

Date of Filing : 10.02.2022

Date of Order : 12.12.2022

**BEFORE THE DISTRICT CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL COMMISSION-III,  
HYDERABAD**

Present

SRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY, PRESIDENT  
SMT. D.SREEDEVI, MEMBER  
SMT. J.SHYAMALA, MEMBER

Monday the 12<sup>th</sup> Day of December' 2022

C.C.No. 569 of 2021

Between:

N.C. Lakshmi Narayana Charyulu, S/o NC Venkata Chary , Aged ...  
Permanent resident of 3-1-5/JP/43023,  
Janapriya Utopia APT, Attapur X road, Pillar #143,  
Hyderguda, Rajendra nagar, Hyderabad - TS 500048  
(Presently living in Australia).

.....Complainant

And

1 Karvy Stock Broking Ltd.

Address: 46, Avenue 4, Street No.1, Banjara Hills, Road No 10,  
Hyderabad - 500034 - Telangana.

Represented by its relationship Manager

Mail: [service@karvy.com](mailto:service@karvy.com)

2. Karvy Group

Address: No.46, 8-2-609/K, Karvy House, Avenue 4, Road Number 1,  
Gaffar Khan Colony, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad Telangana 500034,  
Rep. by its Chairman, Mail: [service@karvy.com](mailto:service@karvy.com)

3. Group Financial services, Karvy Group

Address: No.46, 8-2-609/K, Karvy House Avenue 4, Road Number 1,  
Gaffar Khan Colony, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad, Telangana 500034,  
Rep. by its Chief Executive Officer Mail: [service@karvy.com](mailto:service@karvy.com)

4. Securities and Exchange Board of India,

1st Floor, Indira Chamber, Road No.10,  
Banjara Hills Hyderabad – 500034, Represented by its Manager

5. Securities and Exchange Board of India,

G — Block, Plot No. C4 — A, Bandra Kurla Complex,  
Bandra EAST MUMBAI – 400051,

Represented by its Managing Director

.....Opp. Parties No. 1 to 5

Counsel for the Complainant : Sri K. V. Rao, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party No.1 to 3 : Absent Ex parte

For the Opposite Party No.4 & 5 : P I P

## **ORDER**

**(PER SRI M.RAM GOPAL REDDY, PRESIDENT ON BEHALF OF THE BENCH)**

1. This COMPLAINT FILED UNDER SECTION 35 OF CONSUMER. PROTECTION ACT, 2019 praying to this commission to direct the opposite parties to A , compensate the Housing Development Finance Corporation Ltd., Shares Shares and HDFC Bank Ltd. Total shares 100 Alternatively the Sum of Rs.49,25,400/- (Rupees Forty Lakhs Twenty Five Thousand Four Hundred only) toward value of the shares as on date of filing the complaint. B. Interest @ 12% from the date of claim further interest date of actual payment; C. Compensation for the harassment, inconvenience frustration and mental agony suffered by the complainant sum of Rs.10,00,000/- (Rupees Ten Lacs Only) D. A sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) towards legal and other incidental expenses and to pass such other reliefs as this commission may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

2. BRIEF FACTS OF THE CASE: The complainant humbly submits as under:- The Complainant is the son of Late Sri. VENKATA CHARY, and Nominee of DEMAT ACCOUNT with Opposite Parties herein is permanent resident of Flat.No 3-1-5/0/43 023, Hyderguda x road, Janapriya Utopia apt Hyderabad, Rajendrangar, Attapur, K.V.Rangareddy Telangana — 500048 - Mobile No 9490173788. Whereas the Complainant is the younger son of Late Sri. N.C.Venkata Charyulu is now residing at Australia. The Opposite Parties 1 to 3 are official representatives working at offices of M/s. KARVY GROUP, incorporated as a company under the provisions of Companies Act 1956 and having its Registered Office at No.46, 8-2-609/K, Karvy House Avenue, 4, Rd Number 1, Gaffar Khan Colony, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad, Telangana 500034. This Complaint against Opposite Parties 1 to 5 above of which the O.P — 4 & 5 are authorised agents for share transactions of the DEMAT account holders in India having their registered office Mahape, Navi Mumbai. 6. In this complaint summons, orders K.V.RAO, Advoc Himayath Nagar The addresses etc., to the Opp( appearing in the

