

**IN THE COURT OF THE ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE
AIZAWL JUDICIAL DISTRICT : AIZAWL.**

PRESENT

Smt. Helen Dawngliani
Addl. District & Sessions Judge

SR No.353/2012
In Crl.Tr. No.2038/2012
U/s 376(2)(f) IPC

Ref :- Vaivakawn PS Case No. 113/2012 dt. 19.8.2012/s 376(2)(f) IPC

State of Mizoram

Versus

C.Lalzawmliana	Accused
Date of hearing	22.5.14 & 19.6.14
Date of Judgment	3.7.14

A P P E A R A N C E

For the Prosecution	Mrs. Rose Mary, Addl. PP Ms. Rosy, Asst. PP
For the Accused	Mr. J.N. Bualteng, Advocate

J U D G M E N T & O R D E R

1. The prosecution story of the case in brief is that on 19.8.2012 C.Zohmangaiha of Chanmari West lodged a written FIR at Vaivakawn Police Station to the effect that on the said afternoon @ 3:30pm his daughter X, 5 years old was sexually assaulted by C.Lalzawmliana in their house.

On the basis of the said information, Vaivakawn P.S Case No.113/12 dt. 19.8.2012 u/s 376(2)(f) IPC was registered and investigated into. Upon completion of investigation, having found prima facie case against the accused C.Lalzawmliana for the offence punishable u/s 376(2)(f) IPC Charge sheet was laid against them and committed for trial.

2. Copy of the Police Report and all connected documents were delivered to the accused.

3. Charge u/s 376(2)(f) IPC was framed against the accused. The charge was read over and explained to the accused in Mizo language which is known to him to which he pleaded not guilty and claims for trial.

4. The prosecution examined 5 witnesses to prove its case. The accused was examined u/s 313 Cr.P.C. Two defence witnesses were examined and the parties are heard.

Mrs. Rose Mary, the Ld. Addl. PP submitted that the prosecution has proved its case beyond reasonable doubt. In support of her submission the Ld. Counsel submitted that the prosecutrix herself had clearly stated how the accused acted upon her person. The

Ld. Counsel submitted that even though the prosecutrix due to tender age had stated that her parents told her what to say in the court, the very fact that there was FIR and the medical examination report support the prosecution story. As a child even if her parents told her what to say in the court it does not mean that they told her to lie. The Ld. Counsel argued that legally an offence of rape can be committed even with the hymen intact and in the instant case the hymen of the prosecutrix being intact by itself does not mean that no offence of rape was committed upon her. The Ld. Counsel also submitted that the prosecutrix being a minor below 12 years have not been disputed and thus pray to convict the accused for the offence punishable u/s 376(2)(f) IPC.

On the other hand, Mr. J.N. Bualteng, the Ld State Defence Counsel vehemently argued that the prosecutrix herself clearly stated on oath that she was tutored by her parents. The Ld. Counsel submitted that the entire prosecution story is false and concocted and based on hearsay. In this regard the elder sister of the prosecutrix who was the first person to mention the incident to her parents was not examined as a witness though she is a vital witness. The Medical Officer examined the prosecutrix found her hymen intact but there was inflammation around the introitus. The said medical officer in her cross examination stated that no other sign of injury was seen on the body or genital organ of the prosecutrix. The witness also stated that inflammation can be caused by scratching, infection or pressure from outside meaning that inflammation can be self inflicted or due to sexual intercourse. The prosecution has failed to shake the stand of the accused that during the relevant time he was with his wife and his friend DW No1/Lalngaihmagawii and that the accused went out at around 2:00pm. The Ld. Counsel therefore submitted that reasonable doubt exist in the prosecution story and thus pray for acquittal. In support of his submission the Ld. Counsel placed reliance on the following decisions:-

- A) Nawal Ram versus State of Rajasthan 2005 Cri.LJ 4726(Raj)
- B) Bhagwan Singh versus State of M.P. (2002)4 SCC 85

5. POINT(S) FOR CONSIDERATION:-

1. Whether the accused had sexual intercourse with X amounting to rape as defined u/s 375 IPC and the accused thereby guilty of the offence punishable u/s 376(2)(f) IPC ?

