

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1767 of 2016

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-69 Year-2011 Thana- JAMALPUR District- Munger

1. Shankar Yadav, Son of Achhelal Yadav null
2. Rakesh Yadav Son of Shankar Yadav
Both of Village- Fulkagumti, P.S. Jamalpur, District- Munger

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

with

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 2167 of 2016

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-69 Year-2011 Thana- JAMALPUR District- Munger

Pratap Yadav Son of Shankar Yadav, Resident of Village - Fulka Gunti, P.S. -
Jamalpur, District - Munger.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 1767 of 2016)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Arun Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.A.Dayal App

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 2167 of 2016)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Arun Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.A.Dayalapp

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

6 14-11-2019

Cr. Misc. No. 1767 of 2016

This petition has been filed for quashing the order

dated 30.10.2012 passed by the Chief Judicial Magistrate,

Munger in connection with Jamalpur P. S. Case No. 69 of

2011, whereby cognizance has been taken against the



petitioners under Section 498(A) and 306/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

This Court had asked for the report about the stage of the case which has since been received. The report is dated 15.09.2018, which indicates that charges in this case have already been framed on 10.08.2016 and the trial has progressed.

Considering this aspect of the matter, I am not inclined to entertain the present petition.

The petition is dismissed.

Cr. Misc. No. 2167 of 2016

This petition has been filed against the order dated 28.07.2015 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge – III, Munger in connection with Sessions Trial No. 202 of 2013, whereby application for discharge for the offences against the petitioners under Sections 498(A), 307, 324/341 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 has been rejected.

In this case, charges have already been framed in the year 2016 and the trial has progressed.

Considering the afore-mentioned aspect of the



matter, I am not inclined to entertain the petition.

The petition is dismissed.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

skm/-

U			
---	--	--	--