The complainant Upon learned that missing shares from his father's Demat Account and in an unauthorized transfer of shares his brother Sri Ramachandra Charyulu Nallan Chakravarutlu resident of 3-1- 5/JP/43023, Janapriya Utopia APT, Attapur X Road, pillar # 143, Hyderguda, Rajendra Nagar, Hyderabad \_ TS 500048 had complied to the Narayanaguda P.s on 10-10-2019 that the shares belong to father of the complainant was sold unauthorizedly by the opposite party. The Police has registered the complaint vide F.I. R. No 274 of 2019 under Section 420, 406. 471 read with 34 I. P.C: dated 15.10.2019 against the opposite party and took up for investigation. The Police by its letter dated 17.10.2019 sought the relevant information to proceed further in the matter. As the matter was also simultaneously

brought to the notice of O.P.No.5 by the mother for redressal though Email was registered the Complaint under No. SEBIE/ TG19/0000140/1 dated 12.09.2019. The Opposite party acknowledged our letter through NSDL (National Stock Exchange Limited) and replied that the shares were transferred at the request of the client. The Opposite Party 1 to 3 confirmed that they were in receipt of a request for issuance of a Delivery Instruction Slip (DIS) booklet on 28.12.2016. A DIS containing Serial Number AA1000331026 - AA1000331030 was issued on 5th January, 2017. However it is important to note that my Father passed away on 4th January 2017 i.e. 1 day before the dispatch of the DIS. Copy of the Death certificate (Ex-4) It is learnt from the charge sheet filed before the Hon'ble IXth Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Nampally, Hyderabad that the DIS was undelivered to the customer and was returned to the Opposite Party. The Employee of the Opposite Party took position of the DIS and misused the same by way of transferring the shares to another entity. The accused who is an Employee of the Opposite Parties 1 to 3 had confessed his mis deeds before the Police and was arrested and was presented before the court. The Police have sought certain documents as in Exhibit -2 from the Opposite Parties 1 to 3 and on verification found that the signatures deferred from the DS and concluded that an act of misappropriation took place. To confirm their findings the matter was referred to Telangana State Forensic Science Laboratories, Hyderabad who confirmed the misdeeds of the O.P. 1 to 3. That the signatures of the complainant's Mother and Father reportedly affixed on 19.01 2017 on DIS No.AA1000331026 which clearly established that an act of forgery .has been committed by O P.'s 1 to 3 as the date of death was much before the date of execution of DIS (EX-5) The Opposite party sent a transaction statement on 4.09.2019 which clearly shows the Dematerialization of HDFC LTD & HDFC BANK LTD., The Transfer transaction of these shares were in DIS on 17.01.2017 Thus it is a falsified statement. (Ex 6) The Assistant Commissioner of Police requested for a Forensic Examination of the documents by the Telangana State Forensic Science Laboratory, Hyderabad. The FSL report dated 22.02.2020 established that the documents were forged. ( Ex — 7) The Police filed a charge sheet. against F.I.R. No.274/2019 under 173 Crpc before the IXth Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Nampally, Hyderabad based on the investigation and to punish the Karvy Stock Broking Ltd., officials under Section 420; 406; 468;471 read with 34 I.P.C. for punishing them. The investigation report along with F.S.L., list of accused were filed before the court . Ex- 8 The Opposite Parties 1 to 3 had approached the High of. Judicature, Telangana State, for staying of all the proceedings in F I.R.No.274 of 2019 dated 15.10.20219 of P.S. Narayanguda pending disposal of criminal petition CRMP 5354 of 2020. ( Ex - 9) The Hon'ble High Court by its order dated 8.12.2020 ordered follows " Issued notice to 2nds Respondent. Personal Notice is permitted. List on 8.1 Sri.S.Niranjan Reddy, Senior Counsel, representing Sri.Avinash Desai, learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner 2 to 4 are Directors 1 Petitioner

