

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA  
CRIMINAL APPEAL (DB) No.600 of 2023**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-27 Year-2012 Thana- UDWANTNAGAR District- Bhojpur

Baliram Singh @ Bali Singh Son Of Late Sabhapati Singh Dihri, Ps- Udwant  
Nagar, District- Bhojpur. ... .. Appellant

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Kamleshwar Singh Son Of Late Shiv Vachan Singh @ Sidheshwar Singh  
Resident Of Villge- Dihri, Ps- Udwant Nagar, District- Bhojpur
3. Ranjan Singh Son Of Musahar Singh @ Sudeshwar Singh Resident Of  
Villge- Dihri, Ps- Udwant Nagar, District- Bhojpur
4. Sanjeet Kumar @ Sanjeet Singh Son Of Musahar Singh @ Sudeshwar Singh  
Resident Of Villge- Dihri, Ps- Udwant Nagar, District- Bhojpur
5. Madho Singh Son Of Late Somaru Singh Resident Of Villge- Dihri, Ps-  
Udwant Nagar, District- Bhojpur
6. Shikandar Singh @ Shikandar Son Of Kameshwar Singh Resident Of  
Villge- Dihri, Ps- Udwant Nagar, District- Bhojpur

... .. Respondents.

**Appearance :**

|                         |   |                                                                                                                           |
|-------------------------|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Appellant/s     | : | Mr. Ravindra Kumar, Advocate<br>Mr. Priyanshu Kumar, Advocate<br>Mr. Sanjeet Kumar, Advocate<br>Mr. Amish Kumar, Advocate |
| For the State           | : | Mr. Syed Ashfaque Ahmad, APP                                                                                              |
| For the Res. No. 2 to 6 | : | Mr. Murlidhar Mishra, Advocate<br>Mr. Subhesh Pandey, Advocate                                                            |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD  
and  
HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA  
ORAL JUDGMENT  
(Per: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA)**

**Date : 17-03-2026**

Heard learned counsel for the appellant, learned APP for  
the State and learned counsel for the respondent nos. 2 to 6.

2. The present appeal has been preferred under Section  
372 proviso of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 challenging  
the judgment and order dated 25.04.2023 passed by the Court of



Additional Sessions Judge-III, Civil Court, Bhojpur (Ara) in Sessions Trial No.220 of 2013 (arising out of Udwantnagar P.S. Case NO. 27 of 2012) whereby and whereunder the respondents have been acquitted by the learned trial court from the charges levelled against them under Sections 302, 307, and 120 (B) of the Indian Penal Code read with section 34 of the Indian Penal Code (hereinafter referred to as 'IPC') and section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The records of this appeal have been placed before this Court for consideration of the prayer of the appellant.

4. The prosecution case emerging from the fardbeyan (Ext.4) of the informant, namely Baliram Singh @ Bali Singh, is that on 10.01.2012 at about 16:15 hours, he along with his son Hare Krishna Singh was returning to his house from Ara and when they reached near the farmyard of Lallu Singh, they were surrounded by the accused persons namely Madho Singh, Dharmendra Singh, Kameshwar Singh, Sikandar Singh, Yogendra Singh @ Punjabi, Musahar Singh, Rajan Singh, Sanjeet Singh and Ramjeet Singh, who were all variously armed. It is alleged that Madho Singh and Kameshwar Singh instigated the other accused persons to kill the informant and his son, upon which all the accused persons caught hold of the informant's son Hare Krishna Singh. Thereafter, Dharmendra Singh and Sikandar Singh fired on



the head of Hare Krishna Singh, as a result of which he fell. It is further alleged that the accused persons also assaulted the informant by means of fists and slaps. At the same time, Madho Singh also fired at the informant, however the bullet was misfired. Upon raising alarm, informant's wife Moharmato Devi and other villagers reached the place of occurrence and witnessed the incident. Seeing the villagers gathering at the place of occurrence, all the accused persons fled away. It is further alleged that Hare Krishna Singh died due to the gunshot injury fired by Dharmendra Singh. The reason for the occurrence is stated to be a land dispute between the parties, as the accused persons allegedly intended to grab the land of the informant. It is also alleged that Madho Singh, who is a Chowkidar, is the main conspirator behind the occurrence.