6. DISCUSSION, DECISION AND REASONS THEREOF:-

P.W. No. 1/ C.Zohmangaiha stated that the accused is his first cousin and next door neighbours. The prosecutrix X is my daughter. He stated that his daughter had gone to the house of the accused and they sent her elder sister to call her. Her elder sister learnt that the accused and the prosecutrix were locked inside a room and she called out to her sister from outside and came back home. Thereafter the prosecutrix also came home and complaint to her mother of pain on her private part. His wife then asked his daughter what had happened and his daughter made a full disclosure of what the accused had done

to her. He was informed by his wife that his daughter said the accused removed the underwear of his daughter and introduced his male organ into her private part. Then he and his wife once again asked our daughter which she stated the same thing and she further said that she has been sexually assaulted by the accused for 5 times. Then he went to the house of the accused and since he was very angry he slapped the accused. The accused denied and he became very angry and he took a knife and gave a blow on his hands. Thereafter he left for his house and lodged the FIR. He produced the original birth certificate of my daughter to the police and after making a photocopy the original was returned to me. He further stated that earlier the accused had sexually assaulted Y who is the daughter of his first cousin namely Baby Malsawmthangi. Earlier the accused had also sexually molested his minor son and the two sons of his elder sister Malsawmthangi after watching a pornography film with them he touched their male organs and anus. The earlier incident were not brought before the police since the parents of the accused vehemently asked for pardon saying that it was within the family and it would bring shame to the entire family and the accused also asked for pardon and said that he will not repeat such act in future. However inspite of having forgiven for his earlier misdeeds, the accused once again sexually assaulted my daughter and did not reform himself and that was why he lodged the FIR. He exhibited the FIR as Ext.P-1 and his signature as Ext.P-1(a). In his cross examination, he stated that the accused is the son of his father's younger brother. It was the evening of 19.8.12 that his daughter complained of pain on her private part. He checked the private part of his daughter with his wife in the common room of his house and saw redness all around but did not see any blood/blood stain and he also did not notice anything which looked like semen. On the day of the incident around mid-day he saw his daughter in the house of the accused and they were sitting together and playing mobile games. It was his wife who sent his elder daughter to call the prosecutrix in the afternoon from the house of the accused. He could not relate the exact date of the earlier date regarding sexual molestation of his son and his two cousins. At that time his son was 9 years old and his two cousins were 10 years and 12 years respectively. He heard the earlier incidents of sexual molestation of my son and his two cousins from the three of them. He denied that he lodged the FIR due to property dispute between him and the family of the accused. He also denied that there is property dispute the two families. He admitted that the prosecutrix did not make any complaints to them of the earlier incidents. He also stated that when he saw the accused and his daughter during midday sitting together on a sofa and playing games on a mobile phone, there were other children in the same room.

PW No. 2/ X is the prosecutrix and she stated that the accused made her lie down on his old bed, removed her underpant and also removed his own underpant and then introduced his male organ into her private part. She stated that the accused told her not to speak out to her parents and aunt and that the accused on earlier occasion used to give her Rs.2/Rs.5/-. In her cross examination she stated that the accused used to have a bird and

that she used to look for food (grasshopper-khau) for the said bird for which the accused used to give her money. She stated that prior to the present incident she has never been sexually molested by the accused and further made an affirmative reply when asked whether her parents told her what to say in the court.

PW No.3/ Lalthakimi is the mother of X . She stated that 19.8.2012 she sent her elder daughter to call the prosecutrix from the house of the accused. Her daughter came back together and her elder daughter told her of what she heard from the prosecutrix. She personally asked her daughter and she said the same thing as she told to her elder sister that the accused took her in his old bedroom, pulled down her underpant upto her shin and introduced his male organ into her private part. When she asked her daughter whether she was ready to confront the accused she stated that she was ready. As her husband was smelling of liquor she thought of not telling the incident to him. So she went to the house of the accused with the younger brother of her husband. However, her husband came to learn about it and came to the house of the accused. The accused denied the allegation and there was a fight between her husband and the accused. She and her husband checked the private part of her daughter and saw redness all around and her daughter was in severe pain. She also stated that even on earlier occasion there was similar incident against the accused with her son and his two cousin brothers. But as it was all within the family they settled the matter amicably. There was also another incident against the accused with the daughter of baby who was looked after by the family of the accused. This matter was also not brought to light because the victim and her mother were looked after by the accused's family. In her cross examination, she stated that she did not see the accused sexually assaulting the prosecutrix, there was no bleeding or spermatozoa when she checked the private part of her daughter. At the time of the incident her daughter was 4 years old.

