

**IN THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL
DIVISION BENCH (COURT- I) CHENNAI**

ATTENDANCE CUM ORDER SHEET OF THE HEARING
HELD ON **18.04.2024** THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCE

PRESENT: HON'BLE SHRI SANJIV JAIN, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)
HON'BLE SHRI VENKATARAMAN SUBRAMANIAM, MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

IN THE MATTER OF : State Bank of India
Vs
Kamachi Industries Ltd

MAIN PETITION NUMBER : IBA/883/2019

(IA/MA) APPLICATION NUMBERS

IA(IBC)/384(CHE)2024

ORDER

Present: Ld. Counsel Shri. Himanshu for the Applicant.

Vide separate order announced in open court, the application is dismissed with no orders as to cost.

Ld. Counsel submits that his EMD deposited with the Applicant may be released.

Considering the above and in view of the order, the Liquidator is directed to release the EMD deposited by the Applicant.

-Sd-
[VENKATARAMAN SUBRAMANIAM]
MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

MG

-Sd-
[SANJIV JAIN]
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

**IN THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL,
DIVISION BENCH – I, CHENNAI**

IA(IBC)/384(CHE)2024 IN IBA/883/2019

(filed under Section 60(5) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016)

In the matter of M/s. Kamachi Industries Limited

IMR Steel Private Limited

[Affiliate of India Coke & Power Private Limited],

Having its Registered Office at:

904, Windfall, Sahar Plaza Complex,
Andheri Kurla Road, Andheri (East),
Mumbai, Maharashtra-400 059

...Applicant

Vs.

1. Kamachi Industries Limited,

Having its Registered Office at:

ABC Trade Centre, Old No.50, (New No.39),
3rd Floor, Anna Salai,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu-600 002

...1st Respondent

2. SPP Insolvency Professionals LLP,

(Liquidator of Kamachi Industries Limited),

Having its Registered Office at:

No. 27/9, Nivedh Vikas Apartment,
Pankaja Mill Road, Puliyakulam,
Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu-641 045

...2nd Respondent

3. National E-Governance Services Limited,

Having its Registered Office at:

Gresham Assurance House,
4th Floor, Sir P.M. Road, Fort,
Mumbai, Maharashtra-400 001

... 3rd Respondent

4. **Mr. Virendra Jain**
Residing at B/19, Sterling Apartment
38, Peddar Road,
Mumbai – 400 026

5. **Mr. Ankit Jain**
Residing at B/19, Sterling Apartment
38, Peddar Road,
Mumbai – 400 026

*... 4th and 5th Respondents
(impleaded by this Tribunal vide
order dated 23.02.2024 passed in
IA(IBC)/453(CHE)/2024)*

Order pronounced on 18th April, 2024

CORAM:

**SANJIV JAIN, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)
VENKATARAMAN SUBRAMANIAN, MEMBER (TECHNICAL)**

*For Applicant : Shri. E. Om Prakash, SR. Advocate and Shri. Himanshu,
Advocate.*

*For Respondents : Shri. T.K. Bhaskar & A.G. Sayanarayana, Advocate
for the Liquidator.
Shri. Yasar Arafath, Advocate for Respondent No.3/NeSL.
Shri. Sankar P., Senior Consultant-Head, Strategy and New
Initiatives along with Shri. Araventhana SE, SR. No. Officer-
IP Services (NeSL).
Shri. Jayesh B. Dolia, Advocate for the Successful Bidder.*

ORDER

(Hearing conducted through Video Conferencing)

IMR Steel Private Limited, the Applicant herein, has filed an application under Section 60(5) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy

Code, 2016 (“IBC”) read with Rule 11 of NCLT Rules, 2016 seeking reliefs as follows;

- (a) *Allow the present Application and cancel the E-Auction process of Respondent No.1 held on 31.01.2024;*
- (b) *Direct Respondent No.2 not to proceed further with the E-Auction Process dated 31.01.2024 in any manner whatsoever and not to declare the purported successful bidder or issue any Letter of Intent during the pendency of the present Application;*
- (c) *Direct Respondent No.2 to stay the auction process in lieu of auction notice dated 27.12.2023 during pendency of the present Application.*
- (d) *Direct Respondent No.2 to publish a fresh Sale notice for E-Auction of Respondent No.1 as a going concern in accordance with the provisions of I&B Code;*

