

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.24299 of 2016

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-80 Year-2015 Thana- MIRGANJ District- Gopalganj

-
-
1. Kanhaiya Chaudhari
 2. Suresh Choudhari @ Prabhat Kumar. Both sons of Nand Kumar Choudhari.
 3. Pintu Yadav, Son of Gyan Yadav.
 4. Anup Yadav, Son of Suresh Yadav @ Suresh Choudhari @ Prabhat Kumar.
 5. Biran Yadav.
 6. Pappu Yadav. Both Sons of Pratap Choudhari. All are residents of Village-Badheya, Tola- Barauli, P.S.- Mirganj, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. State Of Bihar
2. Sanjay Kumar Ranjan, Son of- Jagdish Choudhari, Resident of Village-Badheya, Tola- Barouli, P.S.- Mirganj, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Opposite Party/s

with

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 24654 of 2016

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-80 Year-2015 Thana- MIRGANJ District- Gopalganj

Pratap Chaudhari Son of Nand Kumar Chaudhari Resident of Village-Badhaya, Tola- Barouli, P.S.- Mirganj, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. State Of Bihar
2. Sanjay Kumar Ranjan Son of Jagdish Chaudhari Resident of Village-Badhaya, Tola- Barouli, P.S.- Mirganj, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 24299 of 2016)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Suresh Prasad Bhakta, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Veena Kumari Jaiswal, APP

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 24654 of 2016)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Suresh Prasad Bhakta, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Abhay Kr. Ray, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 12-09-2023

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.24299 of 2016

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and
learned A.P.P. for the State.



2. Learned counsel for the petitioners seeks permission to withdraw the present quashing application.

3. Permission is accorded.

4. Accordingly, the present quashing application is dismissed as withdrawn.

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 24654 of 2016

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the present quashing application.

3. Permission is accorded.

4. Accordingly, the present quashing application is dismissed as withdrawn.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishi/-

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

