

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Appeal No.674 of 2023

Arpana Kumari, wife of Shyam Kishore Kumar, daughter of Dharmendra Kumar, resident of Village-Islampur, P.S.-Islampur, Dist.-Nalanda, At present C/o- Abhinav Raj, House No. -14/19, 2nd Floor, Room No. -303, DLF, Phase-3, Nathupur, Gurgaon (Haryana).

... ... Appellant/s
Versus

Shyam Kishore Kumar, son of Bahadur Tanti, resident of Village-Parasi, P.O.-Bagan Bigha, Dist. Nalanda, Bihar, At present, resident of Chitragupta Nagar, Near Sanjivani Hospital, Kankarbagh, P.S.-Patrakar Nagar, Dist.-Patna residing at Alhand Apartment, Masjid Chausath Khambha, Mirdard Road, New Delhi.

... ... Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Dilip Kumar Roy, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Satyendra Kumar Sinha, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
And
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. B. PD. SINGH
CAV JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. B. PD. SINGH)

Date : 18-09-2025

Heard the parties.

2. The appellant-wife (Arpana Kumari) has come up in this appeal against judgment and decree dated 01.08.2022 passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Patna in Matrimonial Case No. 1298 of 2017, whereby the petition filed by the respondent-husband (Shyam Kishore Kumar) under Section 13(1)(i-a) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 (in short 'the 1955 Act') seeking



dissolution of marriage by a decree of divorce, has been allowed and divorce stands granted.

3. Succinctly, the marriage of appellant- Arpana Kumari was solemnized with respondent- Shyam Kishore Kumar on 11th January, 2016 as per Hindu rites and ceremonies. The marriage was never consummated since the appellant always denied to cohabit with the respondent.

4. The pleaded case of respondent-husband in his petition filed under Section 13 (i-a) of the 1955 Act is that respondent-husband is a Doctor and is working as Senior Resident Doctor in Microbiology Department at Maulana Azad Medical College, New Delhi. The marriage was fixed after negotiation between the appellant's grandfather and respondent's friend Dr. Kaushalendra. The marriage with the appellant was ideal one and there was no exchange of dowry and the same had taken place at Shyam Mandir Community Hall, Bazar Samiti, Patna. After marriage, the appellant went along with respondent to his native village- Parsi, District – Nalanda and stayed there for three days, but during this period the appellant refused cohabitation with the respondent. When the respondent asked for the reason,



the appellant said that firstly, she wants to make understanding with respondent. On 18.02.2016, the respondent came to New Delhi along with the appellant and started living as husband and wife but again the appellant refused to cohabit with the respondent. The behavior of the appellant towards the respondent and other in-laws family members was very rude and inappropriate and kept using abusive language and insulting the respondent and his family members. The appellant also started pressurizing the respondent and in-laws to buy a flat in New Delhi. The respondent made every effort to convince the appellant to change her behavior and cooperate in leading a happy married life but the appellant kept pressuring that she would not do as the respondent said. Three months have passed, still the appellant did not agree to have marital relationship with the respondent. The appellant did not want to live with her husband and was not interested in having cordial relation with them. She always wanted to live with her husband separately from her in-laws. Therefore, she started creating disputes as per the instructions of her parents and threatened the respondent and his family that she would



involve them in false criminal cases of harassment and dowry. The respondent always tried to make happy married life and fulfill all the demands of the appellant but she kept pressurizing the respondent to live separately from his old parents. The appellant used to wake-up late in morning and does not make breakfast for respondent. The appellant never respected the respondent and her in-laws family members. The appellant was suffering from Adenomyosis. The respondent made a lot of efforts for her treatment, but all efforts failed. Ultimately, on 27.01.2017, appellant left her in-laws' house along with all her *Stridhan* and went to her maternal home. Thereafter, the respondent went to the appellant parent's house and met their family and asked her to go with him, but they did not agree to do so. The appellant and her family members always insulted and despised the respondent. The appellant always refused to have marital relations with the respondent and voluntarily abandoned the respondent and his family. The appellant has been suffering from mental depression and due to which she often became aggressive towards the respondent and his family members. Since due to the said behavior of the



appellant, it has become impossible for the respondent to live with her. Thus, respondent has filed divorce petition under Section 13 (1)(i-a) of the Hindu Marriage Act for dissolution of marriage between the parties which was allowed by the learned Principal Judge family Court, Patna in Matrimonial (Divorce) Case No. 1298 / 2017, vide order dated 01.08.2022.

