

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.56643 of 2017

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-58 Year-2014 Thana- KESARIA District- East Champaran

1. Munna Singh @ Ravinder Singh, Son of Late Bir Bahadur Singh,
2. Sinku Singh @ Pinku Singh,
3. Sonu Singh @ Monu Singh, Both are sons of Munna Singh @ Ravinder Singh,
4. Ruby Kumari @ Lakki Kumari,
5. Antima Kumari,
6. Neha Kumari, all are daughters of Munna Singh @ Ravinder Singh,
7. Janki Devi, Wife of Munna Singh @ Ravinder Singh, All are resident of Village- Kabirpur, P.S.- Mohammadpur, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Shankar Shrivastava- Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad- A.P.P.

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, the learned counsel for the petitioners submits

that despite his best endeavour, he could not contact the

petitioners nor the deponent of the affidavit. It is also

submitted that neither the petitioners nor the deponent of

the affidavit ever contacted him in these six years, as such,

he is not in a position to inform the Court with regard to the



stage of the case.

3. The learned Additional P. P. thus submits that the present quashing application has been filed seeking quashing of the order dated 27.07.2017, by which Criminal Revision No.37 of 2017 was dismissed affirming the order dated 18.01.2017 passed by the learned A.C.J.M.-11th, Motihari, whereby petition filed under Section 239 of the Cr.P.C. on behalf of the petitioners seeking discharge was rejected. It is next submitted that much water has flown and it may be a possibility that the trial might have concluded by now and that perhaps explains why the petitioners nor the deponent of the affidavit ever contacted the learned counsel for the petitioners.

4. Considering the submission made by the learned Additional P. P., the Court is not inclined to entertain the quashing application.

5. Accordingly, the quashing application is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

