

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.84214 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-66 Year-2024 Thana- MANJHI District- Saran

Raman Kumar Singh @ Raman Kumar @ Ram Kumar Singh Son of
Upendra Singh @ Upendra Kumar Singh Village- Bhajouna, Nachap,
P.S. -Manjhi, Dist. -Saran, Bihar, 841208

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms.Sarandha Suman, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Jharkhandi Upadhyay,APP

Mr.Dewendra Narayan Singh, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA SHEKHAR JHA
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 14-05-2025

Heard Ms. Sarandha Suman, learned counsel
appearing for the petitioner and Mr. Dewendra Narayan
Singh, learned counsel for the informant.

2. The present petition was preferred by the
petitioner for quashing of the order dated 16.11.2024 as
passed by the learned Additional District & Sessions Judge
-15, Saran at Chapra, in connection with Sessions Trial No.
711 of 2024, whereby learned court has been pleased to
reject the discharge petition filed by the petitioner in
connection with Manjhi P.S. Case No. 66 of 2024 registered
under sections 304B/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section



3 & 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 and further to quash the order dated 03.09.2024 by which charges have been framed against the petitioner under section 304B/34 and 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code on the sole ground that same was filed during pendency of his discharge petition as preferred under section 227 of the Cr.P.C.

3. From perusal of the record and also by taking note of the argument as advanced by learned counsel for the parties, it appears that charges have already been framed against the petitioner on 03.09.2024 in the first half of the court working day, whereas a petition under section 227 of the Cr.P.C. was received by court in post-lunch session i.e. at 2:05 P.M.

4. It appears from impugned order that by taking a guiding note of the legal report of Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court as available through **Dev Rattan Vs. State of Haryana [1989 Cri LJ 1044]**, as no order of discharge can be made after framing of charge against accused persons, the aforesaid petition for discharge was rejected.



5. Taking note of aforesaid fact as discharge petition was subsequently filed after framing of charge, which is apparent from the order dated 03.09.2024, of the learned trial court, the present petition stands devoid of any merit.

6. Accordingly, this application stands dismissed.

(Chandra Shekhar Jha, J)

Rajeev/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	14.05.2025
Transmission Date	14.05.2025