5. In the aforesaid matrimonial suit, the appellant was noticed but in spite of valid service of notice, she did not choose to appear. Hence, petition was proceeded for *ex parte* order.

6. In view of facts and circumstances and materials available on record learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Patna held that the appellant-wife has treated her husband with mental cruelty. It has further been held that appellant-wife has deserted respondent-husband and accordingly the suit has been decreed under Sections 13 (1) (i-a) of the Act and accordingly the marriage solemnized on 11.01.2016 between the parties was dissolved on the ground of cruelty and desertion. The appellant-wife, aggrieved by the said judgment of the learned Family Court filed the



instant appeal before this Court.

7. Learned counsel for the appellant-wife submits that the learned Family Court has erred in law and facts in allowing the divorce petition filed by the respondent-husband. Learned counsel has further submitted that the divorce petition has wrongly been allowed on the ground of cruelty and desertion without hearing her averments. It is further submitted that the Family Court has wrongly concluded that the appellant had deserted the respondent-husband, whereas it was the respondent, who had deserted her and now he has remarried. The appellant-wife is dependent on her parents who are old aged persons and does not have any source of income. The respondent-husband is a medical practitioner and is earning about Rs. 2,50,000/- per month and is engaged in Government Service, however, in the maintenance case i.e. Maintenance Case No. 421 of 2022 filed by the appellant-wife, a meager amount of Rs. 15,000/- per month as daily expenses and Rs. 5,000/- per month for rent as maintenance has been fixed by the learned Family Court. The appellant-wife is still unmarried however, respondent-husband has remarried with



another girl.

8. It is further submitted that no concrete efforts were made by the Family Court to make the appellant-wife present and place her submissions and in a mechanical order, without hearing the appellant-wife, divorce petition was allowed and the marriage between the appellant and respondent was dissolved without deciding any permanent alimony to the appellant-wife. It is therefore contended that the findings returned by the Family Court are not sustainable in the eyes of law.

9. It is submitted by learned counsel for the respondent that after marriage, the appellant-wife did not agree to cohabit with him throughout the subsistence of marriage. She did not respect the respondent and his family members. The respondent made every effort to convince the appellant to change her behavior and cooperate in leading a happy married life but she did not agree for that and ultimately she left the matrimonial house on 27.01.2017. Thereafter, the respondent went to the appellant's parent house and met their family and asked her to go with him, but they did not agree to do so. The appellant and her family



members always insulted and despised the respondent. The appellant always refused to have marital relations with the respondent and voluntarily abandoned the respondent and his family. The appellant has been suffering from mental depression and due to which she often became aggressive towards the respondent and his family members. In the aforesaid circumstance, it has become impossible for the respondent to live with the appellant.

10. It is further submitted that learned Family Court has also observed that a unilateral decision to refuse to have sex with partner for a long period without any physical disability or valid reason comes under the category of mental cruelty. The cruel behaviour of the appellant towards her husband (respondent) and other in-laws family members and threatening to implicate in a false case also comes under the category of mental cruelty. Hence, it was found that the respondent's case is fully covered by the provisions of Section 13(1) (i-a) of the Hindu Marriage Act and the divorce petition was allowed.

11. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book as well as the impugned



judgment.

12. The following question arises for consideration before this Court: "Whether the decree for divorce granted on the grounds of cruelty and desertion by the Family Court, requires interference?"

13. Further, the concept of cruelty within the meaning of Section 13 (1)(i-a) of the Hindu Marriage Act has been explained by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of "**Joydeep Majumdar v. Bharti Jaiswal Majumdar**", **(2021) 2 RCR (Civil) 289**, by observing as under: -

"10. For considering dissolution of marriage at the instance of a spouse who allege mental cruelty, the result of such mental cruelty must be such that it is not possible to continue with the matrimonial relationship. In other words, the wronged party cannot be expected to condone such conduct and continue to live with his/her spouse. The degree of tolerance will vary from one couple to another and the Court will have to bear in mind the background, the level of education and also the status of the parties, in order to determine whether the cruelty



alleged is sufficient to justify dissolution of marriage, at the instance of the wronged party..."

