

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Revision No.689 of 2015

=====

1. Rajgrihi Tiwari.
2. Rajdeo Tiwari.
3. Jay Shankar Tiwari.
4. Janardan Tiwari.

Petitioner Nos. 1 to 4 are Sons of Late Jagarnath Tiwari.

5. Bhulan Tiwari, Son of Ramraj Tiwari.
6. Dineshwar Tiwari, Son of Late Gayatri Tiwari.
7. Nagendra Tiwari, Son of Late Gayatri Tiwary.

All belong to Village Mahuat, P.S.-Chenari, District-Rohtas.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Ram Raj Tripathi, Son of Late Baijnath Tripathi, resident of Village Mahuat, P.S.-Chenari, District-Rohtas.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Raghunandan Kr. Singh, Adv.

For the State : Mrs. Anita Kumari, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

2 16-02-2018 The petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 02.02.2015, passed by the learned Adhoc Additional District Judge-III, Rohtas at Sasaram, in Cr. Appeal No. 25 of 2012, arising out of Chenari P.S. Case No. 68 of 1998, whereby certain documents have been accepted by the learned court



below as an additional evidence.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that those documents could not be relied upon and, therefore, they were wrongly taken in evidence.

The case is still pending trial.

The petitioner would be entitled to argue before the learned Trial Court that such additional evidence, which has been taken on record, is not fit to be relied upon. The Trial Court, while passing the final judgment, shall look into the aforesaid grounds and would pass a reasoned judgment in accordance with law.

With the aforesaid observations, the present revision petition is disposed of.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

Praveen-II/-

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