5. On the basis of the above-mentioned fardbeyan of the informant- Baliram Singh @ Bali Singh, Udwantnagar P.S. Case No. 27 of 2012 was registered by the police against nine accused persons including the appellant. After submission of the charge-sheet against accused persons, cognizance was taken by the learned C.J.M under sections 302, 307 and 120(B) read with Section 34 of the IPC and 27 of Arms Act, whereafter the case was committed to the Court of Sessions vide order dated 22.05.2013,



giving rise to Sessions Case Nos. 220 of 2013, 221 of 2013 and 222 of 2013, which were subsequently amalgamated.

6. Accordingly, the trial proceeded against six accused persons, one of them was declared juvenile vide order dated 03.08.2016, and his case was separated. Thereafter, the trial proceeded against the remaining five accused persons.

7. Further, charges under Sections 302, 307 and 120(B) IPC and Section 27 of the Arms Act were framed against the five accused persons vide order dated 26.09.2013 to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried. The statement of the accused persons under Section 313 Cr.P.C was recorded on 07.04.2022, after closure of the prosecution evidence.

8. The prosecution to substantiate its case during trial has examined, as many as, eight witnesses and has exhibited several documents, while the defence have neither examined any witness nor exhibited any document. The list of prosecution witnesses and documents exhibited on behalf of prosecution and defence are mentioned hereinbelow in a tabular chart:

**List of Prosecution witnesses**

|     |                                 |
|-----|---------------------------------|
| PW1 | Suraj Kumar Singh @ Suraj Singh |
| PW2 | Radhika Devi                    |
| PW3 | Anjali Devi @ Rinku Devi        |



|     |                                                                              |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| PW4 | Dr. R.N. Yadav (Doctor who conducted autopsy of deceased Hare Krishna Singh) |
| PW5 | Vijay Prasad Rai (SHO -Cum-IO)                                               |
| PW6 | Moharwati Devi (Mother of deceased)                                          |
| PW7 | Maheshwar Singh                                                              |
| PW8 | Baliram Singh (Informant)                                                    |

**List of Exhibits on behalf of Prosecution**

|       |                                                   |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Ext.1 | Post-Mortem Report                                |
| Ext.2 | Formal FIR                                        |
| Ext.3 | Fard-bayan                                        |
| Ext.4 | Signature of informant Baliram Singh @ Bali Singh |

**FINDINGS OF THE TRIAL COURT**

9. The learned trial court, upon analyzing the evidence and deposition of the prosecution witnesses with respect to the charges levelled against the respondents arrived at the conclusion that the prosecution has failed to prove and establish well beyond reasonable doubt, both the criminal act and intent of the accused persons and that the prosecution was not able to bring home the charges against the accused persons. Accordingly, the accused persons/respondents stood acquitted of the charges framed under



Sections 302, 307 & 120(B) read with Section 34 of I.P.C & Section 27 of the Arms Act, in absence of sufficient evidence and were thus discharged from the liabilities of their bail bonds.

**ARGUMENT ON BEHALF OF APPELLANT**

10. The argument of the learned counsel for the informant/appellant is that the witnesses of the prosecution have fully supported the allegations against the accused persons. It has been specifically submitted that there is a direct allegation that the appellant along with the other co-accused persons fired on Hare Krishna Singh (deceased), resulting in his death while other co-accused persons also assaulted the informant by means of lathi, danda, farsa, etc. It has further been submitted that the medical evidence in form of the Post Mortem Report and the deposition of the doctor (PW4) also indicates that the deceased died due to gunshot injury. Considering the allegations to be serious in nature, it was prayed that the accused persons deserve to be convicted and the impugned judgment of acquittal be thus set aside.

**ARGUMENT ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENTS**

11. Per contra, the learned APP for the State and respondent nos. 2 to 6 have emphatically submitted that the accused persons are totally innocent and they have been falsely



implicated on account of previous enmity and land dispute. The witnesses of the prosecution are all interested and hearsay and as a matter of fact there is no eyewitness of the incident as upon perusal of the deposition of the witnesses, it becomes apparent that they were not present at the place occurrence at the alleged time of incident. The Investigating Officer has also not collected any evidence worth the name to lend support to the case of the prosecution. As such, the charges levelled against the accused persons/respondents have not been proved by the prosecution beyond reasonable doubt and hence, the acquittal of the respondents do not need to be interfered with.

