

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.52115 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-390 Year-2010 Thana- WEST CHAMPARAN COMPLAINT
District- West Champaran

-
1. Savita Devi @ Chhathi Devi Wife of Om Prakash Mahto @ Om Prakash Kushwaha Resident of village- Rampur (Bagaha), Police Station- Bagaha, District- West Champaran.
 2. Om Prakash Mahto @ Om Prakash Kushwaha Son of Jagdish Mahto Resident of village- Rampur (Bagaha), Police Station- Bagaha, District- West Champaran.
 3. Nirjala Devi Wife of Sudama Mahto Resident of village- Telpur, Police Station- Lauriya, District- West Champaran.
 4. Amla Devi Wife of Shankar Mahto Resident of village- Telpur, Police Station- Lauriya, District- West Champaran.
 5. Krishna Mahto @ Krishna Kumar Son of Shankar Mahto Resident of village- Telpur, Police Station- Lauriya, District- West Champaran.
 6. Pukar Mahto Son of Shankar Mahto Resident of village- Telpur, Police Station- Lauriya, District- West Champaran.
 7. Sudama Mahto Son of Shankar Mahto Resident of village- Telpur, Police Station- Lauriya, District- West Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Patna
2. Laxami Prasad Son of Late Gopal Prasad Resident of village- Amwa Majhar, Police Station- Bettiah (Mufassil), District- West Champaran.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anand Kishore Choudhary, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pandey, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 16-09-2025 Heard Mr. Anand Kishore Choudhary, learned counsel

 appearing on behalf of the petitioners and Mr. Sanjay Kumar

 Pandey, learned APP for the State.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the

petitioners informs that in view of the fact he has been

instructed that the victim, who is the daughter of the informant,



has already married with some other person and as such, proceeding pending before the learned District Court is vexatious in nature and the same is required to be quashed.

3. *Per contra*, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State informs that the petitioners have not challenged the order, which has been taken as per prosecution under Section 319 of the CrPC. and they sought for quashing of order dated 05.06.2025 by which the petitioners' application for discharge has been rejected.

4. In view of the changed circumstances and stage of trial I am not inclined to interfere with the order passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge IInd, West Champaran, Bettiah in connection with Sessions Case No.227 of 2012(C.I.S. No.1971 of 2013) arising out of Complaint Case No.390 of 2010.

5. The petitioner is at liberty to avail remedy in accordance with law.

6. Accordingly, the present application stands disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Ashishsingh/-

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

