

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION No.884 of 2017

- 1.1. Sanjay Kumar Mehta Son of Late Ramchandra Mehta, Resident of Village
1. Barahkurwa, Police Station - Treveniganj, District Supaul.
- 1.1. Manoj Mehta Son of Late Ramchandra Mehta, Resident of Village
2. Barahkurwa, Police Station - Treveniganj, District Supaul.
- 1.1. Sikendra Mehta Son of Late Ramchandra Mehta, Resident of Village
3. Barahkurwa, Police Station - Treveniganj, District Supaul.
- 1.2. Krishnadeo Mehta Son of Late Babuji Mehta, Resident of Village
Barahkurwa, Police Station - Treveniganj, District Supaul.
- 1.3. Rajendra Mehta Son of Late Babuji Mehta, Resident of Village Barahkurwa,
Police Station - Treveniganj, District Supaul.
- 1.4. Sitaram Mehta Son of Late Babuji Mehta, Resident of Village Barahkurwa,
Police Station - Treveniganj, District Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

- 1.1. Anil Kumar Mehta S/o Late Ramdeo Mehta, Resident of Village
Barahkurwa, Police Station - Treveniganj, District Supaul.
- 1.2. Indra Devi W/o Late Ramdeo Mehta, Resident of Village Barahkurwa,
Police Station - Treveniganj, District Supaul.
- 1.3. Anita Devi W/o Late Laleshwar Mehta, Resident of Village Barahkurwa,
Police Station - Treveniganj, District Supaul.
- 1.4. Bhushan Kumar S/o late Laleshwar Mehta, Resident of Village Barahkurwa,
Police Station - Treveniganj, District Supaul.
- 1.5. Ravish Kumar S/o Late Laleshwar Mehta, Resident of Village Barahkurwa,
Police Station - Treveniganj, District Supaul.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vivek Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 07-07-2025

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and I
intend to dispose of the present petition at the stage of
admission itself.

02. The petitioners are aggrieved by the order dated



30.01.2017 passed by the learned Munsif, Supaul in Title Suit No. 57 of 1994 whereby and whereunder the objection raised by the original plaintiff/petitioner to the report dated 17.07.2014 submitted by the Police Laboratory, CID, Patna has been rejected.

03. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the main grievance of the petitioners is on the ground that the documents were to be sent in terms of the order dated 07.03.2014 but the documents were sent twice by the court. However, the learned counsel has failed to point out how the sending of the documents in this manner has affected the rights of the plaintiff/petitioner. Further, this objection was taken into consideration by the learned trial court in the impugned order dated 30.01.2017 and the learned trial court also considered that whether the documents were sent in terms of order dated 07.03.2014 or not. Perusal of impugned order shows that the documents in terms of order dated 07.03.2014 were sent in three sets to the Criminal Laboratory, Patna and thereafter at the request of Director, Criminal Laboratory, Patna, essential documents in the original form were again furnished. If the documents were sent and report was obtained from the Police Laboratory, CID, Patna, merely on the ground that the report is



not of liking of the plaintiff/petitioner, his plea could not be accepted.

04. The plaintiff/petitioner has also taken a plea that authenticity of the report should be tested by sending all the relevant documents to some other laboratory. Unless the plaintiff/petitioner is able to point out any infirmity in the report, merely making wild allegation without any substance, would not help of the cause of the plaintiff/petitioner.

05. In the light of aforesaid facts and circumstances, I do not find any error on part of the learned trial court in passing the impugned order. Hence, the impugned order date 30.01.2017 is hereby affirmed.

06. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

Ashish/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	11.07.2025
Transmission Date	NA