In alternative

- (e) *Direct Respondent No.2 to continue the bidding process from the point where the technical glitch arose and ensure that the maximum price for the Corporate Debtor through the present auction is realized;*
- (f) *Pass such other and / or further and / or ad-interim order(s) as this Hon’ble Tribunal deems fit in the facts and circumstances of the case.*

2. The Applicant viz. IMR Steel Private Limited filed IA(IBC)/453(CHE)/2024 seeking thereof to implead the Respondent

Nos.4 and 5 in the present Application and the same was allowed by this Tribunal vide order dated 23.02.2024.

3. Briefly, the facts are that the Corporate Debtor, Kamachi Industries Limited was engaged in the business of manufacturing and sale of TMT bars and power through its facility at Gummidipoondi, Tamil Nadu. The Applicant is the Company viz., IMR Steel Private Limited and is affiliate of India Coke and Power Private Limited at Mumbai. CIRP of the Corporate Debtor was ordered on an application filed by State Bank of India under Section 7 of IBC, 2016 and Mr. Vikas P. Gupta was appointed as the RP. The liquidation of the Corporate Debtor was ordered vide dated 09.12.2022 and Mr. Ganesan V. was appointed as the Liquidator who was replaced by SSP Insolvency Professional, LLP (IPE) i.e. Respondent No.2 as Liquidator.

4. It is stated that the erstwhile Liquidator vide notice dated 16.10.2023, invited Expression of Interest (EOI) for purchase of the Corporate Debtor as a going-concern. ICPPL vide mail dated 30.10.2023, submitted its EOI along with the supporting documents. It was selected as one of the successful bidders. However, the auction

notice issued on 16.10.2023 was cancelled on 23.12.2023. Respondent No.2 again published the sale notice on 27.12.2023 fixing the date of e-auction as 31.01.2024 between 3.00 P.M. to 4.00 P.M. (with unlimited extension of five minutes each). ICPPL vide mail dated 29.12.2023, showed its interest to participate in the process, pursuant to which, it was invited to participate in the new auction process vide mail dated 29.12.2023. The reserve price fixed for the sale of Corporate Debtor as a going-concern was INR 457 Crores with the EMD of INR 46 Crores to be paid by the prospective bidder on or before 29.01.2023 before 5.00 P.M. The Applicant submitted its bid document and deposited the EMD amount on 29.01.2024 along with the requisite documents which were duly acknowledged by the Respondent No.2. The Applicant participated in the bidding process of the Corporate Debtor in liquidation (auction ID: 29) held on 31.01.2024 at 3.00 P.M. on the e-auction bidding platform of Respondent No.3 i.e. National E-Governance Service Limited (NeSL).

5. It is stated that the bid process consisted of three steps which were required to confirm the bid. First step was to **place** a bid in which the bidder could increase its bid by multiple of incremental bid

amount. Second step was to **confirm** the bid amount in which the bidder confirms its bid amount and third step was to **reconfirm** in which the bidder reconfirms its bid amount.

6. It is stated that the Applicant had put in 15 bids in the increment of INR 1 Crore over the previous bid and had put in last recorded bid in the extended time of INR 486.0 Crores at 4:31:36:131 P.M. It is stated that during the bidding process after the Applicant's bid, another bidder had bid the amount of INR 487.0 Crores. Thereafter, within the permissible time of five minutes, the Applicant revised its bid to INR 488.0 Crores with more than two minutes remaining before the expiry of the auction process. It is stated that the e-auction platform consisted of countdown timer which indicated the time remaining before the auction closes. The Applicant placed its incremental bid for INR 488.0 Crores and confirmed the same by pressing **confirm** button. However, to the misery of the Applicant, when the Applicant tried to reconfirm the same by clicking on '**reconfirm**' button, it was unable to press the **reconfirm** button because the **reconfirm** button stopped responding even though there were still two minutes left before the end of the e-auction process.

