

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.31695 of 2013

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-271 Year-2006 Thana- MADHUBANI COMPLAINT CASE
District- Madhubani

=====

Premchand Goel, Manager, Pammi Tissue Limited, Barauti Wala, District - Solanki (Himachal Pradesh), having its Head Office M.O.C.-55 First Floor, Middle Marg, Sector- 26, Chandigarh.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Mahendra Sah Son of Late Prem Sahu, Resident of Village Ppahi P.S. Rajnagar, Distt Madhubani.

... .. Opposite Party/s

with

Criminal Miscellaneous No. 32923 of 2013

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-270 Year-2006 Thana- MADHUBANI COMPLAINT CASE
District- Madhubani

=====

Premchand Goel S/o Late Surajbhan Goyal, Manager Pammi Tissue Limited, P.S- Barauti Wala, District- Solan, (Himachal Pradesh), Having its Head Office, M.O.C. 55, First Floor, Middle Marge, P.S- Sector- 26, District Chandigarh.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Rameshwar Sahu S/o Late Prem Sahu Resident of Village- Chapahi, P.S- Rajnagar, District- Madhubani.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

(In Criminal Miscellaneous No. 31695 of 2013)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ratanakar Jha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar-I, APP

(In Criminal Miscellaneous No. 32923 of 2013)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ratanakar Jha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar-I, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

9 03-05-2018 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and the

learned APP for the State.

In this case cognizance has been taken under Section



420 of the Indian Penal Code as well as under Section 138 of the N.I. Act by order dated 17.08.2006, passed by learned Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Madhubani in C.R. Case No.271 of 2006 corresponding to Trial No.1742 of 2013.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have entered into a compromise with the complainant, however, that compromise petition was not pressed by the complainant in the court below.

The Court finds that it is not that the allegations do not disclose offence against the petitioners, moreover the compromise petition has also not been pressed before the court below as submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners. However, the compromise petition may be moved before the court below and the same shall be considered in accordance with law.

Hence, with aforesaid observation, the application stands dismissed.

(Arun Kumar, J)

S.KUMAR/-

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