### **ANALYSIS AND CONSIDERATION**

12. We have heard learned counsel for the informant/appellant, learned APP for the State and learned counsel for respondent nos. 2 to 6 and considered the materials on record. The prosecution has examined as many as eight witnesses as enumerated hereinbefore in the tabular chart, whose evidence needs to be briefly analyzed for arriving at a justifiable decision.

13. P.W.-1 (Suraj Kumar Singh @ Suraj Singh), who happens to be uncle of the deceased, has claimed to be an eyewitness in his examination-in-chief by stating that he had



reached the place of occurrence upon alarm being raised and even intervened in the clash which was taking place between the accused persons and the informant and the deceased. However, in his cross examination in para-8, he has stated that there is no other witness to the incident but for his family members while in para-14, he made a statement that when he was going towards the place of occurrence he did not meet anyone on the way and did not witness the alleged incident (Maarpit), when he reached the place of occurrence. He has further clarified in para18 of his deposition that he had not reached the place of occurrence while the incident was happening and further in para-20, he stated that he reached after the occurrence. He also disclosed that his brother had told him about the occurrence. It thus, appears from totality of his evidence that he is not an eyewitness to the occurrence but is only a hearsay witness.

14. P.W.-2 (Radhika Devi), the mother of the deceased and P.W.-3 (Anjali Devi), the wife of the deceased have admitted in their examination-in-chief itself that it was the informant who had informed them about the incident and the information was also given by the villagers. While P.W.-2 has admitted that hundreds of people had already reached the place of occurrence before her, P.W.-3 has specifically stated in para-16 of her deposition that she



was at the rooftop of her house along with Maheshwar Singh (P.W.-7), her mother-in-law Moharmati Devi (P.W.-6), father-in-law Suraj Singh (P.W.-1) & Radhika Devi (P.W.-2), at the time of firing. In para-17 and 18, she had further confirmed that she had stated before the Investigating Officer that she was at her rooftop along with the aforesaid family members and before she or her family members reached the place of occurrence, 20 to 30 persons had already assembled but she is unable to name any of them. Thus, she negates not only her presence at the place of occurrence as an eye witness but other witnesses too, including P.W.-1, P.W.-2, P.W.-6 and P.W.-7.

15. As per the deposition of P.W.-4 (Dr. R.N. Yadav)– Cause of death is due to shock & hemorrhage caused by firearm injury which is consistent with the prosecution case of the deceased being killed by firing of gunshot.

16. P.W.-6 (Moharmati Devi), wife of the informant and P.W.-7 (Maheshwar Singh), son of the informant have also made an attempt to pose themselves as eyewitness of the occurrence but P.W.-6 in para-7 of her cross-examination has stated that 10 to 20 persons were already present at the place of occurrence, before she reached. Further, PW7 in Para-6 of his cross-examination stated that before he reached the place of occurrence, thirty to forty



people were already assembled there. In para-7, he stated that he saw his brother lying on the ground having gun-shot injury. Thus, upon a cumulative reading of the testimonies of P.W.-6 and P.W.-7, read in conjunction with the deposition of P.W.-3, it becomes evident that P.W.-6 & P.W.-7 were on the rooftop of P.W.-3 at the time of firing. Therefore, P.W.-6 & P.W.-7 were only hearsay witnesses and have not seen the alleged occurrence.

17. Thus, upon consideration of the deposition of all the above mentioned prosecution witnesses, it is gathered that the witnesses are all giving a hearsay account of the occurrence on the basis of what has been fed to them by the informant (P.W.-8), which takes us to analyse the evidence of the informant, Baliram Singh @ Bali Singh, examined as P.W.8.

18. P.W.-8 (Baliram Singh @ Bali Singh), the appellant, who is also the informant of the present case, claims to have witnessed the occurrence as he has stated that he was coming along with the deceased from Ara and the occurrence took place when they reached the field of Lallu Singh. He has reiterated the story, narrated in the fardbeyan (Exhibit-4) to the extent that Madho Singh (R-5) and Kameshwar Singh (R-2) had exhorted for killing the deceased. So far as the allegation of opening fire on deceased is concerned, while this witness had attributed such



allegation on Dharmendra Singh and Sikandar Singh in the FIR, during trial the said allegation is confined to Dharmendra Singh only, which led to the death of the deceased.