P.W. No. 4/ Dr. Vanhlalhruaii Fanai examined X at Civil Hospital Aizawl on 19.8.2012 on the basis of requisition made by the Police at around 9:00pm Upon examination she found the girl physically and mentally healthy. On genital examination, her secondary sexual organ have developed. There was inflammation around the introitus, her hymen was intact. Against the column for signs of infection (discharge or colour) with duration she found that there was inflammation which appeared to have been caused in between 24-48 hours approximately. Since she found that the inflammation could not be more than 24 hours she has noted that it was recent inflammation. Introitus is around the opening of the vagina. The inflammation was around the introitus. Such inflammations can be caused by infection, by scratching or by any pressure from outside. It is also possible that such inflammation can be caused due to sexual intercourse. She exhibited the Medical Examination Report as Ext.P-2 and her signature as Ext.P-2(a). In her cross examination, she stated that apart from the inflammation around the introitus she did not find any injuries on the body or genital organ of the victim. There was no pus or other discharge from the vagina or around the inflammation site. She concluded that

the inflammation was caused within 24-48 hours but not more than 48 hours since the appearance of such injury/inflammation changes in time. Since inflammation can be caused by infection, scratching or pressure from outside, it means that it can be self-infected or can also be due to sexual intercourse.

PW No.5/ SI H. Lalhmingthangi is the Investigating Officer. She stated that FIR was received on 19.8.2012. During investigation, she visited the PO, arrested the accused on the night of 19.8.12 itself, recorded the statements of complainant, victim and witnesses. She forwarded the victim for medical examination on the night of 19.8.12 itself. She interrogated the accused and recorded his statement. She obtained the original Birth Certificate of the victim and after making a photocopy, returned the original to her family. She also forwarded the accused for medical examination. She exhibited the photocopy of Birth Certificate of the victim as Ext.P-3 and Charge sheet as Ext. P-4 and her signature thereon as Ext. P-4(a). In her Cross-examination_ She stated that she examined the witnesses in the Police Station as they accompanied the victim and the complainant to the PS at the time of lodging the FIR. She did not call them separately to the PS to record their statement. She arrested the accused and also investigated the case. She did not check the body of the victim. But from a mere look, she did not notice any injury on her body. She denied that there is no prima facie case of sexual assault in the instant case since the hymen of the prosecutrix is intact.

7. Examination of the accused u/s 313 Cr.P.C was one of denial. However, the accused admitted that on the date of the incident the prosecutrix went to his house.

8. At this stage the evidence adduced by the defence may also be highlighted:-

DW No.1/ Lalnghahmawii stated that she lives in the same locality with the accused but their houses are not closely located and that are about 5 houses in between their houses. To her knowledge, the accused does not have bad reputation in the society and he has not behaved in a disorderly manner either in the public or in his family or towards the opposite sex. On 19.8.2012 which is the alleged day of the incident, as they did not have water she went from the house of her grandparents to the house of the accused to wash clothes. Her friends were with her and the accused also ask her to wash the flannels of their new born baby. He also helped her in washing clothes. While washing clothes with the accused, the prosecutrix X was also playing nearby with her younger brother Isak Lalruatsanga. The accused remained with her till 2 PM and thereafter he left with his friend. When the accused left with his friends the prosecutrix X was still around. She was called by her sister at about 3:30 PM. The witness stated that she does not believe that the accused could have sexually assaulted the prosecutrix on that day because around the time when he was alleged to committed the offence, she was also present with him. She had food in the house of the accused and the accused was also there for the evening meal. She left the house of the accused at about 8 PM. In her Cross-

examination she stated that she and the accused are close friends. She admitted that X is the cousin sister of the accused and also that prior to the present incident, the present accused was alleged to have committed sexual offence against Y who is also his cousin sister. She denied the suggestion that she did not see X on the date of the incident. It was by presumption she stated that she left the house of the accused at 8:00pm. She denied the suggestion that she is not aware about the sister of the prosecutrix coming to the house of the accused to call her and that during the time of the incident she was not with the accused. She does not have any knowledge about any misunderstanding between the family of the accused and the prosecutrix.

