

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.7915 of 2014

Arising out of Case No. -3421 Year- 2010 Thana -PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District- PATNA

=====

1. Awadh Kishore Pandey, Son of Late Dwarika Datt Pandey
2. Manorama Devi @ Mano Devi, W/O Awadh Kishore Pandey
Both Resident of Village Babandih, P.S. Bajirganj, District Gaya

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Nitu Devi, Wife of Parmanand Pandey @ Chhote, D/O Nawal Kishore Pandey, Resident of Village Gangasarai, P.S. Barahiya, District- Lakhisarai.
At Present Resident of Mohalla- Budha Nagar, Nalapar, P.S. Kankarbagh, District- Patna

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

with

Criminal Miscellaneous No.9472 of 2014

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -3421 Year- 2010 Thana -PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District- PATNA

=====

Parmanand Pandey @ Chhotu S/O Awadh Kishore Pandey Resident of Village- Babandhi, P.S.- Bajirganj, Dist.- Gaya

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Nitu Devi W/O Parmanand Pandey @ Chhote, D/O Nawal Kishore Pandey Resident Of Village- Gangasarai, P.S.- Barahiya, Dist.- Lakhisarai
At Present of Mohalla- Budh Nagar, Nalapar, P.S.- Kankarbagh, Dist.- Patna

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

(In Cr.Misc. No.7915 of 2014)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar Pandey, Advocate.
For the State : Mr. Ajay Kumar-I, A.P.P.
For the O.P. No. 2 : Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate.

(In Cr.Misc. No.9472 of 2014)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar Pandey, Advocate.
For the State : Mr. Ajay Kumar-I, A.P.P.
For the O.P. No. 2 : Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

Dated: 21-07-2017

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioners have filed this application under



Section 482 of Cr.P.C. challenging order dated 20.10.2011 passed by the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Patna in Complaint Case No. 3421C of 2010 whereby he has taken cognizance of offence under Section 498A of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Petitioners in Cr. Misc. 7915 of 2014 are the father-in-law and mother-in-law and petitioner in Cr.Misc. No. 9472 of 2014 is husband of the complainant.

4. The allegation in brief in complaint is that after marriage, all accused persons started torturing her and insisting for transferring the land by her father in the name of the husband of the complaint as she was only issue of her father and on that account intermittently she was tortured by the husband and others including the petitioners.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in fact complainant does not want to live with the husband and there is no specific allegation against the father-in-law and mother-in-law.

6. Whereas, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the O.P. No. 2 submits that the allegation is specific against all these petitioners and now petitioner Parmanand Pandey has already married with another woman.

7. Having considered the rival submissions and on



perusal of complaint, it appears that allegation levelled against the petitioners is specific so there is no ground for quashing the cognizance order. Both these petitions stand dismissed.

(Arun Kumar, J)

Sujit/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	29.08.2017
Transmission Dated	29.08.2017