19. The attempt of the informant (P.W.8) to portray himself as an eyewitness has also failed as his evidence suffers from the vice of inherent inconsistencies and is replete with major contradictions. Neither does his presence gets established by the evidence of other witnesses nor he has been able to give any details of the incident in order to inspire confidence. On the contrary, he has not even been consistent in mentioning names of the accused who fired at the deceased and most importantly, fired at him. He even failed to give any satisfactory reason for being present at the place of occurrence with the deceased.

20. Learned counsel for the appellant has contended that although the informant (P.W.8) is the only eye witness, but his evidence may be kept in the category of a 'wholly reliable' witness. It is an admitted position and there is no contest with the finding of the learned trial court that all other prosecution witnesses are not eye witnesses of the occurrence.

21. So far as the testimony of P.W.-8 is concerned, we have closely looked into the same and find that he has changed his statement during course of trial. While in the fardbeyan, he has



mentioned the name of Madho Singh as his assailant who had fired upon him, in course of trial he has attributed such allegation upon Sikandar. There are other deficient statements such as, he could not say that for how long he was present at the place of occurrence and when the police arrived at the place of occurrence, from which direction bullets were shot etc., all these together make us to believe that he cannot fall in the category of a 'wholly reliable' witness as veracity cannot be attached to his testimony and his testimony alone, without sufficient corroboration from independent quarters, would not be sufficient, much less safe, to convict the respondent nos. 2 to 6. This Court is unable to reach an irresistible conclusion as to the guilt of the respondents.

22. Moreover, the trend of prosecution evidence is also to be viewed in background of the fact that all the witnesses belong to the family of the informant and deceased and there is an admitted case of land dispute between the parties, thereby bringing these witnesses in the category of 'interested witnesses'. It also needs to be considered that despite the specific and consistent case of the prosecution of several villagers assembling at the place of occurrence, not a single independent witness has been examined on its behalf, which could have attached some credence to the case of the prosecution. Thus, the non-examination of any independent



witness, not even the landlord of the farmyard, which is place of occurrence, Lallu Singh, especially when the incident is said to have taken place in broad daylight, takes away the credibility of the prosecution story.

23. PW-5 (Vijay Prasad Rai), S.H.O. -cum-Investigating Officer of this case, has stated in his examination-in-chief that on 10-01-2012, he received an information (source not disclosed) about murder of a person at Village Dihri, whereupon, he registered a sanha and thereafter reached the place of occurrence at 04:15 p.m., where he saw that one person has been killed by gunshot. This witness recorded the fardbeyan of Baliram Singh (PW8) at place of occurrence, prepared inquest report of the dead body and thereafter sent the dead body for post-mortem examination. Further, this witness sated that he inspected the place of occurrence which is farmyard of Lallu Singh (not examined), where he found dead body of deceased near the bundles of hay stock and blood near the place of occurrence. After completion of investigation, this witness submitted charge-sheet against the accused persons.

24. This Court takes note of the fact that the Investigating Officer (P.W. 5) of the case has indulged in perfunctory investigation in as much as, he has not recovered or



collected any objective evidence from the place of occurrence in order to establish the same, including empty cartridges, pellets, blood etc. and submitted charge-sheet in absence of the same. He failed to record statements of independent witnesses of the vicinity of the place of occurrence, as admitted by him during trial. What further appears to be a glaring deficiency in investigation is that he even failed to examine the witness on the Inquest Report, Akhilesh Kumar, as specifically admitted in para-7 of his deposition. Thus, in wake of the fact that neither Investigating Officer has examined Akhilesh Kumar, the witness on Inquest Report, nor the said witness has been examined during trial, nor the inquest has been exhibited/brought on record, even by any other formal proof of the same, makes him remain as ghost witness and further rendering the very existence and preparation of the Inquest Report shrouded in mystery. Moreover, even as per the deposition of the Investigating Officer, neither the informant, nor any family member is witness to the alleged Inquest Report, thereby further negating their presence at the place of occurrence.

