

Ref. No.: 01:SEC:LA:1

Dated: 7th February 2026

General Manager Department of Corporate Services BSE Limited Floor 25, Phiroze Jeejeebhoy Towers, Dalal Street, Mumbai-400 001	Manager Listing Department National Stock Exchange of India Limited "Exchange Plaza", Bandra-Kurla Complex, Bandra (E), Mumbai-400 051
महाप्रबंधक कॉर्पोरेट सेवा विभाग बीएसई लिमिटेड मंजिल 25, फ़िरोज़ जीजीभोय टावर्स, दलाल स्ट्रीट, मुंबई- 400 001	प्रबंधक सूचीकरण विभाग नेशनल स्टॉक एक्सचेंज ऑफ़ इंडिया लिमिटेड "एक्सचेंज प्लाज़ा", बांद्रा-कुला कॉम्प्लेक्स, बांद्रा (पूर्व), मुंबई-400 051
Scrip Code: 532555	Symbol: NTPC

ISIN: INE733E01010

Sub.: Newspaper publication regarding special window for re-lodgement of transfer requests of physical securities of NTPC Limited

Dear Sir/Madam,

Pursuant to SEBI Circular No. HO/38/13/11(2)2026-MIRSD-POD/ I/3750/2026 dated 30th January 2026, please find enclosed herewith copies of newspaper clippings containing the notice published by the Company in the edition dated 7th February 2026 of Financial Express, The Indian Express and Jansatta.

This is for your information and records.

Thanking you/ धन्यवाद,
Yours faithfully/ भवदीया,

(Ritu Arora)/ (रितु अरोड़ा)
Company Secretary & Compliance Officer/
कंपनी सचिव एवं अनुपालन अधिकारी
Membership No.: / सदस्यता क्र. F5270

Encl.: As above

SAYAJI HOTELS (INDORE) LIMITED

CIN : L55209MP2018PLC076125

Registered Office: H-1, Scheme No. 54, Vijay Nagar, Indore, Madhya Pradesh - 452010

Tel. No. : 0731-4006666, Email Id : cs@shilindore.com, Website : www.shilindore.com

Extract of Unaudited Standalone Financial Results for the Quarter and Nine Months ended 31st December, 2025

(in Lakhs except figures of EPS)

S. No.	Particulars	Standalone			Financial Year Ended 31.03.2025 (Audited)
		Quarter Ended 31.12.2025 (Unaudited)	Quarter Ended 31.12.2024 (Unaudited)	9 Months Ended 31.12.2025 (Unaudited)	
1	Total Income from Operation (Net)	3213.37	3016.78	7,695.43	10567.72
2	Net Profit / (Loss) for the period (before Tax, Exceptional and / or Extraordinary items)	777.31	527.47	1,038.27	1342.40
3	Net Profit / (Loss) for the period before tax (after Exceptional and / or Extraordinary items)	777.31	527.47	1,038.27	1342.40
4	Net Profit / (Loss) for the period after tax (after Exceptional and / or Extraordinary items)	586.97	453.56	783.21	1057.11
5	Total Comprehensive Income for the period [Comprising Profit / (Loss) for the period (after tax) and Other Comprehensive Income (after tax)]	576.42	453.53	768.12	1036.99
6	Equity Share Capital	304.66	304.66	304.66	304.66
7	Reserves (excluding Revaluation Reserve) as shown in the Audited Balance Sheet of the previous year	-	-	-	5935.57
8	Earnings Per Share (of ₹ 10/- each) (for continuing and discontinued operations)	19.27	14.88	25.71	34.70
	Basic:	19.27	14.88	25.71	34.70
	Diluted:	19.27	14.88	25.71	34.70

Notes : The above is an extract of the detailed format of Financial Results for the Quarter and Nine Months ended 31st December, 2025 filed with the Stock Exchange under Regulation 33 of the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015. The full format of the Financial Results for the Quarter and Nine Months ended 31st December, 2025 are available on the website of Stock Exchange at www.bseindia.com and Company's website at www.shilindore.com and the same can be accessed by scanning the QR Code attached below :



By the Order of the Board
For Sayaji Hotels (Indore) Limited
Sd/-
Thottappally Narayanan Unni, Chairman

HARMONY CAPITAL SERVICES LIMITED

Corporate Identification Number: L67120MH1994PLC288180

Registered Office: WeWork Lightbridge, 6th Floor, Corporate No. 137, Hiranyandani Business Park, Saki Vihar Road, Tunga Village, Chanda, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India, 400072