NO.1, Company. Their names are not figured in the complaint dated 15.10.2019. The offences levelled against the petitioners herein are under S 420, 406, 468 and 471 read with 34 of 1.P.C., The police have already invoked the procedure laid down under Sec-41A of Cr.P.C. by issuing Notices on 20.08.2020 and all the petitioners have already submitted replies to the said notices. The police have also issued notices under Section 91 Cr.P.C. on 17.10.2020 asking the Petitioner company to furnish certain documents for the purpose of investigation in crime No. 274 of 2019. Accordingly the 1st petitioner company has already submitted the documents reply dated 26.10.2019. By referring the same learned Senior Counsel would that even then the Police are trying to apprehend the petitioners herein. The matter requires examination, therefore the investigating officer/Station house officer, Narayanguda Police Station is directed not to arrest the petitioners here in and crime no.274 of 2019. However, it is made clear police may go on with investigation." The Complainant had spent quite a lot of valuable time incurred lot of expenditure with a sole objective to get back shares. But in vain. The O. P.4 & 5 have miserably failed in protecting the interest the investors. It is pertinent to mention the value the shares of the Complainant that Housing Development Finance Corporation Ltd., 1 Shares @Rs.2846.05 = Rs.34,15,260/- and HDFC Bank Total shares 1000 @1555/- = Rs.15,55,000/- and both together valued @ Rs.49,70,000/- (Forty Nine Lakhs and Sev Thousand only). Ex- 1.0 It is submitted that the Father of the Complainant left behind wife who is also advanced in age. A Complaint was filed on 20Th Feb 2021 with O.P s .4 & 5 and submitted all the documents as demanded by them Including Books, Death Certificate. The O.P.'s have duly acknowledged their claim intimation and further sought the documents and the complainant herein has Complied with all their demands. The Claim filed by the Complainant was not complied by the O.P.'s. I submit that I was subjected by the opposite parties to severe financial loss and mental agony by vexatious correspondence and by unreasonably and arbitrarily rejecting the claim which is against to the Regulations. It is submitted that the O. P.'s have totally ignored the Stock holder's Interest Regulations and also the other related laws. The complaint relates to deficiency of service on the part of Opposite Parties 1 to 3 jointly and severally as they failed to settle the genuine Claim. The O P.No.4 & 5 failed to ensure that the Stock holder's protection rights are implemented in spirit. The complainant had no other way other than to knock the doors of this Hon'ble Commission for redressal of their grievance. The act of O. P.'s 1 to 4 is shabby, unreasonable, arbitrary and illegal and also it is in the nature of offending the doctrine of fairness. As evidenced from the refusal of the genuine claim of the complainant, they wanted to avoid the liability resting on them and to deprive the legitimate and bona fide claim of the claimant. This is a kind of unfair trade practices. The O. P's have acted in the most negligent and irresponsible manner while dealing with the subjected claim of the complainants who suffered loss, hardship, inconvenience and mental agony and are entitled to compensation. That the

complainant has been incurring additional expenditure towards the pursuance of this claim and they have been under great financial and mental pressure all through, particularly because of the extremely negligent attitude of the O. Ps. .From the above stated facts and circumstances, it is clear that the acts of the O.Ps are unlawful, illegal, unfounded, biased and tantamount to gross deficiency and negligence of services and unfair trade practices towards the complainants and all their acts and deeds are not only contrary to the well established principles and rules of Stocking Brokers law but also to the provisions of the C.P.A. 2019 in force. In support of the above averments and claims, the relevant documents have been enclosed to this Complaint as shown in the table below. The Complainant herein reserve her right to file additional, amended, modified complaint and interim pleadings during the proceedings of this complaint before the Hon'ble Commission.

3. The Opposite Parties 1 to 3 are refused the notices and they were set exparty on 8-11-2022 and written version/Objections filed by the Opposite Patties Nos. 4 and 5 the Securities and Exchange Board of India. The Opposite Party No 5 i.e. the SEBI is a statutory authority established under the Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992 ("the SEBI Act"), a Central Act passed by the Parliament, with a mandate to protect the interest of investors in securities and to promote the development of, and to regulate the securities market and matters connected therewith and incidental thereto with its Head Office at Murnbai, Maharashtra. SEBI is an expert body having and performing administrative, legislative and quasi-judicial functions entrusted upon it by the SEBI Act and allied statutes administered and enforced by SEBI. Thus, SEBI, being a slabiliorybodyset up by an Act of Parliament, does not render any services for fee or receives any consideration for the services (as defined in the Consumer Protect Act) from any investor. The Opposite Party No.4 is the Hyderabad Local Office of SEBI situated in Hyderabad, Telangana.

