

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Revision No.950 of 2014

=====

1. Jitendra Singh son of Late Parsuram Singh
2. Sunil Singh son of Late Parsuram Singh
3. Shibu Singh son of Jitendra Singh
4. Vishal Singh son of Sunil Singh
5. Rajnath Singh son of Jang Bahadur Singh
6. Shravan Singh @ Bade Singh s/o Late Rajnath Singh All residents of
Village : Pipra (Pasiwad), P.O. : Chand Parsa, P.S. : M.H. Nagar, District :
Siwan.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Sheoji Singh son of Late Bachcha Singh residents of Village : Pipra
(Pasiwad), P.O. : Chand Parsa, P.S. : M.H. Nagar (Hasanpura), District :
Siwan.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vindhykeshri Kumar, Sr. Adv.,
With Mr. Ramadhar Shekhar
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Narendra Kr. Singh(App)
For Opposite party No.2 : Mr. Ram Kishore Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI
SHARAN SINGH
ORAL ORDER

3 15-02-2017 Heard learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners
and the learned Counsel appearing on behalf of Opposite
party No.2.

2. From the records of the case, it transpires that
the Opposite party No.2 has lodged a complaint case in the
Court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Siwan, which has
given rise to Complaint Case No. 1521 of 2010 making out a
case of commission of the offence punishable under Sections
323, 341, 379 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The petitioners were discharged by the Court of



learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Siwan by an order dated 11.12.2012 under Section 245 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The Opposite party No.2 had approached the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Siwan by preferring criminal revision application against the order of the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Siwan of discharge. Learned Sessions Judge, Siwan has allowed the revision application by an order, dated 31.07.2014, which is impugned in the present criminal revision application.

4. Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners and learned Counsel representing Opposite party No.2 have submitted that the parties have resolved their disputes amicably and the parties want the case to be compounded.

5. This is not in dispute that the offences alleged are compoundable.

6. The parties have filed a joint compromise petition seeking an order from this Court for compounding of the offences.

7. I have perused the compromise petition. In view of the stand, which has been taken on behalf of the parties, I don't think any purpose would be served by allowing the criminal prosecution to continue any more.

8. Since the parties have filed a compromise



petition, the offences alleged against the petitioners stand compounded in terms of Section 320 (1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 which shall have the effect of the accused persons.

9. This application is, accordingly, disposed of.

ArunKumar/-s

U			
---	--	--	--

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)

