**ITEM NO.301** 

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO(S). 274/2009

ASSAM PUBLIC WORKS

Petitioner(s)

Respondent(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

(I.A.NO.125532/2018-APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS IA NO.105327/2018-APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS IA NO.86040/2018-CLARIFICATION/DIRECTION IA NO.86036/2018-CLARIFICATION/DIRECTION IA NO. 105666/2018-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. IA NO.125538/2018- EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. IA NO. 10/2013-INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA NO. 121861/2018-INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA NO. 103961/2018-INTERVENTION APPLICATION IA NO. 125524/2018-INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT) WITH W.P.(C) NO. 562/2012 (X) (301.1) IA NO.1/2012-STAY APPLICATION IA NO.24/2017 IA NO.25/2017 IA NO.41036/2017-INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT APPLICATION IA NO.92739/2018-INTERVENTION APPLICATION W.P.(C) NO.916/2014 (PIL-W) (301.2) IA 2/2015 FOR [PERMISSION TO FILE ANNEXURES] IA 3/2015 FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. AND IA NO.119677/2017-IMPLEADING PARTY) IA NO.1/2014-STAY APPLICATION W.P.(C) NO.876/2014 (X) (301.3) [IA NO.1/2014-STAY APPLICATION] W.P.(C) NO.311/2015 (X)(301.4) (IA 2/2015 IA NO.1/2015-SEEKING LEAVE TO FILE WRITTEN ARGUMENTS) W.P.(C) NO.449/2015 (X) (301.5) (FOR ON IA 1/2015)

COURT NO.1

NO.1

SECTION PIL-W/X/XIV

<u>W.P.(C) NO.450/2015 (X)</u> (301.6) (IA 1/2015)

<u>W.P.(C) NO.68/2016 (PIL-W)</u> (301.7) IA NO.1/2017-INTERVENTION APPLICATION

<u>W.P.(C) NO.470/2018 (X)</u> (301.8) (FOR ADMISSION AND I.R. AND IA NO.69948/2018-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

DIARY NO.20944/2018 (XIV) (301.9) (FOR ADMISSION AND I.R. AND IA NO.80351/2018-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING AND IA NO.80352/2018-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT AND IA NO.80350/2018-PERMISSION TO FILE SLP/TP)

DIARY NO.21214/2018 (XIV) (301.10) (IA NO.84178/2018-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)

**DIARY NO.21368/2018 (XIV)** (301.11)

(FOR ADMISSION AND I.R. AND IA NO.82085/2018-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING AND IA NO.82087/2018-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT AND IA NO.82088/2018-INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT AND IA NO.82084/2018-PERMISSION TO FILE SLP/TP AND IA NO.82086/2018-PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS)

## <u>DIARY NO.21377/2018 (XIV)</u> (301.12)

(FOR ADMISSION AND I.R. AND IA NO.92415/2018-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING AND IA NO.92417/2018-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT AND IA NO.92411/2018-PERMISSION TO FILE SLP/TP AND IA NO.92419/2018-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING)

**DIARY NO.21959/2018 (XIV)** (301.13)

(FOR ADMISSION AND I.R. AND IA NO.82961/2018-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING AND IA NO.82962/2018-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT AND IA NO.82959/2018-PERMISSION TO FILE SLP/TP )

<u>W.P.© NO.1047/2018</u> (X) (301.14) (FOR ADMISSION and IA NO.125802/2018-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

Date : 01-11-2018 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHINTON FALI NARIMAN

