

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.29386 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-27 Year-2020 Thana- PARSA District- Saran

Uday Nath Puri @ Uday Puri Son of panchanand Puri Resident of Village -
Anyay, Post office - Babhangawan, Police Station - Parsa, District - Saran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Gopal Govind Mishra, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Jharkhandi Upadhyay, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 10-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

2. The present application has been filed for quashing
the order dated 17.06.2020 passed by the learned Additional
District and Sessions Judge-Ist, Chapra in Parsa Police Station
Case No. 27/2020 and Regd. ST POCSO No. 10/20 by which
the learned Magistrate has taken cognizance against the
petitioner and issue non-bailable warrant.

3. The prosecution case in brief is that the informant
namely Anita Devi, wife of Shambhu Rai, resident of Village-
Mujauna, Police District-Saran Station- Parsa, instituted First
Information Report alleging therein that her daughter, aged
about 14 years, went for natural call outside the house. The
informant further alleged that when she did not return the



informant and others started searching her. The informant further alleged that her daughter was found at some distance from the house in unconscious position. The informant further alleged that the petitioner was identified along with one unknown person to be involved in the crime.

4. The name of the petitioner has come during investigation and chargesheet has been submitted against him. Thereafter, cognizance has been taken.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that his prosecution may be quashed because he is not named in the FIR.

6. A person may not be named in the FIR but if his name transpires during investigation, he can be proceeded against. As the petitioner has been charge-sheeted, I see no reason to interfere by examining the defence of the petitioner.

7. This application is dismissed.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

P. Kumar

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

