

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.23023 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -29254 Year- 2014 Thana -PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
PATNA

- =====
1. Shailesh Kumar Singh @ Sailesh Singh aged about 40 years Son of Shri Mukti Narayan Singh presently posted as Sub Editor of Hindi Hindustan Newspaper, Buddha Marg, P.O. G.P.O., P.S. Kotwali, District and Town : Patna, Bihar - 800001.
2. Dr. Tirvijay Singh aged about 47 years Son of Shri Jagdish Singh presently posted as Senior Resident Editor of Hindi Hindustan Newspaper, Buddha Marg, P.O. G.P.O., P.S. Kotwali, District and Town : Patna , Bihar - 800001.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Raju Kumar @ Raj Kumar Son of Shri Dwarika Sharan Singh resident of Nirala Nagar, P.S. Digha, District and Town : Patna, Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kumar Ravish
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Bhanu Pratap Singh(App)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 02-08-2016 Heard Sri Kumar Ravish, learned counsel for the
petitioners and Sri Bhanu Pratap Singh , learned A.P.P.

Two petitioners, have invoked the inherent jurisdiction
of this court under section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure
with a prayer to quash an order dated 19.5.2015 passed by learned
Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Patna in Complaint Case No.
29254(C) of 2014. By the said order the learned Magistrate after
conducting enquiry has taken cognizance of offence under section
500 of the I.P.C. and directed for summoning the accused

persons.

Learned counsel for the petitioners tried to persuade the court that report which was published making some aspersions against the complainant was virtually issued on the basis of complaint which was received in the office of the District Magistrate, Patna and Superintendent of P.M.C.H. and as such according to learned counsel for the petitioners order of cognizance is liable to be set aside whereas on the basis of complaint petition and publication which has been brought on record, the court is of the opinion that the learned Magistrate has committed no error in passing the impugned order. So far the arguments, which have been advanced by learned counsel for the petitioners is concerned, those facts can be looked into at appropriate stage before the court below .

I do not find any ground to interfere with the impugned order.

The petition stands dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J)

Praful/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--