DW No.2/C. Lalchhanhimi is the wife of the accused. She married the accused on 20.1.2013 and they have 1(one) child out of their wedlock. On 20.1.2013 bride price was handed to her family as per custom but prior to that she eloped with the accused and lived with his family for long time. She knows the prosecutrix X. On 19.8.2012 i.e. the day on which the incident is alleged to have occurred, she was in the house of the accused. The friends of the accused were washing clothes and she was with them. At that time, the prosecutrix was also there with other children. She was outside the house with other children near the place where they were washing clothes. On that day the accused was also with them, as far as she can recollect he was in the house till around 3 PM. To her knowledge, he went towards Vaivakawn. Before the accused left his house around 3 PM, she did not see him carrying the prosecutrix or playing with her. While they were still at a place where the friends of the accused were washing clothes, the elder sister of the victim came to call her. At that time, the prosecutrix was outside the house near the place where they were washing clothes. She does not think that the accused could have committed rape upon the prosecutrix on 19.8.2012. In her cross examination she stated that the date of the incident was Sunday and the friends of the accused were washing clothes in his house and she was with them. The present incident occurred after she married the accused. The prosecutrix X is related to her husband and she used to come to their house. On the day of the incident the prosecutrix came to their house with her friends around midday and she left at around 3 PM. On that day she was not doing any particular work and was hanging around near the place where they were washing clothes. Her husband/accused was also near the place where his friends were washing clothes. He did not play around with the children. The prosecutrix was playing with her friends near the place where the friends of her husband were washing clothes. She was present at the said place till all the children left. They started washing clothes from around 11 AM. The children were playing house house near the place where the friends of her husband were washing clothes. She admitted the suggestion that her husband did not remain at the place of washing all the time and that he also went inside the house. She denied the suggestion that they did not pay attention to the children who were playing house house. Her husband left the house at around 3 PM before his friends finished washing clothes. He did not tell her for what purpose he was going out. She admitted the suggestion that prior to

her marriage with the accused, children including the prosecutrix often used to go to his house.

9. The accused is being charged with the offence punishable u/s 376(2)(f) IPC. It is not in dispute that the prosecutrix was a minor below 12 years old at the time of the incident on 19.8.2012. It is also by now a settled position of law that in cases involving sexual offences conviction can be based on the sole testimony of the prosecutrix if it inspire confidence of the court. At the same time the prosecutrix is a child of barely 4/5 years at the time of the incident complained off. Like any other child witness her evidence have to be examined with more care and caution as child witnesses are susceptible to tutoring, living in the world of make believe and thus Court has to look for indications of tutoring. Yet a child is often a witness of truth, on account of his/her innocence and incapacity for partisan motivation.

10. Explanation to section 375 IPC makes it clear that the depth of penetration is not material in order to commit the offence of rape. Therefore, legally the offence of rape can be committed even with the hymen remaining intact.

According to the prosecutrix, the accused introduced his male organ into her private part. The prosecutrix was not cross examined on this point. At the same time during her cross examination she admitted the suggestion that her parents told her what to say. It is also noticed that in her examination-in-chief she stated that the accused has acted in a similar manner before but in her cross examination she replied in the negative when asked *“Has the accused ever sexually molested you prior to the present case?”* In the case of State of Uttar Pradesh versus Ashok Dixit reported in (2000) 3SCC 70 the honb’le Apex Court has held –

“9. Law is well settled that evidence of a child witness must be evaluated carefully as a child may be swayed by what others tell him and as an easy prey to tutoring. Wisdom requires that evidence of a child witness must find adequate corroboration before it is relied”

Keeping in mind the decision of the honb’le Apex Court and applying the same to the instant case, it is noticed that there is inconsistency in the statement of the prosecutrix and as the prosecutrix herself clearly stated that her parents told her what to say, prudence require that her statements have to find sufficient corroboration.

11. In order to decide on the credibility of the statement of the prosecutrix the other evidence and materials are examined:-

A. Firstly, turning to the medical evidence PW No.4/Dr. Vanlalhruii Fanai stated that the prosecutrix was brought to the Civil Hospital Aizawl for examination on 19.9.2012 @ 9:00pm and that she conducted the examination immediately. As per the FIR at Ext.P-1 the incident occurred on 19.8.2012 @ 3:30pm. As such, the medical examination was done within 7/8 hours of the incident. Upon examination, hymen was

found intact but there was recent inflammation around the introitus and according to the Medical Officer the injury could have been caused within 24 - 48 hours.