For Parties :	<ul> <li>Mr. K.K. Venugopal, Attorney General</li> <li>Mr. Tushar Mehta, SG</li> <li>Mr. R. Balasubramanian, Adv.</li> <li>Mr. Raghavendra Mohan Bajaj, Adv.</li> <li>Mr. Binu Tamta, Adv.</li> <li>Ms. Shraddha Deshmukh, Adv.</li> <li>Ms. Rekha Pandey, Adv.</li> <li>Ms. Rashmi Malhotra, Adv.</li> <li>Mr. B.V. Balaramdas, AOR</li> <li>Mr. B.K. Prasad, AOR</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Mr. Kapil Sibal, Sr. Adv.</li> <li>Ms. Indira Jaising, Sr. Adv.</li> <li>Mr. Salman Khurshid, Sr. Adv.</li> <li>Mr. Fuzail Ahmad Ayyubi, AOR</li> <li>Mr. Abdul Qadir, Adv.</li> <li>Mr. Mustafa Khaddam Hussain, Adv.</li> <li>Mr. Nizam Pasha, Adv.</li> <li>Mr. Paras Nath Singh, Adv.</li> <li>Ms. Tehseena Z. Hussain, Adv.</li> <li>Ms. Lubna Naaz, Adv.</li> <li>Ms. Kamna Singh, Adv.</li> <li>Ms. Aditi Gupta, Adv.</li> <li>Mr. Ibad Mushtaq, Adv.</li> </ul>
UT-Daman & Diu Dadar & Nagar H. Lakshadweep	Mr. Tushar Mehta, SG Mr. A.K. Sinha, Sr. Adv. Ms. Kiran Bhandari, Adv. Mr. Raj Bahadur, Adv. Ms. Anil Katiyar, AOR
	Mr. Tushar Mehta, SG Mr. Romesh Borpatra Gohain, AG, Assam Mr. Devajit Lon Saikia, Sr. AAG, Assam Mr. Shuvodeep Roy, AOR Mr. Somnath Banerjee, Adv. Mr. Chinmay Phukan, Deputy Sec., Mr. Tosheswar Muktdar, Secy. Home
	Mr. Tushar Mehta, SG Mr. Ajit Kumar Sinha, Sr. Adv. Ms. Kiran Bhardwaj, Adv. Mr. Raj Bahadur, Adv. Ms. Anil Katiyar, AOR

Ms. C.S. Vaidyanathan, Sr. Adv. Ms. Rashmi Singhania, AOR Mr. Anirudh Gupta, Adv.... Mr. Akshay Nagarajan, Adv. Mr. B.D. Jha, Adv. Mr. Shakeel Ahmed, AOR Ms. Sadiya Shakeel, Adv. Ms. Preeti Jha, Adv. Ms. Priyanka Jha, Adv. J.U.-e-Hind Mr. B.H. Marlapalle, Sr.Adv. Mr. A.S. Tapadar, Adv. Mr. Ajit Wagh, Adv. Mr. Mansoor Ali, AOR Mr. Sanjay R. Hegde, Sr. Adv. Mr. Anas Tanwir, Adv. Ms. Maryam N. Alavi, Adv. Mr. A. S. Tapadar, Adv. Ms. Pranjal Kishore, Adv. Mr. Mansoor Ali, AOR.... Mr. Kamal Nayan Chaudhary, Sr. Adv. Mr. Manish Goswami, Adv. Mr. Rameshwar Prasad Goyal, AOR Mr. Manan Kumar, Mishra, Sr. Adv. Mr. Anjani Kumar Mishra, AOR Ms. Hardeep Kaur, Adv. Mr. Shakil Ahmad Syed, AOR Mr. Mohd. Parvez Dabas, Adv. Mr. Uzmi Jameel Husain, Adv. Mr. Pulkit Chandna., Adv. Mr. A.S. Tapadar, Adv. Mr. Umesh Babu Chaurasia, Adv. Mr. Arun Adlakha, Adv. Ms. Manjula Chaurasia, Adv. Mr. D.K. Sinha, AOR

