore Mahato is a mason. He has denied the suggestion that he has deposed at the instruction of Kishore Mahato. He has denied the suggestion that the deceased Jnanada Das @ Jnanada Bala Das had not executed any Will.

**21.** PW- 4 Mostofa Hussain Laskar, the other attesting witness of the Will has deposed that he knows the parties of the probate proceeding. He knew the testatrix. The testatrix asked him to remain as a witness of the Will and the testatrix appointed the petitioner executor of the said Will. At the time of execution of the Will, the testatrix was in sound condition of mind. The Exhibit-1 is the said Will. The executor signed in the Will in presence of witnesses. Exhibit-1 (VII) and Exhibit-1

(VIII) are his signatures in the Exhibit-1 Will. They all, including the testatrix, put their thumb impressions in the Exhibit-1 Will. Exhibit-2 is their photograph and finger prints.

**22.** In cross-examination, he has stated that the property bequeathed by the Exhibit-1 Will is situated at Ward No.1, on the back side of the residence of the Deputy Commissioner, Dhubri. His house is situated at Ward No.9. The deceased Jnanada Bala Das has many relatives living at Dhubri town and at Ward NO.1. Except her daughter, there is no witness from Ward No.1 to the execution of the Will. Mira Das was married to Guwahati and she lives in Dhubri in connection with her job. He has denied the suggestion that under a criminal conspiracy with Mira Das and others, they got the Will executed. There is some vacant land, apart from the house mentioned in the schedule of the Will.

**23.** PW-5 Iskandar Azad has deposed that he knows both the parties. He was called by the testatrix to meet her at her residence and accordingly, he met her at her residence on 15-09-2012. The testatrix then requested him to prepare a Will bequeathing her properties in favour of her granddaughter Jyotishmita Das and grandson Nayanjyoti Das. She also asked him to appoint Shri Kishor Mahato executor of the said Will. Accordingly, he drafted the Will and read over the same to the testatrix on 16-09-2012. The testatrix told him that the draft was correct and asked him to type the Will. Accordingly he typed the Will and again read over the same to the testatrix and she accepted the same to be correct. On the day of the execution of the Will, he was requested to go to the office of the Sub-Registrar, Dhubri. The Exhibit-1 is the said Will and Exhibit-1 (1) to Exhibit-1 (5) are the signatures of the testatrix put in his presence before the Sub-Registrar, Dhubri. Exhibit-1 (9) to 1 (1) are his signatures therein. They all, including the testatrix, put their thumb impressions in the Exhibit-1 Will. The Exhibit-2 is their photograph and finger prints.

**24.** In the cross-examination, He has denied the suggestion that the Exhibit-1 Will is a forged document and Jnanada Das @ Jnanada Bala Das did not execute any Will during her life time. He has stated that no Will can be executed in respect of joint family property. He has denied the suggestion that the signatures of the testatrix in the Will are forged.

**25.** PW-6 Kumar Ranjan Roy, Post Master of the Dhubri Post Office has deposed that he has brought the ledger No.108602. The said ledger is in respect of the account of Jnanda Bala Das @ Jnanda Das. As per ledger, as on 1-4-2016, the balance amount in the account of Jnanda Bala Das @ Jnanda Das was Rs.36,404.80. No withdrawal had been made from the said account since 01-04-2016. Exhibit-4 is the computer generated ledger in respect of the account No.108602 of the deceased Jnanda Bala Das @ Jnanda Das.

**26.** In the cross-examination, he stated that he does not know Jnanada Bala Das @ Jnanda Das personally. He does not have any personal knowledge about the Exhibit-4.

**27.** PW-7 Nareswar Barman, Chief Manager of the State Bank of India, Dhubri Branch has deposed that he has brought the statement of account in respect of Account No. CBS A/C No.11042957130. As per the said statement of account, as on 25-06-2016, an amount of Rs.4,95,846.01 is the last credit balance in the said account. The name of the account holder is Jnanada Bala Das. Exhibit-5 is the statement of account in respect of Account No. 11042957130 and Exhibit-5 (1) is his signature therein. The Exhibit-5 is a computer generated copy. He has put his signature being the authority to certify the copy of the document. The Exhibit-6, proved in original, are the first and the last page of the pass book in respect of A/c No. 11042957130, standing in the name of Jnanada Bala Das.

**28.** In the cross-examination, he has stated that since he is the Chief Manager, SBI, Dhubri, for last one and half year, he is not expected to know the account holder personally and the copy of the statement of account is a computer generated copy prepared on the basis of the data available at the Bank. At the time of obtaining the computer generated copy of the above statement of account, the account holder was not present.

