

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.51870 of 2013

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -391 Year- 2012 Thana -SHEKHPURA District- SEKHPURA

=====

1. Sambhu Mian @ Samir Haidar Son Of Basir Haidar Residnet Of Village - Katni
Kaul, Police Station - Sheikhpura, District - Sheikhpura

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Harun Quareshi

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Manish Kumar-2 (A.P.P.)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 21-08-2017

Heard both the parties.

Petitioner, by means of this application under section 482 of the Cr. P.C., have invoked the inherent jurisdiction of this Court with prayer to quash the order dated 20.04.2013 passed by C.J.M., Sheikhpura in Trial No. 1159 of 2013, arising out of Sheikhpura P.S. Case No. 391 of 2012, whereby cognizance has been taken against the petitioner for the offences under section 379/34 of the I.P.C., 3/4/5 Explosive Substance Act, 40 B.M.M.C. Act, 8 of Bihar Illegal Mines Storage and Transportation Act and 4 & 5 of the Environment Act.

The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that no offence against the petitioner is disclosed and the present prosecution has been instituted with *mala fide* intention for the



purposes of harassment. On perusal of Annexure -2, it appears that the police have not investigated the case properly and accordingly, on the basis of the suspicion, charge sheet has been submitted. Petitioner has also filed a petition before the D.I.G., Munger wherein he stated that he has falsely been implicated in this case, as detailed in Annexure-3.

Learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the application by contending that there are allegations against the petitioner and no ground for quashing the entire proceedings is made out.

From perusal of the materials available on record and looking into the facts of the case, at this stage, it cannot be said that no offence is made out against the petitioner. All the submissions made at bar relates to the disputed questions of facts, which cannot be adjudicated upon by this Court in exercise of power conferred under section 482 Cr. P.C. Only a *prima facie* satisfaction of the Court about the existence of sufficient ground to proceed in the matter is required. At this stage only *prima facie* case is to be seen in the light of the law laid down by the Supreme Court in cases of ***R.P. Kapur Vrs. State of Punjab, A.I.R. 1960 SC 866, State of Haryana Vrs. Bhajan Lal, 1992 SCC (Cr.) 426, State of Bihar Vrs. P.P. Sharma, 1992 SCC (Cr.) 192, Zandu Pharmaceutical Works Ltd. Vrs. Mohd. Saraful Haq and another (Para-10) 2005 SCC (Cr.) 283 and recently in***



A.R.C.I. Vrs. Nimra Cerglass Technics (P) Ltd. (2016) 1 SCC 348.

The submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner call for adjudication on pure questions of fact which may be adequately gone into by the Trial Court in this case. This Court does not deem it proper, and therefore, cannot be persuaded to have a pre-trial before the actual trial begins. The disputed defence of the accused cannot be considered at this stage. Moreover, the petitioner has got a right of discharge through a proper application for the said purpose and he is free to take all the submissions in the said discharge application before the Trial Court. The prayer for quashing the order taking cognizance is refused.

The application, accordingly, stands dismissed.

(Arvind Srivastava, J)

Shailendra/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	22.08.2017
Transmission Date	22.08.2017