State	of Sikkim	Mr. Ms. Ms.	Aruna Mathur, Adv. Avneesh Arputham, Adv. Anuradha Arputham, Adv. Geetanjali, Adv. M/s. Arputham Aruna & Co., AOR
		Mr. Ms. Mr.	Mansoor Ali, AOR H.U. Choudhury, Adv. Rubina Jawed, Adv. Saurabh Srivastava, Adv Chandan Kumar Mandal, Adv.
			Anitha Shenoy, Adv. Rashmi Nandakumar, Adv.
State	of Assam	Mr.	Sarad Kumar Singhania, Adv. Milind Kumar, AOR Satish Kumar, Adv.
			Shuvodeep Roy, AOR Rituraj Biswas, Adv.
UT of	And. & N. I.		K.V. Jagdishvaran, Adv. G. Indira, AOR
		Mr.	Gaurav Dhingra, AOR
		Mr.	Mehmood Pracha, Adv. A. Chaliha, Adv. Shadan Farasat, AOR
State	of Meghalaya	Mr. Mr.	Ranjan Mukherjee, AOR K.V. Kharlyngdoh, Adv. Daniel Stone Lyngdoh, Adv. S.C. Ghosh, Adv.
			Rachana Srivastava, AOR Aviral Saxena, Adv.
State	of Manipur	Ms.	Leishangthem Roshmani Kh., AOR Maibam Babina, Adv. Anupama Ngangom, Adv.

Mr. Krishan Kumar Pandey, Adv. Mr. Hitesh Kumar Sharma, Adv. Mr. M. Kumar Mishra, Adv. Mr. Mohan Pandey, AOR. Mr. Syed Ali Ahmad, Adv. Mr. Syed Tanweer Ahmad, Adv. Mr. S.S. Bandyopadhyay, Adv. Mr. Nasrul Haque Manzarbhuiyan, Adv. Mr. Mohan Pandey, AOR. Mr. Debojit Borkakati, AOR Mr. Vivek Sonkar, Adv. Mr. Santi Ranjan Das, Adv. Mr. Anindo Mukherjee, Adv. Mrs. Sarla Chandra, AOR Mr. Prashant Bhushan, Adv. Mr. Syed Burhanur Rahman, Adv. Mr. Somesh Chandra Jha, AOR. Mr. Anand Darshan, Adv. Mr. U.P. Wadhwani, Adv. Mrs. D. Bharathi Reddy, AOR Ms. Rachna Gandhi, Adv. Ms. Vidyottma, Adv. Ms. Gitanjali N. Sharma, Adv. Mr. Mansoor Ali, AOR Mr. Chandan Kumar Mandal, Adv. Ms. Rubina Jawed, Adv. Mr. Saurabh Srivastava, Adv. Mr. Mansoor Ali, AOR Ms. Rubina Jawed, Adv. Ms. Sneha Kalita, AOR

Guahati HC

6

All Assam Students' Union	Ms. Mr.	Malvika Trivedi, Adv. Ankit Yadav, Adv. T. Mahipal, AOR
	Mr.	Partha Sil, AOR
State of M.P.		Anil Kumar Pandey, Adv. Sunny Chaudhary, AOR
State of Goa	Mr. Mr. Mr. Mr.	Atmaram N.S. Nadkarni, ASG Merusagar Samantray, AOR Salvador Santosh Rebello, Adv. Leelesh Krishna, Adv. Snehaprabhu Tendulkar, Adv. Amagh Pravu Deshai, Adv.
State of U.P.		Pradeep Misra, AOR Aditya Kr. Dubey, Adv.
State of		
Chhattisgarh		A.P. Mayee, AOR Chirag Jain, Adv.
	Mr. Mr.	Narender Hooda, Sr. Adv. Sanand Ramakrishnan, AOR. Rajeev Mishra, Adv. Sanjay Kumar Chhetry, Adv.
	Ms. Mr. Ms. Ms.	Suhaan Mukerji, Adv. Astha Sharma, Adv. Amit Verma, Adv. Kajal Dalal, Adv. Dimple Nagpal, Adv. PLR Chambers And Co., AOR.
		Arun Adlakha, Adv. Sarla Chandra, AOR
State of Punjab	Ms.	Ranjeeta Rohatgi, AOR