This' Version is filled on behalf of Opposite Parties Nos. 4 and 5 for bringing the legal aspects of the matter to the notice of this Hon'ble Commission and that this Opposite Party reserves the right to file a detailed reply or submission, if the need arises later or if so advised. Without prejudice do the above, it is submitted before the Hon'ble Commission as under: i. that SEBI is established under the Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992 (No. 15 of 1992) for performing statutory functions assigned to it under the said Act and as such cannot be said to be rendering any services for consideration as contemplated under section 2(42) of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 (herein after referred to as Vim Act). It is respectfully submitted that the performance of statutory functions cannot be construed as rendering of any in terms of the Act as no fees is charged Investors for the functions performed. ii. t " LL

Bombay vs. SEBI, Writ Petition on 01.02 2001, the Hon'ble fee charged by SEBI from its relatable to any service rendered iii. that the Hon'ble National Commission in The Gauhati Co - operative Urban Bank Ltd. Vs. Santosh Kumar Tewari & Others, III (1997) CPJ 68 (NC) held that hiring of services for consideration is a condition precedent to make a person a consumer' within the meaning of Section 2(1)(d)(ii) of the erstwhile Consumer Protection Act, 1986. Under the Act, Section 2(7)(ii) contains the words "hires or avails of any service for a consideration" which is verbatim and in pari materia with the erstwhile law. Thus, it cannot be said that the complainant had hired the 'services' of this Opposite Party. It is further submitted that SEBI is a statutory body set up by an Act of Parliament and it does not render any services for fees or receives any consideration for the services as defined in the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 from any investor. Copy of the judgment is enclosed as Annexure-A. That in the case of SEBI Vs Pinky Jain Rajendra & others (F.A. No 407/96) the Hon'ble Andhra Pradesh State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission has held that SEBI does not render any services for consideration to the investors. The State Commission further observed that SEBI is a statutory body discharging duties for which no consideration is paid by the investors and it cannot be said the investors have hired the services of SEBI for any consideration. v. that in another judgment the Hon'ble National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission in E. Sadanandan Vs. Bureau of Indian Standard & Ors reported as III (1994) CPJ 34 (NC), held that the Bureau of Indian Standards (BIS) in licensing parties to use IR marks on their products is performing as statutory authority a regulatory function to ensure production of quality products in the interest of the consumers. Licensing by BIS can neither be categorised as 'rendering any service' to licensed manufarcutger of goods for a consideration nor can the licence fee be treated as consideration for supplying any goods or rendering any service to the licensee. Copy of order is enclosed as Annexure-B. vi. That in the Appeal No 84/20001 SEBI Vs. Smt. Vandana Nayyar, the Hon'ble State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Punjab, has held that SEBI is a statutory body duly constituted performs statutory functions assigned to it and is not rendering any service to any one for consideration as contemplated under Section 2 (1)(d) of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986. It was further held that since the complainant has not taken or hired any services of SEBI against which she had paid consideration, she could not be considered as a consumer under the Consumer Protection Act, 1986. vii. that in Judgment dated 31st July, 2006, the Hon'ble Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Chennai South, Tamil Nadu, in PCD Nambiar Vs, Karvy Consultants Limited and others (O.P. No 144 of 2005), where SEBI was arrayed as 3rd opposite party, held that ".....r opposite party, who is performing the statutory duties cannot be held liable as the services cannot be termed as deficient as against the 3rd opposite party as admittedly no consideration paid by the complainant". Copy of this order is enclosed as Annexure-C. viii. that in another judgment in SEBI Vs. Appeal no. 654 of 1999,

dated 20.11.08 passed Commission Cuttack, it was held that regulatory body constituted under the Act of the Parliament and does not provide any service for consideration, the finding of the District Forum that it is a liaison office of the Benzo Petro International, Baroda is nothing but misconception of facts and respondent no 1 complainant as such appellant is a service provider". ix. that in the case of S P. Goel Vs Collector of Stamps, (1996) 2 Company Law Journal 199 (Supreme Court), it has been held that officers appointed to implement provisions of statutes like Stamp Act, Registration Act are only performing statutory duties and they do not render any service within the meaning of the Consumer Protection S not a consumer nor the Act, 1986. • Similarly, SEBI is also performing statutory, duties under the Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992 and, in doing so, it does not render any service for consideration to be amenable under the provisions of the Consumer Protection Act. Copy of this order is enclosed as Annexure-D that the Hon'ble Andhra Pradesh State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission in SEBI Vs. Chhakka Kameshwar Rao and others, has held that the complainant is not consumer of SEBI as it does not hangs render any service to the complainant and the complainant does pay any consideration for any service rendered by SEBI. The Hon'ble Commission has further observed that SEBI is merely a statutory body discharging statutory duties for which no consideration is paid by the complainant and it also cannot be said that the complainant hired the services of SEBI for any consideration. xi, that definition of 'service' has not been altered under the enacted Consumer Protection Act, 2019 and hence the judgements mentioned above continue to be applicable with full force despite the coming into force of the new enactment (i.e. the Consumer Protection Act, 2019) and thus continue to hold the same precedential value as earlier and therefore submitted to be applicable xii. That under the newly enacted Consumer Protection Act, 2019, certain new provisions have been introduced. For instance, 'E-Commerce' is defined as "buying or selling of goods or services including digital products over digital or electronic network". Further, 'Electronic Service Provider' is defined as "a person who provides technologies enable a product seller to engage in advertising or selling goods or services to a consumer and includes any online market place or online auction sites." Since SEBI neither sells goods and services to any person as discussed above, the consumer protection regime for online market places It is therefore respectfully submitted that the performance of statutory functions and duties and exercise of statutory powers cannot be construed as rendering of any services for consideration in terms of the Consumer Protection Act as no fees is charged by SEBI from any investor for performing its statutory functions. Without prejudice to necessary party nor privy to the transactions between the Complainant and the other Opposite parties. All the transactions, alleged acts of commission and omission that have been alleged by the Complainant are between the Complainant and Opposite