B. According to the prosecutrix the accused penetrated his male organ into her private part. In the case of State versus Ravi reported in 2004 Cri.LJ *principle that when a fully developed man has committed sexual assault with a minor girl aged 4 or 5 years there is likelihood of an injury being caused on the penis. In the instant case there was cut wound at the bottom of the penis of the accused who was 22 years old having committed rape of a girl of 4 to 5 years of age. Doctor had opined that there was possibility of cut wound of the kind of accused when the penis is forced into the vagina.*

C. In the instant case the prosecutrix is 5 years old. Upon perusal of the materials on record the medical examination of the accused which was conducted on 19.8.2012 at 8:50pm does not show that the accused sustain any injuries. It is a settled position of law that even the slightest penetration of the male organ into the vagina constitute rape. But in the case at hand, the prosecutrix stated “U zawma khum hluiah min muttir a, ka kekawrte a phelh a, ama kekawrte a phelh ve leh a, ka sazu ah ama sazu a rawn hnawh lut(meaning the accused made me lie down on his old bed, he removed my under pant, then he removed his underpant, he then introduced his male organ into my private part). A reading of the exact language of the prosecutrix give an impression of full penetration. If there was full penetration, considering the age of the prosecutrix and the age of the accused (a full grown male), it is expected that the prosecutrix would sustain injuries so also the accused due to the forced penetration. However, in the instant case, the prosecutrix and the accused did not sustain any injuries and the hymen of the prosecutrix was also intact. Accordingly, the medical evidence does not corroborate with the statement of the prosecutrix that the accused penetrated his male organ into her private part.

At the same time, there is a finding of inflammation around the introitus. The medical officer who was examined as PW No.4 also stated that introitus is around the opening of the vagina. The medical officer further stated that such inflammation can be caused by scratching, infection, sexual intercourse or any pressure from outside.

Considering the nature of injury i.e. inflammation and the place inflamed i.e. introitus, it is very unlikely that there could be penetration so as to constitute sexual intercourse.

12. For the reasons indicated above, I am of the considered view that reasonable doubt exist with regard to the commission of the offence of sexual assault within the meaning of section 375 IPC and that the benefit of such doubt should go to the accused.

13. Attempt to commit an offence is an act, or series of acts, which lead inevitably to the commission of the offence, unless something, which the doer of the act neither foresaw nor intended happens to prevent this. In order to find an accused guilty of attempt to commit rape, the court has to be satisfied that the accused, when he laid hold

of the prosecutrix not only desired to gratify his passion upon her, but that he intended to do so at all events, and notwithstanding any resistance on her part.

14. The honb'le Apex Court in the case of *AmanKumar &Anr vs State of Harayna* reported in (2004)4SCC 379 has held as follows :-

“10. An attempt to commit an offence is an act, or a series of acts, which leads inevitably to the commission of the offence, unless something, which the doer of the act neither foresaw nor intended, happens to prevent this. An attempt may be described to be an act done in part-execution of a criminal design, amounting to more than mere preparation, but failing short of actual consummation, and, possessing, except for failure to consummate, all the elements of the substantive crime. In other words, an attempt to consists in it's the intent to commit a crime, falling short of, its actual commission. It may consequently be defined as that which if not prevented would have resulted in the full consummation of the act attempted. The illustrations given in Section 511 clearly show the legislative intention to make a difference between the cases of a mere preparation and an attempt.”

In the case at hand, for the purpose of examining the presence of the ingredient of attempt to commit rape, even if the deposition of the prosecutrix is believed, there is no material to suggest that the accused failed to consummate only because of some interruption which the accused neither foresaw nor intended.

15. In order to constitute an offence punishable u/s 354 IOC there has to be use of criminal force or assault in order to outrage the modesty. The relevant definitions may be quoted:

“350. Criminal force – Whoever intentionally uses force to any person, without that person's consent, in order to the committing of any offence, or intending by the use of such force to cause, or knowing it to be likely that by the use of such force he will cause injury, fear or annoyance to the person to whom the force is used, is said to use criminal force to that other.”