25. From the entire foregoing discussion and analysis of evidence on record, it is apparent that the prosecution has primarily rested its case on the evidence of the informant (P.W.8), whose evidence is not worthy of basing conviction coupled with



several other major deficiencies and gaping loopholes in the prosecution case. As such, in our opinion, there is no good ground to differ with the judgment of the learned Trial Court acquitting the accused persons (Respondent nos.2 to 6) from the charges levelled against them.

26. Thus, considering the settled proposition of law as laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in relation to appeals against acquittal, in the case of **Rajesh Prasad Vs. State of Bihar**, reported in (2022)3 SCC 471, which also took note of the case of **Chandrappa v. State of Karnataka**, reported in (2007) 4 SCC 415, it is abundantly clear that the accused persons (respondents) are within the shield of double presumption -- the presumption of innocence under principles of criminal jurisprudence and the same being re-inforced by the judgment of acquittal by the Trial Court. Paragraph-29 of **Rajesh Prasad (supra)** is being quoted hereunder:

*“29. After referring to a catena of judgments, this Court culled out the following general principles regarding the powers of the appellate court while dealing with an appeal against an order of acquittal in the following words : (Chandrappa case [(2007) 4 SCC 415 : (2007) 2 SCC (Cri) 325] , SCC p. 432, para 42)*

*“42. From the above decisions, in our considered view, the following general principles regarding powers of the*



*appellate court while dealing with an appeal against an order of acquittal emerge:*

*(1) An appellate court has full power to review, reappreciate and reconsider the evidence upon which the order of acquittal is founded.*

*(2) The Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 puts no limitation, restriction or condition on exercise of such power and an appellate court on the evidence before it may reach its own conclusion, both on questions of fact and of law.*

*(3) Various expressions, such as, “substantial and compelling reasons”, “good and sufficient grounds”, “very strong circumstances”, “distorted conclusions”, “glaring mistakes”, etc. are not intended to curtail extensive powers of an appellate court in an appeal against acquittal. Such phraseologies are more in the nature of “flourishes of language” to emphasise the reluctance of an appellate court to interfere with acquittal than to curtail the power of the court to review the evidence and to come to its own conclusion.*

*(4) An appellate court, however, must bear in mind that in case of acquittal, there is double presumption in favour of the accused. Firstly, the presumption of innocence is available to him under the fundamental principle of criminal jurisprudence that every person shall be presumed to be innocent unless he is proved guilty by a competent court of law. Secondly, the accused having secured his acquittal, the presumption of his innocence is further reinforced, reaffirmed and strengthened by the trial court.*

*(5) If two reasonable conclusions are possible on the basis of the evidence on record, the appellate court should not disturb the finding of acquittal recorded by the trial court.”*



27. This view was reiterated in the case of **H.D. Sundara and Ors. Vs. State of Karnataka** reported in (2023) 9 SCC 581 and **Babu Sahebgouda Rudragoudar and Ors. Vs. Sate of Karnataka** reported in (2024) 8 SCC 149. Thus, applying the abovementioned settled principles, the view of the learned Trial Court acquitting the accused persons (Respondent Nos.2 to 6) on the basis of insufficiency of evidence and on the ground that the prosecution failed to prove its case beyond the shadow of reasonable doubt, appears to be a probable view and even if two reasonable conclusions are possible on the basis of evidence on record, in view of the settled position of law, this Court does not find any reasonable ground to disturb the finding of acquittal recorded by the learned Trial Court.

28. Therefore, taking into consideration that the impugned judgment and order of acquittal is based on sound reasons, the same warrants no interference as we do not find any illegality or perversity in the findings recorded by the learned Trial Court in the impugned judgment dated 25.04.2023 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge-III, Bhojpur at Ara, in Sessions Trial No.220 of 2013 (arising out of Udwanthnagar P.S. Case No. 27 of 2012).



