IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 120 of 2011

Vijay Kumar Mallik, S/o late Inder Lal Mallik, Resident of 26, Engineers Enclave P.S. Pitampura P.O. Pitampura District New Delhi - 34 **… … Appellant**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand through C.B.I**… … Respondent**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Appellant : Mr. Shekhar Sinha, Advocate
: Mr. Apurv, Advocate
: Mrs. Moushmi Chatterjee, Advocate
For the CBI : Mr. Prashant Pallav, ASGI
: Ms. Shivani Jaluka, AC to ASGI

05/**23.09.2026** Heard the learned counsel for the appellant.

2. This Criminal Appeal (SJ) has been filed against the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 28.01.2011 passed in Case No.R.C.49A/1996 by the learned Special Judge-IV, C.B.I. (A.H.D. Scam Cases), Ranchi. By the said judgment, the appellant was convicted for the offences punishable under Section 120B read with Sections 409, 420, 467, 468, and 471 and 477A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and under Section 13 (2) read with Section 13 (1) (c) & (d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

The appellant was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 3 years and fine of Rs.75,000/- for offences under Section 120-B read with Section 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 477-A of IPC and under Section 13 (2) read with Section 13 (1) (c) and (d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and in default of payment of fine to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 6 months. The appellant was further sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 3 years under Section 420; rigorous imprisonment for 3 years under Section 467 IPC; 3 years of rigorous imprisonment under Section 468; rigorous imprisonment for 2 years under Section 471 of IPC. However, the learned court passed order that the sentences shall run concurrently.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant has submitted that the appellant has expired and their legal heirs do not want to pursue the

appeal, but the death certificate has been forwarded to the learned counsel for the appellant which has been placed on record along with the mention slip. He submits that accordingly this appeal has abated and the learned counsel for the appellant does not want to press the present appeal.

4. Learned counsel for the CBI has no objection so far as the aforesaid prayer of the appellant is concerned.

5. Considering the submissions, this appeal is treated as abated.

6. Pending interlocutory application, if any, is dismissed as not pressed.

7. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the court concerned through Fax/email.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of order: 23.09.2026
Date of uploading: 29.09.2026
Saurav/