7. It is alleged that there was no issue with any of the devices of the Applicant used for the bid process nor there was any internet issue from the Applicant's side as the Applicant was able to place a bid and confirm the bid. When the timer was going on, the Applicant made several attempts to click on **reconfirm** button but could not do the same due to the technical glitch on the auction platform. It immediately approached the Executive Customer Support provided in the e-auction user manual and raised its concern that reconfirm button stopped responding. The Executive Customer Support after getting to know of this, promised to investigate the matter. The Applicant also approached Respondent No. 3 and raised its concern. It through its counsel, immediately informed Respondent No.2 about the technical glitch and asked to invalidate the auction process but Respondent No.2 did not respond to its letter dated 31.01.2024. It is alleged that the Applicant's bid for INR 488.0 Crores is a better bid than the one made by another bidder. It is stated that the Respondent No.2 must consider its bid which was made within the bidding timeline. It is alleged that the e-auction dated 31.01.2024 suffered from a technical failure leading to a faulty and incomplete e-auction process and as such, the e-auction

is not only technically inept but also is violative of Principles of Natural Justice being against the objective of IBC which prioritises maximization of value of the Corporate Debtor. It is stated that Respondent No.2 may be directed to convene the e-auction process again to attain the maximum value from the sale of Respondent No.1 as a going-concern and in case, it is not done, the Applicant will suffer from great prejudice and irreparable loss.

8. On getting notice of the application, Respondent No.2 filed its reply that it after fixing the reserve price based on the valuation report prepared by the IBBI Registered Valuers with the approval of SCC members published the e-auction notice for the sale of the Corporate Debtor as a going-concern on 29.12.2023 and fixed the e-auction date as 31.01.2024 between 3.00 P.M. to 4.00 P.M. It is stated that the bid process was conducted in a fair manner in accordance with the provisions of the Code and IBBI Regulations on the approved NeSL portal. Virendra Jain and Ankit Jain emerged as the successful bidders by bidding a sum of INR 487.0 Crores. The Applicant who participated in the auction process, had issued a letter dated 31.01.2024 along with the screenshot stating that the e-auction platform did not respond

when it tried to press **reconfirmation** button after pressing **confirm** button despite 2-3 times raising the issue of technical glitch in the system. It is stated that NeSL portal, had designed the process of e-auction in such manner where e-auction continues beyond the fixed timeline, if the bidder increases its bid value within five minutes from the last bid incremental amount, then e-auction will continue upto five minutes from the last incremental amount and further if no one bid within the such five minutes from the last bid incremental amount, then the e-auction sale bidding process gets closed after the said five minutes. It is stated that in the present case, the last bid was made by the successful bidder at 4:33:48 P.M. which was closed after five minutes at 4:38:47 P.M. and the system software duly prewritten as per NeSL portal won't wait even for a single second after five minutes of the last bid time. The screenshot of the Applicant shows the time as 4:38 P.M. which shows that the Applicant pressed the **reconfirmation** button after five minutes of the last bid time. It is stated that there was no technical failure as alleged and the e-auction was conducted in a fair and transparent manner.

9. Respondent No.3/NeSL also filed its reply stating that Respondent No.3 is empanelled by IBBI to provide e-auction service in the liquidation process under IBC. It is stated that there was no technical glitch in the system as the bid history report does not highlight any such technical glitch. The bidder/Applicant was aware of the bidding process and it was to follow the required steps in the e-auction and bid submission. The bidder/Applicant was supposed to check the timer given on the e-auction site (the auction clock) while placing the bid and carrying on with the process and not the time reflected on the device which the bidder was using. The timer provided on the auction site was given for the ease of the bidding process. In the last round, the bidder/Applicant did not act within the stipulated time as per the auction clock which indicated the leftover time and as such the party which submitted the bid within the time permitted in the auction clock, emerged as a successful bidder i.e. Respondent No. 4 & 5.

