

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.119 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-2527 Year-2015 Thana- EAST CHAMPARAN COMPLAINT
District- East Champaran

=====

Ram Chandra Sah @ Chandra Sah S/o Late Devki Sah R/o village- Vishunpur
Matiarwa, P.S.- Paharpur, District- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Awadh Kumar Shrivastava Anchal Adhikari/Circle Officer, Anchal-
Paharpur, P.S.- Paharpur, District- East Champaran
3. Mukesh Giri Rajaswa Karamchari, Anchal- Paharpur, P.S.- Paharpur,
District- East Champaran
4. Mukti Sharan Pandey Bada Babu (Head Clerk), Anchal Office- Paharpur,
P.S.- Paharpur, District- East Champaran

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sunil Kumar No.III, Advocate
For the State : Mr.Anil Kumar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

7 22-09-2025

I.A. No. 01 of 2025

The instant interlocutory application has been filed on
behalf of the petitioner for condonation of delay of 1037 days in
filing of the present criminal revision petition.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that due
to ignorance of law with regard to period of limitation and
paucity of fund, the petitioner could not approach this Court
within time.

4. From perusal of record, I find the same petitioner



moved before the learned Sessions Court against the order of learned trial court directing the complainant-petitioner to produce sanction order and the revision before the learned Sessions Court was allowed and the impugned order was set aside. So the petitioner is not so ignorant of law as he wants the Court to believe. Another submission made on behalf of petitioner is that due to intervention of Covid period, the criminal revision could not be filed earlier. This submission is not sustainable as the limitation expired on 16th of April, 2019 and the Covid struck in the country in March, 2020. For almost 11 months, the petitioner sat tight on the matter and did not file criminal revision petition against the order impugned. I am of the opinion that the reasons offered by the petitioner for condonation of delay are not sufficient and therefore, the limitation petition is dismissed.

Cr. Revision No. 119 of 2022

5. Consequently, the present criminal revision petition also stands dismissed.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

DKS/-

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

