

Court No. - 92

Case :- APPLICATION U/S 482 No. - 44375 of 2012

Applicant :- Shanti Devi

Opposite Party :- State of U.P. and Others

Counsel for Applicant :- Vidya Kant Tripathi, S.L. Pandey, Vikas Kumar

Counsel for Opposite Party :- Govt. Advocate, K.K. Tripathi, K.S. Shukla

Hon'ble Anish Kumar Gupta, J.

1. None appears for the applicant as well as opposite party no.2. Sri Prem Prakash Tiwari, learned A.G.A. for the State is present.
2. The instant application under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been filed seeking quashing of order dated 23.08.2012 passed in Criminal Revision No.13 of 2012 (Shanti Devi Vs. State of U.P. and others) and seeking direction to the court below to summon the opposite parties in Complaint Case No.985 of 2010 (Shanti Devi Vs. Bhola Tiwari and others), under Sections 148, 149, 395 I.P.C. and Section 3(1)(10) S.C./S.T. Act, P.S. - Suriyawan, District - Sant Ravidas Nagar, Bhadohi.
3. From perusal of record, it appears that a compliant was filed by applicant raising various allegations against the opposite parties with regard to the offences under Sections 147, 148, 149, 323, 504, 506, 452, 395 I.P.C. and Sections 3(1)(10) SC/ST Act. After recording statements under Section 200 and 202 Cr.P.C., vide order dated 10.11.2011, the Judicial Magistrate - I, Bhadohi, Gyanpur has summoned the opposite party nos.2 to 10 for the offences under Sections 147, 323, 452, 504, 506 I.P.C. Against the said order, Criminal Revision No.13 of 2012 was filed by the applicant, which was also dismissed vide order dated 23.08.2012. Since, the trial court as well as the revisional court did not find force on the allegations made in the complaint from the statements recorded under Sections 200 and 202 Cr.P.C. with regard to the other offences including the provisions of SC/ST Act.
4. In the instant application, vide order dated 18.01.2013, notices were issued to the opposite parties and they have put in appearance and no interim order was passed in favour of the applicants in the instant case, therefore, due to the lapse of time, the instant

application appears to have become infructuous and nobody is interested in pursuing the same.

5. As it is apparent that nobody is appearing on behalf of the applicant to press the instant application, therefore, the instant application is **dismissed** being infructuous as well as for non-prosecution.

Order Date :- 12.12.2023

Atul