WEB COPY NOT OFFICIAL

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.21447 of 2013

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -35 Year- 2012 Thana -PALASI District- ARRARIA

==========

1. Pankaj Kumar Gupta Son Of Radhey Shyam Gupta
2. Vijay Bahadur Gupta Son Of Radhey Shyam Gupta
Both Resident Of Village- Rampur, P.S.- Sonhan, District- Kaimur At Bhabua
3. Tulsi Chaurasia Son Of Dukan Chaurasia
4. Jainendra Chaurasia Son Of Ghurhu Chaurasia
Both Resident Of Village- Karma, P.S. Sonhan, District- Kaimur At Bhabua
5. Mantu Gupta @ Minut Kumar Gupta Son Of Late Bechan Sah Resident Of Village- Pushauli, District- Kaimur At Bhabua

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Child Development Project Officer, Palasi, Araria
3. The Addl. Chief Executive Officer Zila Parisad, Purnia
4. The Civil Surgeon Cum-Chief Medical Officer, Araria
5. The Block Development Officer Araria

.... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s :
For the Opposite Party/s :

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

5 08-03-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr. Md. Ataur Rahman , learned A.P.P.

Five petitioners invoking inherent jurisdiction of this court under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure have prayed for quashing of an order dated 13.3.2013 passed by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate , Araria. By the said order the learned Magistrate has taken cognizance of offence under Section 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the order of cognizance is illegal. He submits that the petitioners on authorization by the competent authority was preparing plates indicating no. of the house and as such, according to learned counsel for the petitioners, no case is made out.

Besides hearing, I have perused the material on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioners was not in a position to satisfy the court as to whether the order of cognizance was having any apparent error warranting interference. It is not a case that without jurisdiction the learned Magistrate has passed order of cognizance. However in the present case after investigation police submitted charge sheet showing the petitioners as accused and only thereafter the learned Magistrate has passed order of cognizance. On perusal of the impugned order I do not find any ground for interference.

The petition stands dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J)

Praful/-

U		T	