

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.118 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-504 Year-2020 Thana- AKBARPUR District- Nawada

Ravindra Kumar Son Of Late Rajdeo Yadav Resident Of Village- Ghutkhan,
P.S- Fatehpur, Dist- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Satya Nand Shukla, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL JUDGMENT**

Date : 24-11-2022

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The present quashing application has been filed for quashing the order dated 04.12.2021 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge-XII, Nawada in connection with S.T. No. 199 of 2021 (arising out of Akbarpur P.S. Case No. 504 of 2020) whereby and whereunder the learned Additional Sessions Judge-XII, Nawada has rejected the petition filed under Section 227 of the Cr.P.C. dated 27.08.2021 for discharging the petitioner under Sections 302/34, 201/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case, some unknown person had murdered the daughter of the informant and threw her dead body near Patangi More.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not named in the F.I.R and the name of the petitioner has been transpired during investigation on the basis of the confessional statement of co-accused, namely, Pravin Kumar @ Pawan Kumar and petitioner is neither involved in the present occurrence nor he has any concerned with the co-accused person. He further submits that from perusal of the F.I.R it appears that there is love affair between the deceased, namely, Kirti Kumari and the co-accused, namely, Pravin Kumar @ Pawan Kumar and due to physical relationship between the two, the deceased became pregnant and the co-accused administered pills of abortion due to which the deceased died. He further submits that the petitioner has no role at all in the present occurrence and the learned Court below without appreciating the fact, rejected the discharge petition of the petitioner.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the prayer of the petitioner.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, this Court finds that learned court below has rightly rejected the discharge petition and this Court does not find any infirmity in the order of the Court below which may warrant interference of this Court under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.



7. In view of the aforesaid, this Court does not find any merit in the application. Accordingly, it is dismissed.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Vanisha/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	19.03.2024
Transmission Date	19.03.2024

