

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Miscellaneous No 30565 of 2014

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -53 Year- 2012 Thana -CHATOUNI District-
EASTCHAMPARAN(MOTIHARI)

- =====
1. Surendra Kumar Chaudhary Son of Late Ganga Prasad Chaudhary
 2. Urmila Chaudhary Wife of Surendra Kumar Chaudhary Residents of Mohalla - Chhatauni Near Mahavir Petrol Pump, P.S.- Chhatauni, District - East Champaran (Motihari)
 3. Pallawi Gupta Wife of Mukesh Kumar Gupta
 4. Mukesh Kumar Gupta Son of Tribhuwan Prasad Both Residents of Mohalla - Gola Bazar, Sonapur, P.S.- Sonapur, District -Saran (Chapra)

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Ruchi Chaudhary Daughter of Dinanath Bhagat Wife of Pawan Puneet Chaudhary Resident of Virat Nagar, P.S.- Virat Nagar, District - Morang Nepal presently residing at Abhimanyu Complex, Gaja Gaddi Chowk, P.S.- Town District - Motihari

.... Opposite Party/s

WITH

Criminal Miscellaneous No 33671 of 2014

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -53 Year- 2012 Thana -CHATOUNI District-
EASTCHAMPARAN(MOTIHARI)

- =====
1. Pawan Punit Chaudhary @ Jeetu Son of Surendra Kumar Chaudhary Resident of Mohalla Chhatauni, Near Mahavir Petrol Pump, P.S. - Chhatauni, District- East Champaran (Motihari).

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Ruchi Chaudhary Daughter of Dinanath Bhagat, Wife of Pawan Puneet Chaudhary, Resident of Virat Nagar, P.S. - Virat Nagar, District - Morang Nepal, Presently residing at Abhimanyu Complex, Gaja Gaddi Chowk, P.S. - Town, District - Motihari.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

For the Petitioner/s	:	M/s Sandeep Kr & Rana Vikram Singh, Advocates
For the State	:	Mr Jharkhandi Upadhyay, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 02-08-2017

Heard counsel for the petitioners and learned APP for the
State.



2 Earlier when the matter was taken up, time was granted to the petitioners to ascertain the current stage of the proceedings before the trial Court. Today, counsel for the petitioners has informed that the trial has proceeded and charges have already been framed and now the matter is likely to proceed for evidence. He further submits that although the charges have been framed six months back but there has been no progress in the trial during this period.

3 In view of the development subsequent to filing of the instant quashing petitions, this Court is not inclined to grant any relief in the applications filed under Section 482 of Criminal Procedure Code against the order taking cognizance and proceeding arising therefrom.

4 In view of the aforesaid, both these applications are dismissed.

5 However, it is needless to say that the trial Court will make endeavours to expedite the trial without being prejudiced by rejection of the quashing applications by this Court.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

M.E.H./-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	04.08.2017
Transmission Date	04.08.2017

