IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.45026 of 2018
CNR No. BRHC010424712018
Arising Out of PS. Case No.-131 Year-2015 Thana- PALIGANJ District- Patna

==========

Rajesh Kumar Verma Son of Chhotelal Prasad, resident of Village Mairwan, P.S. Mairwan, District Siwan at present Goriyatoli, P.S. Kotwali, District-Patna.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajendra Kumar Jain, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Akshay Lal Pandit, APP
Mr. Jharkhandi Upadhyay, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

3 28-10-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. The defect, as pointed out by the office, is hereby ignored.

3. The present application has been filed for quashing the order dated 16.02.2018 passed by learned S.D.J.M., Danapur (Patna) whereby learned Court below has rejected the discharge petition in connection with Paliganj P.S. Case No. 131 of 2015 dated 29.06.2015 registered under Sections 419, 420, 406, 409 and 120B of the IPC.

4. The prosecution case, in brief, is that the informant, Remihi Devi, an A.N.M. posted at the Primary Health Centre, Paliganj, lodged her fardbeyan before the Officer-in-Charge of Paliganj Police Station on 29.06.2015, alleging that on 26.06.2015, she was informed by the office clerk over telephone that an amount of Rs. 9,00,000/- had been

WEB COPY

illegally withdrawn from her provident fund account. She suspected that the amount, which she had saved for the marriage of her granddaughter, had been fraudulently withdrawn with the connivance of unknown employees and officers of the Primary Health Centre, Paliganj, and the Treasury Department, Danapur.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has prayed for some time in this case to seek instruction in the matter as he has submitted that he is not in touch with the client.

5. This case is pending since 2018 and from the order dated 2.2.2023, it appears that learned counsel for the petitioner had already taken adjournment and today again the learned counsel for the petitioner is not ready to argue the case as he has no instructions regarding the stage of the case from his client.

6. In the opinion of this Court, the discharge application was rejected in the year 2018 i.e. eight years ago and now the trial must have proceeded.

7. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this application is dismissed as not pressed.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

shalini/-

U		T	

WEB COPY