10. It is stated that flow of e-auction process starts with the registration and sign in with OTP to Nbid Portal while 'Time Remaining' in the countdown clock which is noted during auction is

always in sync with the bid history time. The bidder should refer only to the countdown clock. The second step is to enter the live auction page and click on the 'bid now' button in the respective auction further to which, on accepting the terms and conditions, the bidder will be allowed to the auction hall which displays the reserve price, bid open price, incremental amount, time remaining, rank of the bidder and highest bid amount. The bidder is required to select the number of increments above the current highest bid, he wants to place. Thereafter, the auction to 'place bid' comes. The bid confirmation has two stages which includes confirm bid and reconfirm bid. It is alleged that in the present case, the Applicant tried placing the bid after five minutes of the extension time and it was unable to reconfirm the bid since the time ended. Therefore, the confirmation dialogue box did not carry the time stamp and the reconfirmation button did not get enabled and was not recorded in the bid history. Respondent No.2 has explained the bid confirmation stages in the reply stating that if the auction is not live when bid reconfirm button is clicked, server will not record the event (click on reconfirm button) then the reconfirmation time will not be recorded and in the bid history, the status of bid will show as not confirmed and will record the bid confirm time against it.

11. It is stated that in the present auction, the extension was for five minutes and on the basis of that, the last confirmed bid was 4:33:38 IST and the platform was open for bidding till 4:38:48 IST which is supported by the server log/database log. After confirming the bid, the bidder was still required to reconfirm the bid for the bid to get successfully placed. It is stated that there was no technical issue in the e-auction portal and the platform was open to accept the bids till 4:38:47 IST, five minutes from the last bid placed which was at 4:33:48 IST which can be seen by the screenshot. Had the bid been placed and reconfirmation button been pressed within stipulated five minutes, the bid would have been completed. It is stated that the audit trail which captures all the successful bids placed by the Liquidator shows that last bid was at 4:33:48 only and no bids after that. It is stated that the bidder was only to refer the time remaining to know about the closure of the poll as per the user manual. It is stated that the other bidders did not complain about the alleged technical issue, as they were following only the 'Time Remaining' field throughout and the same was synchronised with the server timing. Further, while bidding, auction time is to be followed and not that of the device/computer

timing. It is stated that **“thus the ‘Time Remaining’ tab on the bidding screen is activated from the time the auction begins, showing countdown till close of the auction. The same is visible in the bidder screen attached at page-13 and page-14 of the rejoinder.”**

12. Respondent No. 4 & 5 the successful auction bidders also filed their written submissions submitting that the bid of INR 487.0 Crores given by them was confirmed at 4:33:48 and thereafter till 4:38:47 P.M., the Applicant did not confirm/reconfirm its bid. The bidding clock was set in such a way that if there was no reconfirm bid submitted within five minutes from the last bid, it would automatically close and the last bid would be taken as the successful bid. The system software was duly prewritten which was approved by the IBBI on the NeSL portal. It is stated that the Applicant failed to press the reconfirm bid / button within the time allotted to it and thus, it lost the opportunity to place its highest bid resulting the last bid submitted by them emerged as successful bid. It is stated that NeSL portal was designed in such a way that e-auction continues beyond the fixed timeline if the bidder increases its bid value within five minute from the last bid incremental

amount and it continues upto five minutes from the last incremental amount and if no one bids within the next five minutes from the last bid incremental amount, then the e-auction sale bidding process gets closed after the said five minutes. It is stated that in the present case, the Applicant did not increase its bid before the auction ended and they emerged as the successful bidders. It is alleged that this application has been filed to delay the proceedings and there was no technical glitch or failure. The reply of NeSL supports the case of the Liquidator. The Applicant was supposed to check the timer given in the auction site/auction clock while placing the bid and not the time reflected in the devices. The Applicant cannot be allowed to rely upon the clock in its device rather it had only to rely upon the time remaining in the auction clock before which it had to submit its bid which procedure was already explained in the user manual by the Respondent No.2. In the present case, auction clock was activated at the time the auction began showing the countdown till the close of such auction. The Respondents in support of their reply, filed the screenshots of the real time pictures to demonstrate that there was no glitch in the system, the time ran out and the auction got closed.

13. The Applicant in rejoinder to the reply filed by Respondent No.2, submitted that the object of the IBC is that the e-auction of a company as a going-concern must be conducted to have maximization of the value and to give opportunity to the genuine bidders to participate fairly. It is stated that the Applicant's bid for INR 488.0 Crore was a higher bid than the bid made by the Respondent No. 4 & 5 and the Respondent No. 2 ought to have considered the incremental bid given by the Applicant. It is stated that the bid could not be placed due to technical glitch on the e-auction platform of Respondent No.3 without there being any fault of the Applicant. It is stated that the biddings confirmation time shown at the time of reconfirmation is missing and two times are shown on the bidding platform. It is stated that while the platform was recording bids as per one time, the platform itself was showing another different time as depicted in para-7. It is alleged that Respondent No.2 acted arbitrarily and declared the bids of Respondent No.4 & 5 as the successful bids. It denied that it pressed the reconfirmation button after five minutes of the last bid time as alleged. It is stated that alleged successful bidder's bid was at 4:33:48 P.M. and the bidding would close at 4:38:47 P.M. The Applicant

had pressed the reconfirmation button prior to 4:38 and retried the same and thereafter took the screenshots.

