

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Revision No.1103 of 2017

=====

Subodh Singh, S/o Balmiki Prasad Singh, R/o Village Dhevsa Dih, P.S.
Ariari & District- Sheikhpura.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajit Kumar, Advocate.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar NO. 1, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 23-11-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

2. Petitioner, one of the accused, facing trial in Sessions Trial No. 606 of 2013, has preferred this revision application, being aggrieved with the order dated 31.10.2017 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Sheikhpura, whereby his petition filed under Section 311 Cr.P.C. was rejected for calling Station Diary for marking exhibit in the case.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner failed to explain what entry is made in the Station Diary and how the same is relevant to the case of defence. Only submission is that FIR, lodged in this case, was replaced by the present one and on this point, Investigating Officer (PW-14) has been cross-examined but even in the cross-examination, there is no suggestion with regard to Station Diary entry. The impugned order discloses the fact that



accused persons were examined on 23.01.2016 thereafter case was adjourned for several occasions for adducing defence evidence. No recourse was ever taken by the accused persons to call for the document under Section 91 of Cr.P.C. or under Section 233(3) of Cr.P.C. at the time of adducing defence evidence. Moreover, in the entire revision application or in the submission, it is not revealed how the Station Dairy is relevant with respect to the defence case.

4. So, I do not find any illegality or impropriety in the impugned order dated 31.10.2017. Accordingly, this application stands dismissed.

(Arun Kumar, J)

Sujit/-

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

