

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.981 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-785 Year-1997 Thana- ROHTAS COMPLAINT CASE District-
Rohtas

=====

Brij Nandan Pandey Son Of Late Sheo Nath Pandey Resident Of Village -
Bandoo, P.S.- Nauhatta, Dist.- Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Rang Nath Pandey Son Of Late Shri Pawan Kumar Pandey Resident Of
Village - Bandu, P.S.- Nauhatta, Dist.- Rohtas.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ashutosh Tripathy
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Mohammed Arif

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

7 30-04-2024 The sole contention of the petitioner for setting aside

the impugned order dated 07.05.2019 passed by Additional

Sessions Judge-IX, Rohtas at Sasaram in Cr. Appeal No. 99 of

2008 is that the date of judgment was fixed on 08.05.2019 but

the same was pronounced on 07.05.2019.

2. I have heard the learned counsel for the

petitioner and learned counsel for the private respondents i.e. the

accused.

3. Learned counsel for the private respondents has

submitted that the judgment has been pronounced on 08.05.2019

and not on 07.05.2019. The judgment was pronounced in

presence of the petitioner which is apparent from an application



filed by the petitioner.

4. He further argued that there is a typographical error in the date of judgment. Though the Judgment was passed on 08.05.2019, but the date of judgment has been shown as 07.05.2019.

5. The argument of the learned counsel for the opposite party does not inspire confidence.

6. This application is allowed and the judgment 07.05.2019 passed by Additional Sessions Judge-IX, Rohtas at Sasaram in Cr. Appeal No. 99 of 2008 is set aside.

7. The matter is remitted back to the court below with direction to pass a fresh order in accordance with law after hearing the parties.

8. With the aforesaid observation and direction, this application is allowed.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

Shishir/-

U			
---	--	--	--

