

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Miscellaneous No.10167 of 2018

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -166 Year- 2015 Thana -AMAS District- GAYA

=====

1. Ajay Yadav Son of Rajendra Yadav,

2. Kalawati Devi wife of Ajay Yadav,

Both Resident of Village-Tetariya, P.S.-Amas, District-Gaya.

.... Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

2. Uma Shankar Singh Son of Late Doman Singh, resident of Village-Manjhaulia,
P.S.-Amas, District-Gaya. At Present Packs Chairman, Sawkala, Village-
Tetariya, P.S.-Amas, District-Gaya.

.... Opposite Parties.

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sudhir Kumar Sinha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar Singh-1, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 31-08-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
counsel for the State.

2. By way of filing the present application under Section
482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (for short 'the Cr.P.C.'), the
petitioners have prayed for quashing of the order dated 14.09.2017
passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate- 1st Class, Sherghati, Gaya
in Amas P. S. Case No. 166 of 2015, G. R. No. 1548 of 2015 by
which he has taken cognizance of the offences under Sections 341,
387 and 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code.



3. It has been contended by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the impugned order of cognizance has been passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate by filling up blanks only in pre-typed order format. It is further contended that the order has been passed mechanically without application of judicial mind and, hence, it is fit to be set aside.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State has contended that though the impugned order has been passed on a pre-typed format by filling up gaps, it would be evident from perusal of the order impugned that sufficient grounds were available before the learned Magistrate to proceed further against the petitioners under Sections 341, 387 and 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code. He contended that merely because the order has been passed on a pre-typed format, it cannot be presumed that the learned Magistrate failed to apply his judicial mind.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and carefully perused the impugned order dated 14.09.2017.

6. Without entering into the merits of the allegations, I am of the considered opinion that the order impugned cannot be sustained as it has been passed by filling up blanks on a pre-typed format. It is true that an elaborate order is not required to be passed to take cognizance and to issue summons, but the order must disclose that



there has been an application of judicial mind. The practice of filling up of blanks in readily typed/written format for passing judicial order has been deprecated by this Court on many occasions. It is unfortunate that despite there being repeated orders in this regard, the learned learned Judicial Magistrate- 1st Class, Sherghati has passed the order in a mechanical and objectionable manner.

7. It is well settled that summoning of an accused in a criminal case is a serious matter. The need for proper application of mind by the court at the stage of summoning has been highlighted by the Supreme Court in *Pepsi Foods Ltd. and Another Vs. Special Judicial Magistrate and Others [(1998)5 SCC 749]* as under:-

“28. Summoning of an accused in a criminal case is a serious matter. Criminal law cannot be set into motion as a matter of course. It is not that the complainant has to bring only two witnesses to support his allegations in the complaint to have the criminal law set into motion. The order of the Magistrate summoning the accused must reflect that he has applied his mind to the facts of the case and the law applicable thereto. He has to examine the nature of allegations made in the complaint and the evidence both oral and documentary in support thereof and would that be sufficient for the complainant to succeed in bringing charge home to the accused. It is not that the Magistrate is a silent spectator at the time of recording of preliminary



evidence before summoning of the accused. The Magistrate has to carefully scrutinize the evidence brought on record and may even himself put questions to the complainant and his witnesses to elicit answers to find out the truthfulness of the allegations or otherwise and then examine if any offence is prima facie committed by all or any of the accused.”

8. An order of cognizance passed in a standardized format by filling up perfunctory details buttress an ex facie lack of application of judicial mind.

9. Keeping in mind the discussions made hereinabove and the ratio laid down by the Supreme Court in *Pepsi Foods Ltd. and Another* (supra), the impugned order dated 14.09.2017 passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate- 1st Class, Sherghati, Gaya in Amas P. S. Case No. 166 of 2015, G. R. No. 1548 of 2015 is quashed and the matter is remitted back to the Court of Magistrate for passing order afresh after perusing the allegations made in the first information report, case-diary and the police report submitted under Section 173(2) of the Cr.P.C.

10. I hope and trust that the learned Judicial Magistrate shall be cautious in future and shall refrain from signing orders on readily typed, written or printed format.



11. With the aforesaid observation and direction, the application stands allowed.

(Ashwani Kumar Singh, J)

Kanchan/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	04.09.2018
Transmission Date	04.09.2018