Tel No.: 892803994; Website: www.hcls.co.in; Email: harmonycapital03@gmail.com

Recommendations of the Committee of Independent Directors ("IDC") of HARMONY CAPITAL SERVICES LIMITED ("HCSL" or "Target Company") on the Open Offer made by Mr. Rajesh Ghosh ("Acquirer 1") and Dorni Vinimoy Private Limited ("Acquirer 2" (hereinafter referred to as "Acquirers") to the Shareholders of the Target Company under Regulation 26(7) of the Securities and Exchange Board of India (Substantial Acquisition of Shares and Takeovers) Regulations, 2011 including subsequent amendments thereto ("SEBI (SAST) Regulations").

1. Date	Friday, February 06, 2026
2. Name of the Target Company	Harmony Capital Services Limited
3. Details of the Offer pertaining to the Target Company	This Offer is being made by Mr. Rajesh Ghosh ("Acquirer 1") and Dorni Vinimoy Private Limited ("Acquirer 2") pursuant to the provisions of Regulations 3(1) and 4 of the SEBI (SAST) Regulations, for acquisition of upto 31,52,994 (Thirty-One Lakh Fifty-Two Thousand Nine Hundred and Ninety-Four) Equity Shares of ₹ 10/- each representing 26.00% of the Emerging Equity and Voting Share Capital of the Target Company, at a price of ₹ 10.00 (Rupees Ten Only) per Equity Share, payable in cash.
4. Name of the Acquirers	Mr. Rajesh Ghosh ("Acquirer 1") Dorni Vinimoy Private Limited ("Acquirer 2")
5. Name of the Manager to the Offer	Bonanza Portfolio Limited CIN: U65991DL1993PLC052280 Bonanza House, Plot No. M-2, Camia Industrial Estate, Walhata Road, Behind The Hub, Goregaon (East), Mumbai - 400 063
6. Members of the Committee of Independent Directors (IDC)	1. Mr. Jignesh Keshav Barot, Chairperson 2. Mr. Alpa Bhavesh Vora, Member
7. IDC Member's relationship with the Target Company (Directors, Equity Shares owned, any other contract/relationship), if any	a) IDC members are independent and Non-Executive Directors on the Board of the Target Company. b) None of the IDC member holds Equity Shares in the Target Company. c) None of the IDC member holds any contract or relationship with the Target Company at present.
8. Trading in the Equity Shares/ other securities of the Target Company by IDC Members	None of the IDC members have traded any Equity Shares/ other securities of the Target Company during a period of 12 months prior to the date of Public Announcement till the date of this recommendation.
9. IDC Member's relationship with the Acquirers (Director, Equity Shares owned, any other contract/relationship), if any	None of the IDC members have any relationship with the Acquirer at present.
10. Trading in the Equity Shares/ other securities of the Acquirer by IDC Members	NIL
11. Recommendation on the Offer, as to whether the Offer, is or is not, fair, and reasonable	The IDC members have reviewed the following documents issued by the Manager on behalf of the Acquirer (collectively referred to as the "Offer Documents"): (a) Public Announcement dated Thursday, November 20 2025; (b) Detailed Public Statement published in newspaper on Thursday, November 27 2025; (c) The Draft Letter of Offer dated Thursday, December 04, 2025; and (d) The Letter of Offer dated Thursday, January 29, 2026 The IDC members believe that Offer is fair and reasonable, in accordance with the provisions of SEBI (SAST) Regulations.
12. Summary of Reasons of Recommendation	Based on the review of the Offer Documents, the IDC members are of the opinion that the Offer Price of ₹ 10 per Equity Shares, offered by the Acquirers is in line with Regulation 8(2) of SEBI (SAST) Regulations and prima facie appears to be justified. The Committee considered the following facts: a) The Equity Shares of the Company are infrequently traded on BSE within the meaning of Regulation 2(1)(j) of the SEBI (SAST) Regulations; b) The Offer Price of ₹ 10 per Equity Shares is justified in terms of the parameters prescribed under Regulations 8(2) of the SEBI (SAST) Regulations; Keeping in view of the above fact, the IDC members are of the opinion that the Offer Price of ₹ 10 (Rupees Ten Only) payable in cash per Equity Share to the Shareholders of the Target Company for this Offer is fair and reasonable. However, the Shareholders should independently evaluate the Offer and take informed decision on the matter.