14. In "**Samar Ghosh v. Jaya Ghosh", (2007) 4**

SCC 511, Hon'ble Supreme Court gave illustrative cases where inference of mental cruelty could be drawn even while emphasizing that no uniform standard can be laid down and each case will have to be decided on its own facts.

"85. No uniform standard can ever be laid down for guidance, yet we deem it appropriate to enumerate some instances of human behaviour which may be relevant in dealing with the cases of 'mental cruelty'. The instances indicated in the succeeding paragraphs are only illustrative and not exhaustive.

(i) On consideration of complete matrimonial life of the parties, acute mental pain, agony and suffering as would not make possible for the parties to live with each other could come within the broad parameters of mental cruelty.

(ii) On comprehensive appraisal of the



entire matrimonial life of the parties, it becomes abundantly clear that situation is such that the wronged party cannot reasonably be asked to put up with such conduct and continue to live with other party.

(iii) Mere coldness or lack of affection cannot amount to cruelty, frequent rudeness of language, petulance of manner, indifference and neglect may reach such a degree that it makes the married life for the other spouse absolutely intolerable.

(iv) Mental cruelty is a state of mind. The feeling of deep anguish, disappointment, frustration in one spouse caused by the conduct of other for a long time may lead to mental cruelty.

(v) A sustained course of abusive and humiliating treatment calculated to torture, discommode or render miserable life of the spouse.

(vi) Sustained unjustifiable conduct and behaviour of one spouse actually affecting physical and mental health of the other spouse. The treatment complained of and the resultant danger or apprehension must be very grave, substantial and weighty.



(vii) Sustained reprehensible conduct, studied neglect, indifference or total departure from the normal standard of conjugal kindness causing injury to mental health or deriving sadistic pleasure can also amount to mental cruelty.

(viii) The conduct must be much more than jealousy, selfishness, possessiveness, which causes unhappiness and dissatisfaction and emotional upset may not be a ground for grant of divorce on the ground of mental cruelty.

(ix) Mere trivial irritations, quarrels, normal wear and tear of the married life which happens in day to day life would not be adequate for grant of divorce on the ground of mental cruelty.

(x) The married life should be reviewed as a whole and a few Isolated instances over a period of years will not amount to cruelty. The ill-conduct must be persistent for a fairly lengthy period, where the relationship has deteriorated to an extent that because of the acts and behaviour of a spouse, the wronged party finds it extremely difficult to live with the other party any longer, may amount to mental cruelty.



(xi) If a husband submits himself for an operation of sterilisation without medical reasons and without the consent or knowledge of his wife and similarly if the wife undergoes vasectomy or abortion without medical reason or without the consent or knowledge of her husband, such an act of the spouse may lead to mental cruelty.

(xii) Unilateral decision of refusal to have Intercourse for considerable period without there being any physical incapacity or valid reason may amount to mental cruelty..

(xiii) Unilateral decision of either husband or wife after marriage not to have child from the marriage may amount to cruelty.

(xiv) Where there has been a long period of continuous separation, it may fairly be concluded that the matrimonial bond is beyond repair. The marriage becomes a fiction though supported by a legal tie. By refusing to sever that tie, the law in such cases, does not serve the sanctity of marriage; on the contrary, it shows scant regard for the feelings and emotions of the parties. In such like



situations, it may lead to mental cruelty..."

15. The respondent-husband has produced three witnesses in order to prove his case which are P.W. 1 Dr. Kumar Kaushalendra, P.W. 2 Sharda Devi (mother of the respondent) and P.W. 3 Dr. Shyam Kishore Kumar (appellant).

16. The respondent-husband, however, has not brought on record any documentary evidence.

17. The appellant-wife has not produced any evidence since she has not appeared to contest her case in spite of valid service of notice.