**29.** It is crystal clear from the testimonies of the petitioner and his witnesses that the Exhibit.1 Will was executed as per law. The petitioner has proved the execution and attestation of the Exhibit.1 Will by examining not only the attesting witnesses, but also its scribe. By cross-examining the petitioner and his witnesses, the respondent has failed to bring out anything based on which it can be said they were not telling the truth. Further, as can be seen from the discussion made earlier, the main thrust of the contention of the respondent is that the testatrix had

no right to bequeath the land mentioned in the schedule of the Will, as the same is their undivided joint family property. But, surprisingly, the respondent has not objected to the bequeathing of the money lying with the State Bank of India, Dhubri Branch and in the Savings Bank Account of the Dhubri Main Post Office, as described in the schedule- B of the succession petition. Therefore, the Will must be held to be a genuine Will, duly executed by the testatrix. The respondent also has not taken the plea that the testatrix would not have got equal share in their said undivided joint family property, had the same been partitioned. Therefore, it is held that the testatrix had the right to bequeath her share in the undivided joint family property.

**30.** But, though the petitioner has deposed that the land left behind by the predecessor-in-interest of the testatrix was amicably partitioned among his legal heirs, he could not prove the same by adducing any credible and cogent evidence. PW- 4 Mostofa Hussain Laskar, an attesting witness of the said Will has deposed that except the land where the Assam Type House is situated, the remaining portion is vacant land (the land bequeathed by the testatrix). But, he did not explain how the testatrix and her two sons and daughter partitioned the land that they received from their predecessor-in-interest, that is from the husband of the testatrix. There is also no explanation as to why the testatrix was given the Assam Type House and whether she paid any owelty to other co-owners in lieu of the house. Therefore, it is held that the said land was not partitioned under any family arrangement amongst the co-sharers and the testatrix bequeathed her undivided share in their joint family property, though, the land shown to have been bequeathed by the testatrix might have fallen in her share as the testatrix and her sons and daughter, being Class-I heirs of the predecessor-in-interest of the said land, would have got equal share in the said land.

**31.** Therefore, if the testatrix had bequeathed her undivided share in the joint family property by the Exhibit.1 Will, the Will cannot be held to be null and void on that ground alone. Because, though the beneficiaries of the Will may not be entitled to receive the 6.5 lecha land with specific boundary as mentioned in the Schedule-A of the probate petition, they will receive 6.5 lecha of land out of the total land measuring 0B-1K-6L, covered by Dag No.1106, Patta No. 479 (New) 579 (Old), Holding No.106, Ward No.1, Dhubri Town Khas Mahal, under Dhubri Revenue Circle, being the share of the testatrix, after partition.

**32.** Relying on the case of **Maturi Pullaiah and another vs. Maturi Narasimhan & others, reported in AIR 1966 SC 1863**, the learned counsel for the respondent vehemently argued that as by the alleged family settlement, right, title and interest was created in favour of the testatrix and other co-sharers, registration of the said family settlement is compulsory. Therefore, as the alleged family settlement deed was not registered, the testatrix did not acquire any right, title and interest over the bequeathed land. As such, the testatrix had no right to bequeath the said plot of land. But as it has been held that there was no family settlement, the contention of the learned counsel for the respondent is rejected.

**33.** Relying on the case of **Kanwarjait Singh Dhillon v. Hardyal Singh Dhillon & Ors., reported in AIR 2008 SC 306**, the learned counsel for the petitioner has argued and I also find that this Court is not competent to determine the question of title to the suit properties nor can it decide the question whether the suit properties bequeathed by the Will were joint ancestral properties or acquired properties of the testator. In the said case, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has stated as follows:-

“It is well settled law that the functions of a probate Court are to see that the Will executed by the testator was actually executed by him in a sound disposing state of mind without coercion or undue influence and the same was duly attested. It was, therefore, not competent for the probate Court to determine whether late S. Kirpal Singh had or had not the authority to dispose of the suit properties which he purported to have bequeathed by his Will. The probate Court is also not competent to determine the question of title to the suit properties nor will it go into the question whether the suit properties bequeathed by the Will were joint ancestral properties or acquired properties of the testator.”

**34.** In view of above discussion, the issue Nos. II, III and V are decided accordingly.

#### **ISSUE NO. IV**

**35.** In view of the findings arrived at the issue Nos. I, II, III and V, the petitioner, is entitled to probate of the Will. The issue No. IV is decided accordingly.

**36.** In the result, the petition is allowed on contest. Issue probate in respect of 6.5 lecha land, out of the total land measuring 0B-1K-6L, covered by Dag No.1106, Patta No. 479 (New) 579 (Old), Holding No.106, Ward No.1, Dhubri Town Khas Mahal, under Dhubri Revenue Circle, which Nayanjyoti Das will receive after partition, without prejudice to his right to receive the share of his deceased father Kulendra Kumar Das; and in respect of the deposits lying with the State Bank of India, Dhubri Branch and in the Savings Bank Account of the Dhubri Main Post Office in the account of the testatrix, @ 50% each, to Nayanjyoti Das and Jyotishmita Das, on payment of requisite Court fees.

**37.** In the facts and circumstances of the case, the parties are left to bear their own costs.

**38.** Signed, sealed and delivered in the open Court on this the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of February, 2017, at Dhubri.

(Shri A. Chakravarty )  
District Judge, Dhubri

Dictated & corrected by me.

(Shri A. Chakravarty )  
District Judge, Dhubri