

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47815 of 2017

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-18 Year-2015 Thana- NAWANAGAR District- Buxar

1. Manorma Dwivedi Wife of Kanhjee Dwivedi,
2. Kanhjee Dwivedi, son of Late Sarwanomjee Dwivedi,
3. Ajay Kumar Dwivedi, son of Kanhjee Dwivedi, All resident of Village-Dariyaon, P.S.- Nawanagar, Distt- Buxar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 3 28-11-2023 1. Mr. Rajiv Ranjan Kumar Pandey, learned Advocate appears and submits that in the present case, learned Advocate, Mahesh Prasad Singh and Chandra Has Mishra are learned Advocates-on-Record. It is further submitted that the learned Advocates-on-Record for reasons best known are not representing the petitioners nor are appearing in the case. It is next submitted that the petitioners had even approached Sri Mahesh Prasad Singh, learned Advocate seeking no objection from him but he refused while Chandra Has Mishra left for his heavenly abode. It is further submitted that since the learned Advocate, Sri Mahesh Prasad Singh is not giving no objection to the petitioners, as such, petitioners have given *Vakalatnama* to him, thus, seeks permission from the Court for filing



Vakalatnama.

2. The learned APP for the State, Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, rebuts the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioners and submits that if what has been submitted by the learned counsel is correct in that event the correct procedure to be adopted by the petitioners was to approach the Bar Council against the conduct of the learned lawyers who refused to grant N.O.C. It is further submitted that there is no material available on record before this Court to arrive at a conclusion that the learned Advocate, Sri Mahesh Prasad Singh is not granting No Objection Certificate, except for the submission of the learned lawyer.

3. Considering the submission made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to entertain the submission made by the learned counsel, Sri Rajiv Ranjan Kumar Pandey.

4. It is construed that none has appeared on behalf of the petitioners to represent their case, as such, the case is dismissed for non-prosecution.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

