

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 54924 of 2015

C.B.I. Case No.-6 Year-2014, District-Patna

=====

Vijay Nath Sah, Son of Late Raghunath Sah, Resident of Diwan Mohalla, Ram Janki Chowraha, P.O. Jhauganj, P.S. – Khajekala, District – Patna 800008, at present posted on the post of Inspector of Income Tax, TDS Circle, O/o the Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax (TDS), Central Revenue Building (Annexe), Birchand Patel Path, Patna -1.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Central Bureau of Investigation, Special Crime Branch, Patna, through the Superintendent of Police, Central Bureau of Investigation, Special Crime Branch, Patna, Dr. S.K. Singh Path, Bailey Road, Patna – 800022.
2. The Inspector of Police, Central Bureau of Investigation, Special Crime Branch, Patna, Dr. S.K. Singh Path, Bailey Road, Patna – 800022.
3. Maulesh Paswan, Son of Sh. Jagdish Paswan, the General Secretary, All India Income Tax SC/ST Employees Welfare Federation, Unit Patna, [Bihar & Jharkhand] at present residing at Qt. No. 179, New Type -III, Central Revenue Colony, Ashiyana Road, Patna – 25, at present posted on post of Office Superintendent, O/o the Joint/Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, Range 1, Lok Nayak Jai Prakash Bhawan, Dak Bunglow Chawraha, Patna – 800001.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pradip Kumar, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Bipin Kumar Sinha, (SC CBI)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

02 08-09-2020

Heard.

This is an application seeking quashing of the Central Bureau of Investigation, Special Crime Branch, Patna First Information Report No. RC0922014S0006 dated



30.12.2014 instituted for the offences under Sections 120B, 420, 467, 468 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code.

This Court has been informed that after submission of charge sheet in this case, cognizance has been taken. The order of cognizance has been assailed by the petitioner and others *vide* Cr. Misc. No. 31422 of 2016.

The petitioner would be well advised to pursue the aforesaid petition.

For the reason that a separate petition has been filed challenging the order of cognizance in this case, there would be no necessity to adjudicate the present petition.

The petition stands dismissed with the aforesaid observation.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

krishna/-

U T

