

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Revision No.195 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -null Year- null Thana -null District- SARAN

=====

1. Joyti Kumari @ Jyoti Kumari, daughter of Hardev Singh, under the guardianship of her father Hardev Singh, resident of Village- Pirari, P.S.- Jalalpur, Dist- Saran.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

.... Respondent

WITH

=====

Criminal Revision No. 230 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -null Year- null Thana -null District- SARAN

=====

Manish Kumar Singh @ Manish @ Manish Kr. Singh, son of Hardev Singh, under the guardianship of his father, Hardev Singh, resident of village Pirari, Police Station Jalalpur, District Saran

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Respondent

=====

Appearance :

(In CR. REV. No.195 of 2017)

For the Petitioner : Mr. Harsh Singh

For the State : Mr. Satendra Narayan Singh

(In CR. REV. No.230 of 2017)

For the Petitioner : Mr. Harsh Singh

For the State : Mr. Satendra Prasad

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH

JUDGMENT AND ORDER

ORAL

Date: 16-05-2017

Heard learned Counsel for the petitioners and learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the State.

2. The petitioners have filed the present criminal revision applications against order, dated 13.11.2014, passed by learned Sessions Judge, Saran, at Chapra, in Criminal (Juvenile) Appeal No. 101 of 2014 and Criminal (Juvenile) Appeal No. 99 of 2014. The said order was put to challenge



before this Court by filing Criminal Revision Nos. 55 and 52 of 2015, which have been dismissed by order, dated 23.07.2015.

3. This is to be indicated that the petitioners are juveniles and accused in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 376/307/326/34 of the Indian Penal Code, to which Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code has, subsequently, been added. The Court, while rejecting their revision applications, directed the Juvenile Justice Board to complete the enquiry within a period of five months. The Court, however, further observed that even if the enquiry was not completed within five months, the petitioners would not be entitled for bail.

4. In my view, this second criminal revision application, against the order, dated 13.11.2014, cannot be maintained in view of the fact that earlier criminal revision applications filed against the said order by the petitioner have already been rejected by this Court.

5. These applications are accordingly dismissed, as not maintainable.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J.)

Prabhakar Anand/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	17.05.2017
Transmission Date	17.05.2017

