

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.668 of 2025

=====

Munni Prasad @ Munni Prasad Chandrawanshi @ Muni Prasad S/o- Ram Vrat Singh @ Brat Ram R/o- Village- SAriawan Ps- Nokha Dist- Rohtas A/P- Power House, Electricity Dept. Samhuta Banzari Ps- Banzari Dist- Rohtas
... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Anita Devi W/o- Munni Prasad Chandrawanshi, D/o- Bhikhar Singh Village- Pandeypur Po- Nawadih Ps- Indrapuri Dist- Rohtas
... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Raghunandan Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Sharma, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

5 06-07-2026 Though the matter has been listed for hearing on Limitation Petition, i.e., I.A. No. 01 of 2026. But from perusal of record, I find that the petitioner has challenged a compromise order passed by learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Rohtas in Maintenance Case No. 78 of 2019, wherein it has been mentioned that both sides have filed compromise petition for withdrawal of the case under the terms of compromise. Accordingly, the maintenance case was disposed of as settled.

02. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, however, submits that the signature of the petitioner was forged on the compromise petition but this contention is vehemently opposed by the learned counsel, who has appeared on behalf of opposite party no. 2 after receipt of notice. He submits that the learned counsels for the parties identified the



signatures of their respective parties. Therefore, there is no question of signature of the petitioner being forged on the compromise petition.

03. This Court, at first instance, cannot go into the disputed question of facts in revision. Law is settled that fraud vitiates everything and if the petitioner could make out a case that compromise is based on forged signature of the petitioner, the court which passed the order on the basis of compromise could look into the matter. Hence, the petitioner could take up the issue in the same court and cannot challenge the compromise order in criminal revision.

04. Faced with the situation, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the present petition with liberty to have recourse of law in appropriate proceeding before appropriate forum.

05. Permission is accorded.

06. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as aforesaid.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

DKS/-

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

