

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.636 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.- Year-0 Thana- District- Vaishali

Ranjan Pandey @ Pravan Kumar Pandey, Son of Vijay Kumar Pandey,
Resident of Ward No.- 15, S.D.O. Road, P.S. Hajipur Town, Hajipur, Vaishali,
Bihar - 844101.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Noor Mohammad, Son of Late Abdul Rauf Resident of Jadhua Bagh Tola,
Post - Hajipur, Police Station - Hajipur Nagar, District - Vaishali.
3. Sangita Pandey Wife of Late Mantu Pandey Resident of Ward No.- 15,
S.D.O. Road, Hajipur Vaishali, Bihar.
4. Susalt @ Manu Pandey Son of Mantu Pandey Resident of Ward No.- 15,
S.D.O. Road, Hajipur Vaishali, Bihar.
5. Rinki Pandey Wife of Late Sanju Pandey Resident of Ward No.- 15, S.D.O.
Road, Hajipur Vaishali, Bihar.
6. Jeetlal Pandey (Minor) Son of Sanju Pandey Resident of Ward No.- 15,
S.D.O. Road, Hajipur, Vaishali, Bihar.
7. Bali Alam Son of Sekh Saheb Jan Resident of Jadhua, Bagh Tola, P.O.-
Jadhua, Police Station - Hajipur, District - Vaishali.
8. Noor Alam Son of Sekh Saheb Jan Resident of Jadhua, Bagh Tola, P.O.-
Jadhua, Police Station - Hajipur, District - Vaishali.
9. Mahmood Alam Son of Sekh Saheb Jan Resident of Jadhua, Bagh Tola,
P.O.- Jadhua, Police Station - Hajipur, District - Vaishali.
10. Mahmad Farida Son of Sanid Alam Resident of Jadhua, Bagh Tola, P.O.-
Jadhua, Police Station - Hajipur, District - Vaishali.
11. Mahmad Ashique Son of Sanid Alam Resident of Jadhua, Bagh Tola, P.O.-
Jadhua, Police Station - Hajipur, District - Vaishali.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Madhukar Pandey, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr.Mukesh Kumar Singh, APP
For O.P.No. 2	:	Mr. Ajit Kumar Ojha, Advocate
		Mr. Mirtunjay Kumar, Advocate
		Ms. Urvashi Bharti, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

5 19-08-2025

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated



05.05.2022 passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer, Vaishali at Hajipur passed under Section 144 of the Code of Criminal Procedure in Case No. M1/574/22.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, submits that since the order has been passed on 05.05.2022, it has lost its effect, but the petitioner is aggrieved by the operative portion of the order wherein the Sub-Divisional Officer observed that unless the competent authority passes any order for cancellation of the registered sale deed executed in favour of the first party, till that date, the proceeding stood vacated in favour of the first party and was made absolute against the second party and the order was to lost its effect only when any order came from any competent court. Further, the second party was prohibited from going to the land and making any sort of construction. Therefore, the impugned order suffers from impropriety on account of this type of prohibition against the petitioner/second party.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of opposite party no.2/second set submits that there is no infirmity in the impugned order and even the order prohibiting the petitioner would remain in effect till the efficacy of the order of the Sub-Divisional Officer. So, the petitioner could have no



grievance on this account.

5. Having regard to the rival submission of the parties and without going into details of the case, since any order passed under Section 144 Cr.P.C, remains effective for only sixty days from the date of passing of the order, any observation made therein will also remain in effective for the said stipulated period and would not get extended beyond that period of sixty days.

6. Accordingly, the present revision petition is disposed of as having become infructuous with the aforesaid observation.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

V.K.Pandey/-

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