18. In **"Jagdish Singh v. Madhuri Devi", (2008) 10 SCC 497**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court while considering the scope of interference by first appellate court, observed as under:-

"24. It is no doubt true that the High Court was exercising power as first appellate court and hence it was open to the Court to enter into not only questions of law but questions of fact as well. It is settled law that an appeal is a continuation of suit. An appeal thus is a re-hearing of the main



matter and the appellate court can re-appraise, re-appreciate and review the entire evidence "oral as well as documentary" and can come to its own conclusion.

25. At the same time, however, the appellate court is expected, nay bound, to bear in mind a finding recorded by the trial court on oral evidence. It should not forget that the trial court had an advantage and opportunity of seeing the demeanour of witnesses and, hence, the trial court's conclusions should not normally be disturbed. No doubt, the appellate court possesses the same powers as that of the original court, but they have to be exercised with proper care, caution and circumspection. When a finding of fact has been recorded by the trial court mainly on appreciation of oral evidence, it should not be lightly disturbed unless the approach of the trial court in appraisal of evidence is erroneous, contrary to well-established principles of law or unreasonable..."

19. Now, it is relevant to mention para 1 and 2 of our previous order dated 21.11.2024 which are extracted hereunder:-



“Pursuant to our previous order dated 04.10.2024, respective parties are present.

2. The parties have entered into marriage on 11.02.2016 and they are living separately from the month of January, 2017. In the light of Family Court order dated 01.08.2022, the appellant Arpana Kumari has preferred this appeal belatedly on 07.10.2023 along with interlocutory application for condonation of delay. In the meanwhile respondent - Shyam Kishore Kumar has entered into second marriage and he is having a child, therefore, we have suggested both the parties for amicable settlement and they are prepared.”

20. In view of forgoing discussion, we conclude that respondent-husband has made a ground for grant of decree of dissolution of marriage on the ground as mentioned in Section 13(1)(i-a) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955."

21. Considering the totality of circumstances, in our considered view, learned Family Court has rightly passed a decree of dissolution of marriage between the parties and we see no reason as to why, the findings as



given by the learned trial Court should not be upheld. The point of determination is answered accordingly and the impugned judgment and decree is hereby upheld.

22. Before we part with this order, it is apposite to state here that while granting the decree of divorce, the learned Family court has not granted anything to the Appellant towards Permanent Alimony. Here it is useful to refer to Section 25 of the 1955 Act, which reads thus:

"Section 25. Permanent alimony and maintenance: (1) Any Court exercising jurisdiction under this Act may, at the time of passing any decree or at any time subsequent thereto, on application made to it for the purpose by either the wife or the husband, as the case may be, order that the respondent shall pay to the appellant for her or his maintenance and support such gross sum or such monthly or periodical sum for a term not exceeding the life of the applicant as, having regard to the respondent's own income and other property, if any, the income and other property of the applicant (the conduct of the parties and other circumstances of the case), it may seem to the Court to be just,



and any such payment may be secured, if necessary, by a charge on the immovable property of the respondent."

23. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Rajnesh v. Neha* reported in *(2021) 2 SCC 324*, provided a comprehensive criterion and list of factors to be looked into while deciding the question of permanent alimony. This judgment lays down an elaborate and comprehensive framework necessary for deciding the amount of maintenance in all matrimonial proceedings, with specific emphasis on permanent alimony and the same has been reiterated by Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Kiran Jyoti Maini v. Anish Pramod Patel* reported in *2024 SCC OnLine SC 1724*.

24. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Pravin Kumar Jain v. Anju Jain* reported in *2024 SCC OnLine SC 3678* has taken note of the various judgments to clarify the position of law with regard to determination of permanent alimony and the factors that need to be considered in order to arrive at a just, fair, and reasonable amount of permanent alimony. In para 31 it is held as under:



“31. There cannot be strict guidelines or a fixed formula for fixing the amount of permanent maintenance. The quantum of maintenance is subjective to each case and is dependent on various circumstances and factors. The Court needs to look into factors such as income of both the parties; conduct during the subsistence of marriage; their individual social and financial status; personal expenses of each of the parties; their individual capacities and duties to maintain their dependents; the quality of life enjoyed by the wife during the subsistence of the marriage; and such other similar factors. This position was laid down by this Court in Vinny Paramvir Parmar v. Paramvir Parmar, and Vishwanath Agrawal v. Sarla Vishwanath Agrawal.”