14. We have heard learned counsels for the parties and perused the records.

15. In the present case, as seen from the record, after the Corporate Debtor was ordered for liquidation, the Liquidator published the sale notice on 27.12.2023 fixing the date of e-auction as 31.01.2024 between 3.00 P.M. to 4.00 P.M. (with unlimited extension of 5 minutes each). The reserve price fixed for the sale of the Corporate Debtor in liquidation as a going concern was INR 457.0 Crores with the EMD of INR 46.0 Crores to be paid by the prospective bidders on or before 29.01.2023 before 5.00 P.M. The Applicant along with the Respondent No. 4 & 5 submitted the bid documents and deposited the EMD amount on 29.01.2024. They participated in the bidding process of the Corporate Debtor in liquidation (auction ID: 29) held on 31.01.2024 at 3.00 P.M. on the e-auction bidding platform of Respondent No. 3 i.e. NeSL.

16. As per the procedure, the bidding process consisted of three steps. The first step was to place a bid in which the bidder could increase its bid by multiple of incremental bid amount which in the present case was 1.0 Crore. The second step was to confirm the bid amount in which bidder confirms its bid amount. The third step was to reconfirm in which the bidder reconfirms its bid amount. NeSL portal was designed in such a manner that where e-auction continues beyond the fixed timeline, if the bidder increases its bid value within five minutes from the last bid incremental amount, then the e-auction would continue upto five minutes from the last incremental amount and if no one bids within such five minutes from the last bid incremental amount, then the e-auction sale bidding process gets closed after the said five minutes. The NeSL portal does not wait even for a single second after five minutes of the last bid time.

17. Before starting the process, the bidders were explained the bidding process and the required steps to be followed in the e-auction and bids submission. The bidder was supposed to check the timer given on the e-auction site (auction clock) while placing the bid and carrying on with the process and not the time reflected on the device

which the bidder was using as there always remains the possibility of variation of time in the devices being used by the bidders. The time on auction site was given for the ease of the bidders and the bidding process. The Applicant and the successful bidders did not dispute about the auction clock which was used at the time of bidding on the NeSL portal. They were supposed to see the time remaining on the countdown clock, and not the time appearing on the system during auction. It has come in the submission of the Respondent No.3 which is an independent agency that auction was always in sync with the bid history time and bidder was required only to refer to the countdown clock.

18. Respondent No.3 in its reply has also explained the procedure for bidding i.e. the bidder should refer only to the countdown clock, it has to enter the live auction page and click on the 'bid now button' in the respective auction further to which, on accepting the terms, the bidder is allowed to the auction hall which displays the reserve price, bid open price, incremental amount, time remaining, rank of bidder and highest bid amount. The bidder is required to select the number of increments above the current highest bid he wants to place.

Thereafter the auction to 'place bid' comes. The bid confirmation has two stages which includes 'confirm bid' and 'reconfirm bid'.

19. In the present case, the Applicant had put in 15 bids in the increment of INR 1.0 Crore over the previous bid and put in last recorded bid in the extended time of INR 486.0 Crores at 4:31:36 P.M. After the Applicant's bid, Respondent No. 4 & 5 had bidded the amount of INR 487.0 Crores. Though the Applicant within permissible time of five minutes, revised its bid to INR 488.0 Crores by placing its bid at 4:33:48 but it failed to press 'reconfirm button' after pressing 'confirm button' within the clock time of five minutes available to it. That being the position, the bid of INR 488.0 Crores given by the Applicant was not reconfirmed and the Respondent No. 4 & 5 who had bidded INR 487.0 Crores emerged as the successful bidders and the bid was closed after five minutes i.e. 4:38:47 P.M. The countdown clock also shows that the time of five minutes was over before the Applicant pressed the 'reconfirm bid'. We are in agreement with the contention of Ld. Counsel for Respondent No. 3 that the bidder should refer only to the countdown clock but in the present case, the Applicant without referring to the countdown clock has alleged technical glitch in the e-

