

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.807 of 2017

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-2 Year-1987 Thana- ARA MUFFSIL District- Bhojpur

=====

Bharat Pd. Sao @ Bharat Sao Son of Late Bishwanath Sao, Resident of
Village- Shubh Karan Ganj, Police Station- Arrah Muffasil, District- Bhojpur
(Arrah). Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Hari Prasad Yadav, Son of Dewdhari Yadav.
3. Lallan Yadav, Son of Chhabila Yadav.
4. Shankardeo Yadav, Son of Jhagaru Yadav,
All Resident of Village- Shubhakaranganj, Police- Station- Arrah Mufassil,
District- Bhojpur (Arrah).

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ram Lallan Singh, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Tarkeshwar Nath Thakur, APP.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 21-04-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

The present Cr. Revision Application has been filed against the judgment and order dated 23.06.2017 passed by Sessions Judge Ist F.T.C., Bhojpur Arrah in S.Tr. Case No. 229 of 1989 ignoring and disobeying the direction and guideline given by this Hon'ble Court in Cr. Revision No. 382 of 2003.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has filed the application for compliance of said order passed in Cr. Revision No. 382 of 2003 but instead of compliance, trial court has rejected the same, therefore, he has preferred the criminal revision again.

Learned A.P.P. for the State submits that the present case is not maintainable as from the dated 23.06.2017 it



transpires that order of High Court has been fully complied.

After going through the order dated 23.06.2017 and upon hearing the parties on this point, it has been categorically stated in the judgment that this Hon'ble Court by the order passed in Cr. Revision No. 382 of 2003 has directed to consider the available documents on record and upon hearing the argument of the parties to pass fresh order whereas the petitioner wants that his new evidence should be accepted by re-opening the case which is not permissible in law particularly when the trial is pending since 1989.

The trial court is directed to conclude the trial within two months from the date of communication of this order as it is one of the oldest matter i.e. of the year 1987. No fresh document is directed to consider but if already available on record then court shall acknowledge the same, if not then court shall proceed further.

With this direction, the present Cr. Revision Application stands dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

ritik/-

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