25. The Hon'ble Apex Court, taking note of Rajnesh v. Neha (supra) and Kiran Jyot Maini (supra), in para 32 of Pravin Kumar Jain (supra) laid down the following eight factors to be looked into in deciding the quantum:



“i. Status of the parties, social and financial.

ii. Reasonable needs of the wife and the dependent children.

iii. Parties’ individual qualifications and employment statuses.

iv. Independent income or assets owned by the applicant.

v. Standard of life enjoyed by the wife in the matrimonial home.

vi. Any employment sacrifices made for the family responsibilities.

vii. Reasonable litigation costs for a non-working wife.

viii. Financial capacity of the husband, his income, maintenance obligations, and liabilities.

These are only guidelines and not a straitjacket rubric. These among such other similar factors become relevant.”

26. It is pertinent to mention here that duration of the marriage i.e., how long the marriage existed is also a relevant factor in determining the quantum of permanent alimony. Generally, marriages that lasts more than 10 years are entitled to be granted a lifetime alimony. The Hon’ble



Supreme Court in Rajnesh v. Neha (supra) in para 74 observed that:-

“74. In contemporary society, where several marriages do not last for a reasonable length of time, it may be inequitable to direct the contesting spouse to pay permanent alimony to the applicant for the rest of her life. The duration of the marriage would be a relevant factor to be taken into consideration for determining the permanent alimony to be paid.”

(emphasis supplied)

27. The conduct of the party seeking the relief is also relevant. The three-judges Bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Sukhdev Singh v. Sukhbir Kaur reported in 2025 SCC OnLine SC 299, observed in para 26 as under:

“26.We must note that subsection 1 of Section 25 uses the word “may”. A grant of a decree under Section 25 of the 1955 Act is discretionary. If the conduct of the spouse who applies for maintenance is such that the said spouse is not entitled to discretionary relief, the



Court can always turn down the prayer for the grant of permanent alimony under Section 25 of the 1955 Act. Equitable considerations do apply when the Court considers the prayer for maintenance under Section 25. The reason is that Section 25 lays down that while considering the prayer for granting relief under Section 25, the conduct of the parties must be considered."

(emphasis supplied)

28. Section 25 of the 1955 Act itself envisages that the wife can initiate proceedings for grant of permanent alimony even after the decree of divorce. Therefore, the court does not become *functus officio* with the passing of the decree and continues to have jurisdiction to award alimony even thereafter.

29. Keeping in view the totality of circumstances and to do justice to the parties, we are of the considered view that while keeping it open to the appellant-wife to institute her claim for grant of permanent alimony before the court of competent jurisdiction, we deem it appropriate to grant some amount towards Interim permanent alimony



subject to any final decision to be taken by the concerned court on an application to be filed under section 25 of the 1955 Act by the appellant-wife.

30. Be it stated, while granting permanent alimony, no arithmetic formula can be adopted as there cannot be mathematical exactitude. It shall depend upon the status of the parties, their respective social needs, the financial capacity of the husband and other obligations. In "Vinny Parmvir Parmar v. Parmvir Parmar", (2011) 13 SCC 112: (2011) 3 RCR (Civil) 900: 2011 (4) Recent Apex Judgments (R.A.J.) 357, while dealing with the concept of permanent alimony, this Court has observed that while granting permanent alimony, the Court is required to take note of the fact that the amount of maintenance fixed for the wife should be such as she can live in reasonable comfort considering her status and the mode of life she was used to be when she lived with her husband. At the same time, the amount so fixed cannot be excessive or affect the living condition of the other party.

31. Be that as it may, it is the duty of the Court to see that the wife lives with dignity and comfort and not in



penury. The living need not be luxurious but simultaneously she should not be left to live in discomfort. The Court has to act with pragmatic sensibility to such an issue so that the wife does not meet any kind of man-made misfortune.