	Ms. Diksha Rai, AOR. (Standing counsel for the State of Assam)
	Mr. M. Shoeb Alam, AOR
State of Goa	Mr. Pratap Venugopal, Adv. Ms. Surekha Raman, Adv. Mr. Dileep Pollakot, Adv. Mr. Anuj Sarma, Adv. Ms. R. Raj, Adv. M/s. K.J. John & Co.
	Mr. Somiran Sharma, AOR
Assam Public Works	Ms. Nidhi Banga, Adv. Mr. Kailash Prasad Pandey, AOR
State of Telangana	Mr. S.Udaya Kumar Sagar, AOR Mr. Mrityunjai Singh, Adv.
State of T.N.	Mr. M.Yogesh Kanna, AOR Ms. Sujatha Bagadhi, Adv.
	Mr. Barhm Dev Jha, AOR
	Mr. Suhaan Mukerji, Adv. Ms. Astha Sharma, Adv. Mr. Amit Verma, Adv. Mr. Abhishek Manchanda, Adv. Ms. Kajal Dalal, Adv. Ms. Dimple Nagpal, Adv. M/S. PLR Chambers And Co., AOR.
	Ms. Madhumita Bhattacharjee, AOR
	Mr. Abhijit Sengupta, AOR
	Mr. Avijit Roy, AOR
	Mr. Mohit D. Ram, AOR

	Mr. Guntur Prabhakar, AOR
	Mr. Snehasish Mukherjee, AOR
State of Odisha	Mr. Shibashish Misra, AOR Mr. Ompal Singh, Adv. Mr. Chandan Kumar Mandal, Adv.
	Mr. Praveen Swarup, AOR
	Mr. S.S. Shamshery, AAG, Rajasthan Mr. Amit Sharma, Adv. Mr. Sandeep Singh, Adv. Mr. Ankit Raj, Adv. Ms. Indira Bhakar, Adv. Ms. Ruchi Kohli, AOR Mr. Milind Kumar, AOR
	Mr. Parijat Sinha, AOR
State of Uttarakhand	Mr. Aviral Saxena, Adv. Ms. Rachana Srivastava, AOR
	Ms. Hemantika Wahi, AOR
State of Nagaland	Ms. K. Enatoli Sema, AOR Mr. Amit Kumar Singh, Adv.
	Mr. B. Balaji, AOR
	Mr. Kuldip Singh, AOR
	Ms. Liz Mathew, AOR
State of Jharkhand	Mr. Tapesh Kumar Singh, AOR Mr. Aditya Pratap Singh, Adv.
State of Kerala	Mr. C. K. Sasi, AOR Ms. Nayantara Roy, Adv.
State of Bihar	Ms. Abha R. Sharma, AOR Mr. D.S. Parmar, Adv.

Mr. Abhishek, AOR Mr. Jugal Kishore Gilda, AG State of Mizoram Mr. Shikhar Garg, Adv. Mr. Mudit Makhijani, Adv. Mr. Mudit Makhijani, Adv. Mr. P. V. Yogeswaran, AOR Mr. Anuvrat Sharma, AOR Mr. Anuvrat Sharma, AOR Mr. Ashok Kumar Singh, AOR Mr. Ashok Kumar Ganguli, AOR Mr. Chanchal Kumar Ganguli, AOR Mr. Chanchal Kumar Ganguli, AOR Mr. V. N. Raghupathy, AOR Mr. Gopal Singh, AOR Ms. Sushma Suri, AOR Mr. V. K. Sidharthan, AOR M/S. Corporate Law Group, AOR

> UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following O R D E R

We have heard the learned counsels for all the contesting stake holders. We have also heard Shri Prateek Hajela, learned State Coordinator, NRC, Assam, Shri K.K. Venuogopal, learned Attorney General for India and Shri Tushar Mehta, learned Solicitor General of India.

The issue for consideration for the day is whether the following five documents can/should be allowed to be introduced on behalf of the claimants for inclusion of their claims in the NRC in the on-going process of filing of claims and objections to the final draft NRC published on 30<sup>th</sup> July, 2018.

(i) Names in NRC, 1951;

(ii) Names in Electoral Roll upto 24<sup>th</sup> March, 1971;

(iii)Citizenship Certificate; and Refugee
Registration Certificate;

(iv) Certified copies of pre-1971 Electoral Roll, particularly, those issued from the State of Tripura; and

(v) Ration Card

At the request of the Court Shri Hajela had submitted a report dated 4<sup>th</sup> October, 2018 wherein he has objected to the introduction of any one of the five documents, as stated above. We have considered the said objections.

