

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Revision No.290 of 2015

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

=====

Sushila Devi Wife of Ramashish Pandit resident of village - Belauni, P.S. Korma,
District - Sheikhpura

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Anandi Pandit Son of Kedar Pandit resident of village - Belauni, P.S. Korma,
District - Sheikhpura, At Present Sansar Pokhar, Pachana Road Lakhisarai, P.S.
Lakhisarai, District - Lakhisarai
3. Ramotar Mahto Son of Late Khyali Mahto
4. Sitaram Mahto Son of Late Narayan Mahto O.P. No. 3 and 4 resident of
village - Belauni, P.S. Korma, District - Sheikhpura
5. Anik Yadav (Writer) Son of Not Known, resident of village - Sijhauri, P.S.
Karandey, District - Sheikhpura

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bharat Lal

For the Respondent/s : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 23-01-2018

The petitioner is aggrieved by the judgment of the Trial Court viz. Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Sheikhpura in Complaint Case No. 291C of 2006, Tr. No. 1549 of 2013, whereby the respondent Nos. 2 to 5 have been acquitted of all the charges as well as the order passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sheikhpura in Cr. Appeal No. 13 of 2013 dated 12.03.2015, whereby the judgment and order of acquittal of respondent Nos. 2 to 5 has been sustained and affirmed.

2. The petitioner had filed a complaint against her brother-in-law and others alleging that a property which stood in



her name was fraudulently sold to somebody else.

3. From the records, it appears that respondent No. 1, by mistake had sold a plot of land which stood in the name of the petitioner/complainant and after coming to know of that mistake, the same was remedied and the land which did not belong to the petitioner/complainant was only conveyed to the vendee.

4. Mr. Bharat Lal, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that modification was done after three months of the lodging of the complaint.

5. This is not a good ground for reopening the verdict returned by the Trial Court as well as Appellate Court. No good ground has been made out by the learned counsel for the petitioner for this Court to interfere with the appellate order.

6. The petition is, therefore, dismissed.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

Shageer/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	24/01/2018
Transmission Date	24/01/2018