To the best of our knowledge and belief, after making proper enquiry, the information contained in or accompanying this statement is, in all material respect, true, correct, and not misleading, whether by omission of any information or otherwise, and includes all the information required to be disclosed by the Target Company under SEBI (SAST) Regulations.

For and on behalf of
Committee of Independent Directors
Harmony Capital Services Limited
Sd/-
Jignesh Keshav Barot
(Chairperson of IDC)

Place: Mumbai

Date: Friday, February 06, 2026



YOUR PARTNER BEYOND PRODUCTS

ELIN ELECTRONICS LIMITED

CIN: L29304DL1982PLC428372

Corporate & Registered Office : 4771, Bharat Ram Road, 23, Daryaganj, New Delhi - 110 002, India

Tel: 011-43000400 | E-mail: rkc@elinindia.com | Website: www.elinindia.com

EXTRACT OF UNAUDITED (STANDALONE & CONSOLIDATED) FINANCIAL RESULTS FOR THE QUARTER AND NINE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2025

(Rs. in Millions unless otherwise stated)

S. No.	Particulars	STANDALONE						CONSOLIDATED					
		Quarter Ended		Nine Months Ended		Year Ended		Quarter Ended		Nine Months Ended		Year Ended	
		31.12.2025	30.09.2025	31.12.2024	31.12.2025	31.12.2024	31.03.2025	31.12.2025	30.09.2025	31.12.2024	31.12.2025	31.12.2024	31.03.2025
1	Total income from operations	2,498.54	2,804.01	2,249.41	7,709.13	7,007.40	9,449.47	2,935.17	3,745.35	2,663.13	9,635.35	8,644.57	11,802.06
2	Net Profit / (Loss) for the period (before Tax, Exceptional and/or Extraordinary Items & Share of profit/(loss) of Associates)	58.05	122.29	37.95	299.61	154.13	272.83	48.24	138.66	19.94	313.57	164.93	385.15
3	Net Profit / (Loss) for the period before tax (after Exceptional and/or Extraordinary Items & Share of profit/(loss) of Associates)	58.05	122.29	37.95	299.61	154.13	272.83	48.24	138.66	19.94	313.57	164.93	385.15
4	Net Profit / (Loss) for the period after tax (after Exceptional and/or Extraordinary Items & Share of profit/(loss) of Associates)	43.96	90.72	28.28	223.37	113.84	201.72	36.63	102.99	13.99	233.54	120.99	293.22
5	Total Comprehensive Income for the period [Comprising Profit / (Loss) for the period (after tax) and Other Comprehensive Income (after tax)]	43.57	90.32	29.14	221.62	116.42	197.89	36.28	103.43	16.46	233.20	128.49	291.57
6	Paid-up Equity Share Capital	248.30	248.30	248.30	248.30	248.30	248.30	243.52	243.52	239.63	243.52	239.63	243.52
7	Reserves (excluding Revaluation Reserve as shown in the Balance Sheet of previous year)	-	-	-	-	-	4,251.92	-	-	-	-	-	5,098.26
8	Earnings Per Share (of Rs. 5/- each) (not annualized)												
	(a) Basic (in Rs.)	0.89	1.83	0.57	4.50	2.29	4.06	0.75	2.11	0.29	4.80	2.52	6.11
	(b) Diluted (in Rs.)	0.88	1.82	0.57	4.49	2.29	4.06	0.75	2.11	0.29	4.78	2.52	6.11

Note:
The above is an extract of the detailed format of Quarterly Financial Results filed with the Stock Exchanges under Regulation 33 of the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015. The full format of Financial Results for the quarter ended 31st December, 2025 are available on the Stock Exchange websites (www.bseindia.com and www.nseindia.com) and Company's website (www.elinindia.com).

Place: New Delhi

Date: Friday, February 06, 2026



Dai-ichi Karkaria Limited

CIN : L24100MH1960PLC011681

Regd. Off. Liberty Building, Sir Vithaldas Thackersey Marg,

New Marine Lines, Mumbai : 400 020

EXTRACT OF UNAUDITED FINANCIAL RESULTS FOR THE QUARTER & NINE MONTH ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2025

(Rs. in Lakhs)

Particulars	Standalone			Consolidated		
Quarter ended 31 December 2025 (Unaudited)	Nine month ended 31 December 2025 (Unaudited)	Quarter ended 31 December 2024 (Unaudited)	Nine month ended 31 December 2025 (Unaudited)	Quarter ended 31 December		

FIR against IPS officer for 'illegally detaining' Nigerian man in 2023

Express News Service
New Delhi, February 6

THREE YEARS after a Nigerian man was allegedly illegally detained from Delhi's Dabri, an FIR has been filed against 2011-batch IPS Officer Shankar Choudhary, who was posted with the Mizoram Police, in connection with the case.

