

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA  
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.22744 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-924 Year-2014 Thana- BHAGALPUR KOTWALI District-  
Bhagalpur

=====

Shovendra Kumar Chaudhary @ Shobhendra Kumar Chaudhary, S/o Sri  
Shakti Dhar Choudhary, R/o Panchobh, P.S.- Bishanpur, District- Darbhanga

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Smt. Pratima Kumar, Wife of Manoj Kumar, R/o Village-Kala Tola, P.S.-  
Bariyarpur, District- Munger.

... .. Opposite Parties

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Nilanjan Chhaterjee, Advocate
		Mr. Ujjwal Raj, Advocate
		Mr. Sahil Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr. Anil Kumar Singh No.1, APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA SHEKHAR JHA**  
**CAV JUDGMENT**

**Date : 17-06-2025**

The present application has been preferred for quashing of First Information Report (in short 'FIR') of Bhagalpur (Adampur) P.S. Case No.924 of 2014 dated 13.12.2014 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 467, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code (in short 'IPC').

2. As per case of prosecution, a piece of land which



was owned by the informant was leased to her uncle for business purposes, which was further sub-let to co-accused, namely, Abhay Kumar Singh as the business of her uncle did not go well. The said co-accused Abhay Kumar Singh established a rice mill on the land of the informant, who approached in January, 2013 to uncle of the informant and requested to provide the original land deed on the pretext of getting correct information regarding boundaries and specifications of the land. The original document of land, which was obtained by co-accused Abhay Kumar Singh as aforesaid, was not returned to the informant, and later on, she came to know that co-accused Abhay Kumar Singh in connivance with the petitioner mortgaged the land of the informant and took a supply contract of paddy to the Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation (in short, "Corporation") worth Rs. 35 lakhs with an intention to siphon off the money and get the land of the informant sold.

3. The petitioner said to be posted as District Manager of Corporation, Dist.-Bhagalpur, at the relevant point of time.



4. In the background of the aforesaid written information, Bhagalpur (Adampur) P.S. Case No.924 of 2014 was lodged against the petitioner on 03.12.2014.

5. It is submitted by Mr. Nilanjan Chatterjee, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, that earlier a quashing application was preferred by the petitioner to quash the aforesaid FIR, which was numbered as Cr. Misc. No.11396 of 2015 but, the same was dismissed by this Court through its order dated 06.02.2018. It is pointed out that the argument which was raised in the aforesaid quashing petition was that for same cause of action another FIR was already lodged by the uncle of the informant being Sultanganj P.S. Case No.284 of 2014. It is submitted that the informant herself has given no objection regarding the plot in issue, where the rice mill of the co-accused is situated. It is submitted that the present FIR was instituted only after Certificate Case No.6 of 2014-15 was lodged against O.P. No.2 by District Administration.

6. It is further submitted that the order as passed in Cr. Misc. No.11396 of 2015 was challenged before the



Hon'ble Supreme Court, but, the same was also denied through Special Leave Petition (Crl.) Diary No.30123 of 2018 vide order dated 07.09.2018.

7. Taking account of the aforesaid dismissal of prayer of quashing the petition of petitioner upto the Supreme Court, it is pressed that the present quashing petition preferred on the second occasion on the ground of changed circumstance of inordinate delay in investigation that even after the lapse of almost eleven years, the charge-sheet has not been submitted.

8. Learned counsel, *qua* maintainability of the present second quashing petition, submitted that there is no bar regarding maintainability of the second quashing petition and in this context, referred to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court as available through **Superintendent and Remembrancer of Legal Affairs, West Bengal vs. Mohan Singh and Ors.** reported in **(1975)3 SCC 706**, which was further affirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **Vinod Kumar, IAS vs. Union of India & Ors.** reported in **Live Law 2021 SC 281**.



9. Learned counsel also relied upon the legal report of the Hon'ble Supreme Court as available through **Pankaj Kumar vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.** reported in **(2008) 16 SCC 117**, where considering the inordinate delay, in the investigation, the criminal proceeding was quashed.

10. It is also submitted by learned counsel that he came to know during the pendency of the present petition that the investigation of this case now also stands completed, and the petitioner was not sent up for facing trial.

11. Considering the aforesaid submission, the Senior Superintendent of Police, Bhagalpur was directed to file a counter affidavit in the present case vide order dated 09.04.2025 of this Court.

12. It is submitted that if it is so, then this changed circumstance also appears to be the second ground for the maintainability of the present quashing petition.

13. A notice was issued to the informant/O.P. No.2 but, despite of service of notice, which is apparent from Letter No.354 dated 02.05.2025 as issued from the Senior



Superintendent of Police, Bhagalpur, suggesting that notice as issued by this Court duly received by informant/O.P. No.2, she fails to join the present proceeding.

