

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL REVISION No.20 of 2018**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.- Year-1111 Thana- District-

=====

Sudama Roy @ Sudama Singh S/o Late Jag Narayan Singh @ Jaggu Roy, R/o  
Village- Shahpur, P.S.- Shahpur, District- Bhojpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate, Bhojpur at Ara.
3. The S.D.M., Jagdishpur , District - Bhojpur at Ara.
4. The Executive Magistrate, Jagdishpur, District- Bhojpur at Ara.
5. The Anchaladhikari, Shahpur, District- Bhojpur at Ara.
6. The S.H.O., Shahpur, P.S. at Shahpur, District- Bhojpur at Ara.
7. Baliram Tiwari, S/o Late Raghubir Tiwari, R/o Village- Shahpur, P.S.-  
Shahpur, District- Bhojpur at Ara.
8. Gaya Singh S/o Late Jay Govind Singh,
9. Laxman Singh
10. Ram Chander Singh
11. Hareram Singh,
12. Sri Bhagwan Singh All Sons of Late Gaya Singh, All R/o Village- Shahpur,  
P.S.- Shahpur, District- Bhojpur at Ara.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                                    |
|----------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr. Chandan Kumar Verma, Advocates |
| For the OP No. 7     | : | Mr. Rash Bihari Thakur, Advocate   |
| For the OP No. 10    | : | Mr. Dhanendra Chaubey, Advocate    |
| For the State        | : | Mr. Yogendra Kumar, APP            |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN**  
**AMANULLAH**

**ORAL JUDGMENT**

**Date : 02-07-2019**

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner; learned APP  
for the State; learned counsel for the opposite party no. 7 and  
learned counsel for the opposite party no. 10.



2. The petitioner has moved the Court under Sections 397 and 401 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for the following relief:

*“That the present Revision is directed to set aside the order dated 24.8.2017 by the Executive Magistrate, Jagdishpur, Bhojpur at Ara in Case No. 70 of 2000/Tr. No.26/2013 under section 145 Cr.P.C. decided on the basis of compromise only to the extent of 0.03 decimal land and directed the officer in-charge of concerned police station and Anchaladhikari for necessary action which is totally illegal and without jurisdiction.”*

3. After hearing the parties, it appears that the dispute was with regard to 3 decimals of land. However, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the total land was 12 decimals in which he also had share on the ground that it belonged to his ancestor as per the *Khatiyani*. He further submitted that subsequently also, there has been compromise between the parties.

4. Having regard to the fact that the dispute in the present case relates to 3 decimals of land, which has been granted to the opposite party no. 7 and that land is not in dispute between the parties any more, the Court does not find any occasion to interfere in the order impugned.

5. Accordingly, the application stands disposed off.

6. However, it shall be open to the parties to act in accordance with any compromise, which may have been arrived



between the parties, in accordance with law, and if required before  
the appropriate forum.

**(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J.)**

P. Kumar

|          |  |
|----------|--|
| AFR/NAFR |  |
| U        |  |
| T        |  |

