

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.855 of 2025

-
1. Jitu Singh S/o Raju Singh R/o Vill and Post- Sukhpur, Ward No. 12, P.S.- Supaul, Distt- Supaul, Pincode- 852130, Bihar
 2. Karan Singh @ Karan Kumar S/o Janta Singh R/o Vill and P.O. - Sukhpur, P.S.- Supaul, Ward No. 12, Distt- Supaul, Pincode- 852130, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sanjha Devi W/o Late Shivaji Mahto R/o Vill- Sukhpur, Ward No. 12, P.S.- Supaul, Distt- Supaul, Pincode- 852130, Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Purushottam Kumar, Advocate Ms. Tanushri, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr.Jharkhandi Upadhyay, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

4 18-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners. However, after filing of *vakalatnama* there is no representation on behalf of opposite party no. 2, though learned APP for the State is present.

2. The present revision petition has been filed against the order dated 07.07.2025 passed by learned District & Sessions Judge, Supaul in Sessions Trial No. 39 of 2022, arising out of Supaul P.S. Case No, 402 of 2021, whereby and whereunder the learned trial court dismissed the petition dated 07.07.2025 filed by the petitioners for bringing on record certain



documents on behalf of the defence.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that ER- 83/21, GR-1062/21 has arisen out of same Supaul P.S. Case No. 402 of 2021. Learned counsel further submits that in the said case the accused was child in conflict with law and the learned Juvenile Justice Board has acquitted him. In the said case, the informant was examined as P.W. 4 and there are certain contradictions in the deposition of the informant as P.W. 4 before Juvenile Justice Board and as a prosecution witness in Sessions Trial No. 39 of 2022 in which the present petitioners are facing trial in connection with Supaul P.S. Case No. 402 of 2021. Similarly, the other documents sought to be brought on record are concerning criminal antecedent of the informant. The petitioners filed petition before the learned Sessions Judge for marking these documents as exhibits, but by a cryptic order dated 07.07.2025, the learned Sessions Judge rejected the prayer holding that the documents are not relevant without giving any description of the documents and without recording any finding how the documents were not relevant. Learned counsel further submits that the said order could not be sustained as it suffers from illegality.

4. Learned APP appearing on behalf of the State



opposes the contention of the petitioners. Learned APP submits that the documents brought on record are not relevant and the learned trial court has rightly passed the order rejecting the petition of the petitioners.

5. I have given my thoughtful consideration to the rival submission of the parties and perused the record. The order dated 07.07.2025 which has been impugned in this case reads as under:-

"Both the accused persons file attendance. Defence witness is absent.

Accused persons file a petition with CC of documents praying therein order to mark exhibit the documents but the same is not relevant in this case. Hence, defence evidence is closed.

Put up on 08.07.25."

6. Bare reading of the order shows the order is devoid of any reasoning and it is a completely cryptic order. Therefore, without going into the merits of the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners, the order dated 07.07.2025 is set aside and the matter is remitted to the learned trial court for passing the order afresh on the petition of the petitioners dated 07.07.2025. The learned trial court is directed to furnish reasons while passing the order.



7. Accordingly, the present revision petition stands
allowed.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

DKS/-

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