“351. Assault. – whoever makes any gesture, or any preparation intending or knowing it to be likely that such gesture or preparation will cause any person present to apprehend that he who makes that gesture or preparation is about to use criminal force to that person, is said to commit an assault”

“354. Assault or criminal force to woman with intent to outrage her modesty.- whoever assaults or uses criminal force to any woman, intending to outrage or knowing it to be likely that he will thereby outrage her modesty, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to two years, or with fine, or with both”.

16. While appreciating the evidence on record in the light of the definition given above, as stated above, there is doubt on the credibility of the statement of the

prosecutrix, it appears that the element of Criminal force or assault which are the essential ingredient of the offence punishable u/s 354 IPC appears to be missing.

17. With such inconsistency and contradiction in the statement of the prosecutrix, the possibility of the prosecutrix being tutored and the attitude of the family of the prosecutrix towards the accused due to the earlier incident as stated by them, it is only just and reasonable to expect sufficient corroboration.

18. In the case at hand, the medical officer opined that such inflammation can be caused by scratching, infection or pressure from outside including sexual intercourse. As such, it is clear that sexual intercourse is not the only cause of such injury/inflammation. Accordingly, the presence of inflammation on the introitus alone is not sufficient to conclude that there was sexual molestation or sexual offence.

19. From the evidence of PW No.3/Lalthakimi it is clear that the matter came to light from the elder sister of the prosecutrix who went to call the prosecutrix. But this sister of the prosecutrix have not been examined. It is also noticed that soon after the prosecutrix was called home by her elder sister the matter was brought to the notice of their family. But with the inconsistency and contradiction in the statement of the prosecutrix herself, there being no sufficient corroboration to the statement of the prosecutrix and she having stated that her parents told her what to say in the court(tutored), the prosecutrix not sustaining any injuries, the absence of any evidence that the prosecutrix being in fear or that she was crying, it is not known what exactly happened to the prosecutrix on the date of the incident and whether the inflammation on her introitus was due to the conduct of the accused on her person and the benefit of such doubt has to be given to the accused. Under such circumstance it would not be proper to convict the accused.

ORDER

20. Accordingly, accused C.Lalzawmliana is acquitted of the offence punishable u/s 376(2)(f) IPC by giving him the benefit of doubt.

21. In terms of section 437-A Cr.P.C the accused shall continue to be on bail for another period of 6 months with the same condition as fixed earlier.

22. Give copy of the Judgment & Order free of cost to the accused.

23. Pronounced in open court and given under my hand and the seal of this court on this the 3rd day of July, 2014.

Sd/- HELEN DAWNGLIANI
Additional Sessions Judge
Aizawl Judicial District : Aizawl

Memo No.:_____/AD&SJ(A)/2014 **:** **Dated Aizawl, the 3rd July, 2014**

Copy to: -

1. Accused C. Lalzawmliana through Counsel Mr. J.N. Bualteng, Advocate.
2. District & Sessions Judge, Aizawl Judicial District, Aizawl.
3. District Magistrate, Aizawl District, Aizawl.
4. PP / Addl. PP, Aizawl.
5. DSP (Prosecution), District Court, Aizawl.
6. G.R. Branch.
7. Registration Section.
8. Guard File.
9. Case Record.
10. Calendar Judgment.

P E S H K A R

APPENDIX

A. PROSECUTION EXHIBITS

- Ext. P-1 FIR
 - P-1(a) Signature of PW No. 1
- Ext. P-2 Medical Examination Report of victim
 - P-2(a) Signature of PW No. 4
- Ext. P-3 Photo copy of Birth Certificate of victim
- Ext. P-4 Charge Sheet
 - P-4(a) Signature of PW No. 5

B. DEFENCE EXHIBITS- None

C. EXHIBITS PRODUCED BY WITNESSES - None

D. COURT EXHIBITS- None

E. PROSECUTION WITNESSES:

- P.W. No. 1 - C. Zohmangaiha
- P.W. No. 2 - Prosecutrix
- P.W. No. 3 - Lalthakimi
- P.W. No. 4 - Dr. Vanlalhruii Fanai
- P.W. No. 5 - SI H. Lalhmingthangi

F. DEFENCE WITNESSES - :

- D.W. No. 1 - Lalnghahmawii
- D.W. No. 2 - C. Lalchhanhimi