

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.7331 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-184 Year-2010 Thana- SONEPUR District- Saran

-
1. Raghunath Mishra and Ors Son of Meghnath Mishra Resident of Village- Gogri, P.S.- Gogri, District- Khagaria.
 2. Bharti Devi Wife of Raghunath Mishra Resident of Village- Gogri, P.S.- Gogri, District- Khagaria.
 3. Mritunjay Kumar Mishra @ Mritunjay Kumar Son of Raghunath Mishra. Resident of Village- Gogri, P.S.- Gogri, District- Khagaria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Soni Kumari Wife of Sidheshwar Nath @ Dhananjay Mishra Resident of Village- Murthan, P.S.- Sonapur, District- Saran at Chapra.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Yogendra Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Jharkhandi Upadhyay, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 11-12-2023 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned APP for the State.

2. On query of the Court with regard to the stage of the case, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that despite his best endeavours he could not contact the petitioners or the deponent of the affidavit, nor the petitioners or the deponent of the affidavit ever contacted him in these four years, as such, he is not in a position to inform the Court with regard to the stage of the case.

3. Mr. Jharkhandi Upadhyay, learned APP for the



State submits that the present quashing application has been filed seeking quashing of the order dated 18.09.2018 passed by the learned SDJM, Saran whereby application filed under Section 239 of the Cr.P.C on behalf of the petitioners seeking discharge, has been rejected. It is next submitted that from 2018 much water has flown and it is a possibility that the charges would have been framed by now and the trial also might have been concluded, as such, the petitioners or the deponent of the affidavit never contacted learned counsel for the petitioners.

4. Considering the submission made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to entertain the quashing application.

5. Accordingly, the present quashing application shall stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Adnan/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