Insofar as the documents listed at Serial Nos. (iii), (iv) and (v) are concerned, the primary thrust of the objections of Shri Hajela is that in the process of verification for inclusion of names in the draft NRC large number of forged documents belonging to the said three categories mentioned at serial Nos. (iii), (iv) and (v) above had been filed. The number of such forged documents has also been mentioned. It is our considered view that the mere possibility of filing of forged documents or that such documents were filed in the earlier exercise cannot be a ground to exclude the same from the impending process of filing of claims and objections. Needless to say, all such documents must be subjected to a thorough process of verification and would be accepted only after due and complete satisfaction of the genuineness of the same.

So far as the other two documents i.e. (i) names in NRC, 1951; and (ii) names in Electoral Roll upto 24<sup>th</sup> March, 1971 are concerned, we find it convenient to reproduce herein below the precise objection of Shri Hajela:

> "A. Multiple legacy data availability: Even the Legacy Person is frozen, it is if possible that misuse of the Legacy data may be done by some persons. This will happen by using unused LDCs of the same Legacy Person as multiple Legacy Data Codes are available for the same Legacy Person. availability Multiple Legacy Data Code means that one person's name appears in multiple pre 1971 records, for example, a person's name may appear in 1951 NRC and also in 1966 Electoral Rolls and also in 1971 Electoral roll. For each of these three appearances, the person will have a different Legacy Data Code. It may be argued that one way of handling this would be by calling again all the descendants of that Legacy Person who were called earlier during the Family Tree hearings held. By calling these persons, it might be possible

to identify impostors. However, the deponent humbly feels that even this may not be sufficient to prevent misuse at reading of legacy Codes can still happen. Further, it will not be possible for the NRC authorities to catch such impostors. This is clarified through the following examples :

of Legacy Data one Shri NILAKANTA a. BARMAN, S/o Gunaram. He has Legacy Data Codes (LDCs) of three years - 1951, 1966 and 1971. For example, an imposter used the LDC of 1966 (copy of the actual Electoral Roll of 1966 is at Annexure 1) with Legacy Data Code and got caught when the real descendants of NILAKANTA BARMAN refused to identify him Family during Tree Investigation hearings. This impostor can now use the 1951 LDC of NILAKANT BARMAN (copy of actual NRC 1951 is at Annexure 2) which has not been used by the real descendants. First problem in catching this mis-use will arise as the computer will not be able to identify the other users of this Legacy Data as the Legacy Data Code will change from 370-4015-3609 (1966 LDC) to However, 370-0007-4848 (1951 LDC). this problem can be overcome as those descendants can still be called by the NRC authorities as they were called for the said impostor's Family Tree Investigation hearing earlier. However, now it will be possible for the impostor to bribe the real descendants who can now say that NILAKANTA BARMAN of 1951 NRC is actually a different person. The NRC authorities will never to be able to suspect because names of all the other family members and even neighbours displayed in 1951 NRC are different. This way without change in name of the Legacy Person, Legacy Data can be misused.

b. Legacy Data of one Shri RAMESH TALUKDAR, S/O Madhuram. He has two LDCs – one of 1951 NRC (300-0011-5405) and another of Electoral Roll of 1970 (300-3216-9400). LDC of 1951 NRC (copy of 1951 NRC is at Annexure 3) is of Village No.132, District Tinsukia, while LDC of Electoral Roll of 1970 (copy of Electoral Roll is at Annexure for is Village Hijuquri, 4) District Tinsukia. In 1951 NRC, names of only the father and son appear, while in the 1970 Electoral Roll, names of only the son and wife appear without father. If his an impostor had earlier submitted LDC of 1970 showing his Legacy Person to be RAMESH TALUKDAR and got caught due to nonrecognition sibling by the real as descendants, now he can use the other LDC of 1951 of RAMESH TALUKDAR. He may bribe the genuine descendants of RAMESH TALUKDAR who will now say that RAMESH TALUKDAR in 1951 NRC is actually a different person RAMESH TALUKDAR of 1970 Electoral than Roll. The NRC authorities will not be able to suspect as the names of other family members and neighbours shown with RAMESH TALUKDAR are different.