portal system stating that when it pressed “reconfirm button”, the screenshot displayed the time as 4:38 P.M. i.e. by that time the five minutes time had not been over. We have also seen the documents / screenshots placed by the parties as to the bidding process which had taken place during the bidding process. There is nothing on record to indicate that there was technical glitch in the system or the Respondent No.3 before the closedown time of the clock, closed the process. We find that e-auction was conducted in a fair and transparent manner giving full opportunities to the bidders to participate in the bidding process and to submit their bids. It is not the case that the Applicant was not aware of the bidding process. The Applicant had put in 15 bids in the increment of INR 1.0 Crore over the previous bid which were within the countdown time of five minutes but in the last, it failed to press the reconfirm button within the countdown time of five minutes which made the Respondent No.4 & 5 emerged as the successful bidders.

20. Admittedly, the Applicant’s bid for INR 488.0 Crores is a better bid than one made by the Respondent No. 4 & 5 but the Liquidator/Respondent No. 2 is bound by the process provided in the

e-auction notice. Maximization of value does not mean that the Liquidator has to follow the endless process. Time is the essence of every process which the Liquidator is also required to follow. As is seen from the reply and the documents, in the last round, the Applicant did not act within the stipulated time as per the auction clock which indicated the leftover time and as such, Respondent No. 4 & 5 who had submitted their bid within the time permitted in the auction clock emerged as the successful bidders. It has come in the submission of Respondent No.3 that in the present case the Applicant tried placing the bid after five minutes of the extended time and it was unable to reconfirm the bid since the time ended and the confirmation dialogue box did not carry the time stamp and the reconfirmation button did not get enabled and was not recorded in the bid history. It is also to note that the Applicant has not portrayed the complete picture of the screenshot, it omitted certain portions and these portions clearly explain that the bidder was required to go with the clock time and not the time appearing on the screen. The screenshot at page-166 of the application shows the date and time as 31 Jan 2024 – 4:33:03 though according to the Respondent No.2, the last bid was made by the successful bidder at 4:33:48 P.M. The screenshot provided by the

Applicant to the Auction support Executive does not have the bid confirmation time. We agree with the submission of the Respondent No.3 that if the bid was placed and the confirmation button was pressed within the stipulated five minutes extension time from the last bid, the reconfirmation dialogue box would have carried the bid confirm time. The audit trail records that the last bid was at 4:33:48 only and no bid after that. In the instant case, after confirming the bid, the bidder/Applicant did not put in reconfirmation button to complete the reconfirmation of bid in order to place the bid successfully within the 5 minutes time as provided in the auction clock. We may note that the Respondent No.3 had clearly mentioned in the user manual at page-9 and step-15 that the bidder should refer to the 'time remaining' time to know about the closure of the bid. In the instant case, the Applicant or other bidders did not complain about the issue with the timings in the e-auction platform since they were following only the time remaining throughout which was synchronised with the server timing. In this case, the 'time remaining' time on the bidding screen was activated from the time, the auction began, showing the countdown till the close of the auction which is also visible in the bidder screen placed on record.

21. In the light of above discussions, the contention that the NeSL platform was running on two different times does not carry any significance. The Respondent No.3 has clearly explained the process which was followed during e-auction and there was no technical glitch in the system. The Applicant could not press the reconfirm button since the time reflected in the clock was over/ended, for this, Respondent No. 3 cannot be blamed. The cases of *Alkhnanda Stone Crusher vs. The State of Madhya Pradesh and Ors. (11.10.2023 MANU/MP/2927/2023, Adani Welspun Exploration Limited vs. Union of India MANU/DE/2967/2022* would not help the Applicant in any manner since they are distinguishable on facts.

22. In the light of what has been stated above, we do not find any merits in the application. **The application is dismissed with no orders as to costs.**

-Sd-

VENKATARAMAN SUBRAMANIAM
Member (Technical)

-Sd-

SANJIV JAIN
Member (Judicial)

suguna