Parties 1 2 and 3. The monetary claims prayed for in the Complaint are also against the Opposite Parties. Therefore SEBI is not a necessary party and has wrongly been included in the present proceedings. In view of the above, it is submitted that the present complaint needs to be dismissed qua SEBI (the Opposite Parties Nos. 4 and 5) as not maintainable. 6. Without prejudice to the aforesaid contentions of SEBI to question the maintainability of the complaint against this Opposite Party (Nos. 4 & 5), the following submissions as regards the averments made in the complaint; It is respectfully submitted that in the instant case, there is no prayer or relief sought against SEBI. b. Further, in para 5 of the complaint, the Complainant has stated that his mother had filed a complaint with SEBI. In this regard, it is submitted that the said complaint was registered in the SCORES (SEB Complaints Redress System an online web-portal) portal of SEBI vid No SEBI/TG19/0000140/1 on 12 09.2019. After taking inputs the concerned depository (NSDL), the said complaint was d the following remarks - "this complaint is of fraud and forgery of signature by an indi As such, the issue here is if there was any fraud took place by fo the signatures of account holders, which calk/ be established by Police authorities and not SEBI and the same falls under jurisdiction of Police. The complainant appears to have filed a police complainant in the matter and Police is alma\* in touch with the DP. Complainant is requested to pursue the matter with Police authorities this complaint is disposed air the mother of the complainant/complainant have access So ire Ruda! and are aware of the closure of complaint made to SEBL c As brought out above, this is a case idea ilipetures appeared to have been forged and on that basis shames lone been transferred, for which a Police complaint had been lodged and investigation had been conducted by the Police authorities. Even as per the complainant, a charge-sheet has been filed. These matters are beyond the purview of SEBI's jurisdiction and the complainant and his family have already taken recourse to legal remedies by approaching the Police. d. SEBI has examined the complaint and dosed the same as it was beyond its purview and had advised the complainant's mother to pursue the same with the Police. Therefore, it is incorrect to allege that SEBI had not protected the rights of the complainant.

This complaint as against Opposite Parties Nos. 4 and 5 are devoid of merits and not maintainable on facts or in law. It is therefore, most respectfully prayed that no order or direction may be passed against Opposite Parties Nos. 4 and 5 namely, the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) and further prayed that the Non Commission be pleased to delete the name of SEBI from the proceedings or in the alternative dismiss the above complaint as against Opposite Parties Nos. 4 and 5 (SEBI) with exemplary costs and thus render justice.

4. During the course, of trial, the complainant is examined as PW1 and marked Ex.A1 to A11. The Opposite party No.1 to 3 were Set Ex-parte. Sri Bhawana, Assistant Manager, is examined as DW1 on behalf of the Opposite Party No.4 & 5 and marked Ex.B1. Written Arguments are filed by the Complainant as well as the Opposite Party No.4 & 5. Heard.

5. The points that arise for consideration are:-

- (1) Whether there is any deficiency of service on the part of the opposite parties?
- (2) Whether the complainant is entitled for the reliefs as prayed for?
- (3) To what relief?