Legacy Data of one Shri DILIP BORA, S/o С. Bishnuram Bora of Jorhat appears twice once in 1951 NRC (LDC - 330-0007-8376) and once in Electoral Roll of 1966 (LDC-330-4020-8899). Whereas in the 1951 NRC (copy of 1951 NRC is at Annexure 5) he appears along with his entire family located in Chengali Gaon of Jorhat district, but in 1966 Electoral Roll (copy of 1966 Electoral Roll is at Annexure 6), he appears alone in ward no 1, South Block, Jorhat district and as such even his neighbours are also different in both these images. It is learnt that wheras in 1951 NRC DILIP BORA was enumerated in his permanent residence located at chengali gaon, in the Electoral of 1966 he was enumerated in his Roll business establishment located in a market area of South Block of the same district. In this case if any impostor had used DILIP BORA as the Legacy Person by using his 1951 NRC (which was also used by the real descendants of Dilip Bora and therefore he had got caught), it will be possible now for that impostor to pick the unused 1966

Electoral Roll LDC of DILIP BORA. Even if the NRC authorities are to call the real descendants, it is possible that by taking bribe such real descendants might declare DILIP BORA of 1966 to be another person. The NRC authorities will also not be able to suspect as the names of other family members and neighbours shown with DILIP BORA in both the LDCs are different."

We have taken note of the said objections and the response thereto filed by all the stake holders, particularly, the State of Assam and the Union of India.

The State of Assam has sought to answer the above objections by stating that the apprehensions expressed by Shri Hajela, as extracted above, can be taken care of by adopting different means including:

> "the applicants to declare/disclose all the LDCs (LDC series) of their claimed Legacy Person. The SCNR in his report has himself stated that the LDCs of their Legacy Person would be known to the genuine Family Members."

Insofar as the Union of India is concerned, while expressing an opinion similar to that of the State of Assam, the Union of India has also drawn the attention of the Court to a communication dated 24<sup>th</sup> April, 2018 written by Shri Hajela himself to the Registrar General wherein he had suggested adoption of a vigorous process of verification consisting of two layers. Having considered the matter we are of the view that objection of Shri Hajela to the five (05) documents in question and specifically with regard to the documents listed at Serial Nos. (i) and (ii) i.e. names in NRC, 1951;and names in Electoral Roll upto 24<sup>th</sup> March, 1971 is based entirely on a possibility of abuse which, however, strong, cannot be an acceptable reason in law to exclude the documents from consideration. It would, undoubtedly, be the duty and obligation of Shri Hajela to ensure a thorough verification of the claims that would now be made for which purpose we would be suitably framing the time schedule for consideration of the claims that may be filed.

In this regard, we permit Shri Hajela to undertake through his team a vigorous process of verification and have additional layers of such verification to ensure that only and only eligible persons are included in the final NRC.

Our above view would now require us to re-frame the schedule and to approve the Standard Operating Procedure (S.O.P.) filed along with the affidavit of the Deputy Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs dated 13<sup>th</sup> August, 2018 as modified on 17<sup>th</sup> September, 2018 which we hereby do. The time schedule for filing of claims and objections and consideration thereof would now be as follows:

1.	Last date of filing of Claims	:	15 <sup>th</sup> December, 2018
2.	The time for issuing notice after digitization and completion of all formalities and requirements	:	15 <sup>th</sup> January, 2019
3.	Commencement of the verification process	:	1 <sup>st</sup> February, 2019

Further details of the time schedule including the time for completion of verification/enquiry of the claims which will now be allowed will follow at the appropriate time.

We request Shri Hajela to file a report to this Court after last date fixed the for filing of claims/objections i.e. 15<sup>th</sup> December, 2018 whereafter further orders, if required, will follow.

There is another matter i.e. with regard to the documents filed by persons belonging to the States other than the State of Assam for inclusion of the names in the NRC which we may conveniently deal at this stage. Such documents including the certificates may be accepted subject to back-end verification and on satisfaction of authenticity of such certificates.

[VINOD LAKHINA] AR-cum-PS [ASHA SONI] ASSISTANT REGISTRAR