As per the FIR filed by the Delhi Police Vigilance Unit on Thursday, following an enquiry, Choudhary allegedly misused his official authority and illegally detained the Nigerian national without following legal procedure.

It also claimed he carried out an inter-state police operation without informing authorities or seeking prior approval. *The Indian Express* reached out to Choudhary via text messages seeking comment. A response is awaited.

As per the vigilance FIR, a PCR call was received from a woman in Nigeria, on November 29, 2023, claiming that her

brother had been arrested by the Mizoram Police. She alleged that Rs 35 lakh was taken for his release, with a further demand of Rs 20 lakh being made.

The woman allegedly named Choudhary as the officer involved in the detention and extortion. On July 22 last year, the Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA) had asked the Delhi Police to look into the allegations against Choudhary.

The Delhi Police Commissioner then appointed an enquiry officer to ascertain the facts.

As per the FIR, on November 26, 2023, Choudhary and Delhi Police staff entered the residence of the Nigerian man, Harrison, at 3.34 am. The team left at 5.40 am, taking a locker and two bags.

The seized items were not recorded in police records of either Delhi or Mizoram Police, the FIR claimed. It also said CCTV footage showed Harrison was taken from his resi-

dence by Choudhary's team. He was then kept at Mizoram House from November 26 to 29. There was no arrest memo, court production, or legal order during this period, the FIR claimed.

As per the findings of the enquiry, Choudhary stayed in Delhi after his approved leave ended on November 20, 2023. There was no written or formal communication between Mizoram Police and Delhi Police allowing these raids.

No official diary entry, written order, or wireless message exists in Delhi Police records to authorise these actions, the FIR claimed.

From this, the FIR stated, two head constables, though officially posted elsewhere, acted as Choudhary's driver and assistant without written orders. Their involvement was beyond their official duties and amounted to serious misconduct for which departmental enquiry would be conducted, it said.

'HUMILIATING', SAYS HC ON NOIDA STUDENT

HC sets aside student's punishment with placard

Bhupendra Pandey
Lucknow, February 6

SETTING ASIDE a direction to a student to stand outside a university in Noida for 30 minutes over 30 days, with a message on a placard that he will never misbehave with any girl, the Allahabad High Court said it was unjustified and uncalled for.

"It is not only humiliating but would cast a permanent scar on the character of the appellant," said the division bench led by Chief Justice Arun Bhansali, also comprising Justice Kshitij Shailendra, in its order Wednesday while setting aside the direction by a single bench of the HC.

The appellant, who is pursuing a BSc in Medical Laboratory Technology (BSc MLT) degree at Noida International University, had been rusticated on March 30 last year for allegedly misbehaving with women

students of another university. The varsity had claimed to have video recordings to justify its rustication decision.

The student had challenged his rustication through a petition in the HC. On October 29 last year, a bench of Justice Saurabh Shyam Shamshery had issued an order setting aside the rustication — with conditions and directions.

The single bench had observed, "On the basis of material produced by the...counsel for respondent-university, the conduct of the petitioner appears to be not bona fide...even his attendance is less than 50% in earlier academic years."

It had further stated, "...due to his misconduct, he has been rusticated from Noida International University. The nature of misconduct is serious, i.e., misbehaving with girl students of [another] university and bunk [bunking] classes along with...

Police were also directed to deploy an "anti-romeo mobile squad...at the time of opening and closing of the gate" of the two universities.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

fellow students. There are some video recordings also."

The order had stated that since the student's father was a poor farmer, the rustication order was set aside "while exercising powers under Article 226 of the Constitution".

The student was directed to issue a written apology for his act to the university, file a notarised affidavit before the university that he will attend 95% of remaining classes and not leave the premises during class hours, among other orders.

Police were also directed to deploy an "anti-romeo mobile squad...at the time of opening and closing of the gate" of the two universities.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by the division bench on February 4. His counsel submitted that the direction was not only humiliating for the student, but would affect his career.

The student then filed an appeal against this order, which was heard by