6. **POINT Nos. 1 & 2:**

The Opposite Party No.1 to 3 are set ex-parte. The Opposite party No.4 & 5 filed written version. The Opposite Party No.4 sent written version and Evidence Affidavit through post. Heard the complainant. The main allegation of the complainant is that the opposite party No.1 to 3 transferred 1200 shares of Housing Development Finance Corporation Ltd., @ Rs.2846.05=Rs.34,15,260/- and HDFC Bank Ltd., Total Shares 1000 @ 1555/- = Rs.15,55,000/- and both together valued @ Rs.49,70,000/- (Rupees forty nine lakh and seventy thousand only). The complainant having DEMAT Account for shares transaction with the opposite party No.1 to 3, having their registered office at Mahape, Navi, Mumbai. The complainant learnt that missing shares from his father's DEMAT Account and in an un-authorized transfer of shares of his brother's Account. Subsequently, made a Police Complaint, an FIR was issued, vide No.274/2019, the case of the complainant is that there was an un-authorized transactions were held in his brother's and father's DEMAT Accounts, which needs an elaborate investigation, is required by sending thumb impression and signature and the documents which were used for transfer of shares to the Telangana State Forensic Science Laboratory to be sent. We have further gone through the documents filed by the complainant, there is no allegation of the complainant against opposite party No.4 and 5, their main allegations of the complainant that against the Opposite Party No.1 to 3. But in another angle, the complainant has not established that all his consideration amounts to be paid to the opposite party No.1 to 3 for rendering services for shares transactions buying and selling in faovur of the complainant's father and brother. Moreover, the complainant is not an Account Holder of the Opposite party No.1 & 3 and he has no locus standi to file this complaint nor he has not filed authorization on behalf of his father and brother, also not made a party, an original DEMAT Account holder. Merely saying the documents in any angle, this is not a "Consumer Dispute", so this Commission has no jurisdiction to entertain this compliant for adjudicating as per the judgment filed by the Opposite Party No.4 & 5, i.e. the judgment of the Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Chennai South, Tamil

Nadu in PCD Nambiar vs. Karvy Consultants Limited and others; in SEBI vs. Debendra Rout & Ors., in Appeal No.654 of 1999, dated 20.11.08, passed by the Hon'ble State Commission, Cuttack; in the case of S.P.Goel vs. Collector of Stamps (1996) 2 Company Law Journal 199 (Supreme Court), etc. We are of the considered view that this complainant is not a "Consumer" and this Commission cannot entertain this complaint, on the stated above judgments, rendered by a different Commissions and as well as the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. Hence, this complaint is liable to be dismissed.

**7.Point No.3:**

In the result, the complaint is dismissed, without costs.

Typed to my dictation and pronounced in the Open court on this the Day of 12<sup>th</sup> December, 2022.

MEMBER

MEMBER

PRESIDENT

**APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE**

**WITNESSES EXAMINED**

**For Complainant**

PW1 :- Ramachandra Charyulu Nallan Chakravartula

**For Opposite Parties No.1 to 3 :-**

Un-contested

**For Opposite Parties No.4 & 5 :-**

DW1 :- Bhawana.

**EXHIBITS MARKED**

**For Complainant:**

Ex.A1 – is the Photostat copy of First Information Report, FIR No.274/2019, dated 15.10.2019.

Ex.A2 – is the Photostat copy of Notice u/s 91 Cr.P.C., dated 17.10.2019.

Ex.A3 – is the Photostat copy of Complaint Details.

Ex.A4 – is the photostat copy of Death Certificate of the Venkata Chary Nallan Chakravartula, dated 20.01.2017.

Ex.A5 – is the mail, regarding Demat Account.

Ex.A6 – is the photostat copy of Transaction Statement for the period from 01.01.2004 to 04.09.2019.

Ex.A7 – is the photostat copy of Report/Opinion of Government of Telangana, Telangana State Forensic Science Laboratories, Red Hills, Hyderabad, dated 22.02.2020.

Ex.A8 – is the photostat copy of Report/Opinion of Government of Telangana, Telangana State Forensic Science Laboratories, Red Hills, Hyderabad, dated 22.02.2020.

Ex.A9 – is the photostat copy of Show Cause Notice before Admission, in Criminal Petition No.5354 of 2020.

Ex.A10 – is the gmail, dated 15.09.2021 regarding HDFC Bank and Housing Development Corporation Ltd., Share Price as on 15.09.2021.

Ex.A11 – is the copy of “To all Whom these presents Shall Come”.

**For Opposite Parties No.1 to 3:**

Un-contested

**For Opposite Parties No.4 & 5:**

Ex.B1 :-is the photostat copy of “Action History”, as on 02.11.2021.

MEMBER  
AD.

MEMBER

PRESIDENT