29. Before parting with the judgment, we feel constrained to record our displeasure with the inaction of the Investigating Agency which has conducted an improper, faulty and perfunctory investigation. Such defective investigation largely contributes to the failure of the prosecution and consequently, failure of the justice delivery system. At this juncture, we are tempted to quote from the case of **State of Gujarat Vs. Kishanbhai & Ors.**, reported in (2014) 5 SCC 108, where the Hon'ble Apex Court held in paragraph-23 as under:

*“23. On the culmination of a criminal case in acquittal, the investigating/prosecuting official(s) concerned responsible for such acquittal must necessarily be identified. A finding needs to be recorded in each case, whether the lapse was innocent or blameworthy. Each erring officer must suffer the consequences of his lapse, by appropriate departmental action, whenever called for. Taking into consideration the seriousness of the matter, the official concerned may be withdrawn from investigative responsibilities, permanently or temporarily, depending purely on his culpability. We also feel compelled to require the adoption of some indispensable measures, which may reduce the malady suffered by parties on both sides of criminal litigation. Accordingly, we direct the Home Department of every State Government to formulate a procedure for taking action against all erring investigating/prosecuting officials/officers. All such erring officials/officers identified, as responsible for failure of a prosecution case, on account of sheer negligence or because of culpable lapses, must suffer departmental action. The*



*above mechanism formulated would infuse seriousness in the performance of investigating and prosecuting duties, and would ensure that investigation and prosecution are purposeful and decisive. The instant direction shall also be given effect to within 6 months.”*

30. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of **Dayal Singh & Ors. Vs. State of Uttaranchal**, reported in **(2012) 8 SCC 263** laid down certain parameters for dealing with the question of defective investigation. Paragraph-19 of the judgment is being quoted hereunder:

*“19. Now, we will deal with the question of defective or improper investigation resulting from the acts of omission and/or commission, deliberate or otherwise, of the investigating officer or other material witnesses, who are obliged to perform certain duties in discharge of their functions and then to examine its effects. In order to examine this aspect in conformity with the rule of law and keeping in mind the basic principles of criminal jurisprudence, and the questions framed by us at the very outset of this judgment, the following points need consideration:*

- (i) Whether there have been acts of omission and commission which have resulted in improper or defective investigation.*
- (ii) Whether such default and/or acts of omission and commission have adversely affected the case of the prosecution.*
- (iii) Whether such default and acts were deliberate, unintentional or resulted from unavoidable circumstances of a given case.*



*(iv) If the dereliction of duty and omission to perform was deliberate, then is it obligatory upon the court to pass appropriate directions including directions in regard to taking of penal or other civil action against such officer/witness.”*

31. The investigational lapses conducted by the Investigating Officer, by way of not collecting of any objective evidence including blood, cartridges etc., non-recording of statements of independent material witnesses, not even the witness on the Inquest Report, casts serious aspersion on the conduct of the Investigating Officer which has had a detrimental effect on the prosecution case. We cannot ignore his casual and callous approach towards investigation, as he is expected to perform his duties with greater caution and sincerity, by even taking recourse to scientific methods of investigation. The police has a primary and statutory duty to investigate into a crime in accordance with law and fair investigation is a necessary concomitant of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India and a strict adherence to the same is the bounden duty and obligation of the Investigating agency. In the words of **Lord Denning** “In safeguarding our freedoms, the police play a vital role. Society for its defence needs a well-led, well-trained and well-disciplined force of police whom it can trust: and enough of them to be able to prevent crime before



it happens, or if it does happen, to detect it and bring the accused to justice”.

32. In the present case, the Investigating Officer has utterly failed in the performance of his salutary duty, which raises deliberation upon the fact whether such investigation, done in breach of professional standards and requirements of law, is an intentional act designed to cause failure of prosecution or sheer incompetence of the police officer. We thus direct the Superintendent of Police, District of Bhojpur to conduct an inquiry against the Investigating Officer Vijay Prasad Rai (P.W.-5) and consider taking appropriate disciplinary action as may be permissible in law against the erring officer. If found guilty, the erring police officer would be liable to be punished in accordance with law. It does not matter whether such officer is in service or has since retired.

33. Let a copy of this judgment be sent to the Superintendent of Police, Bhojpur, by email as well as through registered post for compliance of the directions.

34 An action taken report be submitted to the learned Registrar General, Patna High Court within four months from the



date of receipt of communication. The report shall be placed for perusal by the Court.

35. With the above-mentioned directions, the appeal stands dismissed.

**(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)**

**(Soni Shrivastava, J)**

devendra/-

|                   |            |
|-------------------|------------|
| AFR/NAFR          | NAFR       |
| CAV DATE          | NA         |
| Uploading Date    | 26.03.2026 |
| Transmission Date | 26.03.2026 |

