

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.44615 of 2014

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -77 Year- 2010 Thana -CHAINPUR District- BHABHUA (KAIMUR)

=====

1. Kripa Narayan Singh Son of Late Prabhu Narayan Singh
2. Shyamu Chauhan @ Shyam Lal Chauhan son of Late Bishwanath Chauhan
3. Lallu Yadav @ Shankar Yadav Son of Late Ramdeo Yadav
4. Badamu Chauhan Son of Late Bishwanath Chauhan All are resident of Village - Nandana, P.S. - Chainpur, District - Kaimur (Bhabua).

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Mahatma Satsewanand Ji Chela Satyanand Ji Resident of Bramh Vidhalaya and Ashram Chhotaka Rajpur, P.S. - Semari, District - Buxar.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kumar Sunil, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Jitendra Singh, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Tej Bahadur Singh, Adv.
Mr. Kamal Kishore Singh, Adv.
Mr. A.L.Pandit (App)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. ANJANA MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

3 03-01-2018 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, opposite party no. 2 and learned counsel for the State.

The present application has been filed for quashing the order dated 06.09.2014 passed by the learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Kaimur (Bhabua) in connection with Chainpur P.S. Case No. 77 of 2010 , G.R. No. 1087 of 2010, Tr. No. 1296 of 2014 whereby and whereunder the petition for discharge filed by the petitioners has been rejected by the Court



below. The petitioners also seek discharge of the present petitioners in connection with Chainpur P.S. Case No. 77 of 2010 , G.R. No. 1087 of 2010 and also for stay of the operation of the order dated 06.09.2014.

Notices in the present case were issued to the opposite party no. 2, who appeared and filed counter affidavit.

We are informed at the Bar that the charges in the aforesaid case has now been framed and it would be appropriate and in the interest of justice that no further delay be occasioned as the Court below has found sufficient material to proceed against the petitioners and for the said reason by the reasoned order, their application for discharge has been rejected.

It is further submitted that other similarly situated petitioners had also come to this Court and their cases were rejected by the Court below and the matter also traversed to the Apex Court which has also met with a similar fate.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties, this Court is not inclined to proceed further in the present application for the reasons as pointed out and indicated above.

In the result, the present criminal miscellaneous application stands dismissed.

The certified copy of the orders framing charge has been



produced before me.

Let the same be kept on record.

(Anjana Mishra, J)

Jagdish/-

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