32. This Court finds that respondent-husband is a Government Doctor and getting Rs. 2,50,000/- per month because this fact has been averred by the appellant and not rebutted/controverted by the respondent. The respondent-husband has also admitted that he is an Assistant Professor in AIIMS, Deoghar. Now, the respondent-husband has re-married and also having a child from second wife. The appellant-wife has still not re-married with anyone. The appellant has no issue. She is solely dependent on her old aged parents. The appellant has no other source of income and she is getting a maintenance amount of Rs. 20,000/- per month as awarded by the Family Court in Maintenance Case No. 421 of 2022.

33. This Court, while hearing the present petition has observed in para 3, 4, and 5 of the order dated 21.11.2024 which reads as under :-

“3. The respondent has offered Rs. 10



lakhs as a permanent alimony and we are not satisfied having regard to the fact that he is earning about Rs. 2 lakhs per month and he has still twenty years of service. Presently, he is an Associate Professor in AIIMS, Deoghar and he is offering a sum of Rs. 10 lakhs and it would be too meager.

4. Be that as it may, he is hereby requested to pay a sum of Rs. 5 lakhs to appellant to show bona fide in settlement with the appellant within a period of one week. In this regard, appellant is hereby directed to furnish bank account and other details so as to enable the respondent to transfer the aforementioned amount in the name of appellant through bank transfer.

5. The appellant is hereby directed to take note of qualification and profession of the respondent read with the fact that they were living together for about less than one year. So also she is a post graduation in Arts and she can earn money while engaging herself in employment or self employment. Therefore, she should give a counter proposal of permanent alimony which should be reasonable with reference to status of the respective parties. For submission of counter proposal and so also



respondent is hereby directed to furnish one more proposal with reference to his future earning as government servant. ”

34. We have also observed in para 1, 2 and 3 of the order dated 13.02.2025 which reads as under:-

“ On the previous occasion, appellant Arpana Kumari offered a permanent alimony of Rs. 50,00,000/- (Rupees Fifty Lakhs Only). We were not satisfied and suggested for Rs. 35,00,000/- (Rupees Thirty Five Lakhs Only).

2. Today, respondent - Shyam Kishore Kumar in the presence of his counsel submitted that he can't pay more than Rs. 15,00,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Lakhs Only). Having regard to his qualification status as a Government Doctor, we are not satisfied with counter proposal of Rs. 15,00,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Lakhs Only). Therefore, matter is required to be adjudicated on merits.

*3. Respective parties are hereby directed to file their assets and liabilities affidavit positively before the next date of hearing in the light of Hon'ble Supreme Court decision in the case of **Rajnesh vs.***



Neha reported in (2021) 2 SCC 324 read with Aditi alias Mithi vs. Jitesh Sharma reported in (2023) SCC Online SC 1451 read with para 32 of Pravin Kumar Jain vs. Anju Jain reported in 2024 SCC OnLine 3678. Thereafter, respondent Shyam Kishore Kumar is hereby directed to once again think over and suggest one more amount of permanent alimony on the next date of hearing. If he fails to furnish any such proposal after re-thinking with reference to the fact that he is a Government Doctor and earning a sum of Rs. 2,00,000/- (Rupees of Two Lakh) per month and he is aged about 40 years, still he has service of about 25 years. Thereafter, life expectancy would be around 20 years. If these things are taken into consideration, the amount which is acceptable to the appellant is a sum of Rs. 35,00,000/- (Rupees Thirty Five Lakhs Only) would be too meager.”

35. Accordingly, after going through the entire facts of this case, we deem it appropriate to grant an amount of Rs. 35,00,000/- (Rupees Thirty Five Lakhs Only) towards interim Permanent Alimony to be paid by



respondent-husband to the appellant-wife. Let the said amount be paid by respondent-husband to the appellant-wife within a period of three months from today; failing which the said amount shall attract simple interest @ 6% *per annum*. The amount of Rs. 5,00,000/-(Five Lakhs) paid by the respondent-husband to show his *bona fide* during pendency of the present appeal will be set off against the aforesaid amount.

36. Accordingly M.A. No. 674 of 2023 stands disposed of with the aforesaid direction. No order as to costs.

37. Pending I.A(s), if any, stand disposed of.

(S. B. Pd. Singh, J)

(P. B. Bajanthri, ACJ)

Shageer/-

AFR/NAFR	AFR
CAV DATE	31/07/2025
Uploading Date	18/09/2025
Transmission Date	N/A