14. It would be apposite to reproduce the FIR of Bhagalpur (Adampur) P.S. Case No.924 of 2014 dated 13.12.2014 for better understanding of the case, which is as under:-

“सेवा में,

श्रीमान् थानाध्यक्ष

आदमपुर भागलपुर।

विषय:- प्राथमिकी दर्ज कर उचित कार्यवाही करने के सम्बन्ध में।

महाशय,

सेवा में सविनय निवेदन है कि मैं प्रतिमा कुमारी पति मनोज कुमार निवासी काला टोला थाना बरियारपुर जिला मुंगेर की निवासी हूँ। मेरी जमीन ग्राम शाहबाद चौक के पास सुलतानगंज जिला भागलपुर में कुल 10 कट्ठा 7 धूर अवस्थित है जिसमें मेरे नाम से 8 कट्ठा 3 धूर एवं बाकी 2 कट्ठा 4 धूर मेरे पति के नाम से है दिनांक 02.04.2010 को यह जमीन मैंने लीज पर अपने चाचा श्री जवाहर लाल मंडल ग्राम शाहबाद थाना सुलतानगंज जिला भागलपुर को उनकी व्यापार करने हेतु दिया जिसका समाप्ति अवधि दिनांक 31.10.2022 है। जवाहर लाल मंडल ने कारोबार शुरू किया लेकिन किसी कारण वश काम काज आगे नहीं बढ़ पाया। इसलिए उन्होंने मेरी सहमति से उस जमीन को सब लीज श्री अभय कुमार सिंह पिता श्री रामानंद सिंह साकिन फुल किया ब्रह्मस्थान थाना बरियारपुर जिला मुंगेर के पक्ष में दिनांक 20.11.2011 को कर दिया जिसकी समाप्ति तारीख 31.10.2022 है। उक्त अभय सिंह बराबर मेरे यहाँ आया-जाया करते थे। इसलिए मैं उन्हें भी जानती थी।

उक्त अभय कुमार सिंह उक्त जमीन पर अजगैबीनाथ का इन्टर प्राईजेज के नाम से राईस मिल चलाने लगा। जनवरी 2013 के अंतिम सप्ताह में उक्त श्री जवाहर लाल मंडल मेरे पास आए और मुझसे लीज वाली जमीन का मूल केवाला की मॉग पर कहते हुए कहा कि उक्त लीज



वाली जमीन के खाता, खसरा, रकवा एवं चौहद्दी की जानकारी के लिए उक्त केवाला उक्त अभय कुमार सिंह मॉग रहा है। मैंने अपना मूल केवाला दिनांक 13.11.2007 विधानंद मंडल बहक श्रीमति प्रतिमा कुमारी अपने चाचा श्री जवाहर लाल मंडल को दे दिया। जैसा कि उन्होंने उपरोक्त अभय कुमार सिंह को दे दिया। जवाहर लाल मंडल ने मुझे बताया कि अभय कुमार सिंह ने उन्हें कहा कि काम हो जाने के बाद मूल केवाला उन्हें वापस कर देगा। परन्तु उक्त अभय कुमार सिंह ने उक्त मूल केवाला आज तक न तो मुझे न तो जवाहर लाल मंडल को वापस किया है। काफी समय बीत गया तो मुझे कुछ लोगों द्वारा मालूम हुआ कि अभय कुमार सिंह ने 31.01.2013 को बिहार स्टेट फूड एण्ड सिविल सप्लाइज कॉरपोरेशन लिमिटेड भागलपुर के जिला प्रबंधक सोभेन्द्र चौधरी के साथ चावल तैयारी हेतु एग्रीमेंट किया है एवं उसे अजगैबीनाथ इन्टर प्राइजेज के नाम से 0021 कोड दिया गया है। मुझसे जो मूल केवाला धोखा देकर अभय कुमार सिंह ने प्राप्त किया था उस केवाला वाली जमीन को जिला प्रबंधक सोभेन्द्र चौधरी से मिली भगत कर एक षडयंत्र के तहत जमानत के तौर पर रख दिया गया है एवं उक्त मूल केवाला को जमानत के रूप में बिहार स्टेट फूड एण्ड सिविल सप्लाइज कॉरपोरेशन लिमिटेड भागलपुर के कार्यालय में दाखिल कर दिया है। जबकि यह स्पष्ट रूप से गैरकानूनी है पर अजगैबीनाथ इन्टर प्राइजेज सुल्तानगंज आड में उक्त अभय कुमार सिंह सिंह तत्कालीन जिला प्रबंधक के साथ साजिश के तहत फर्जी एवं जाली कागजात बना लिया है। पुनः अभय कुमार सिंह को मेरे केवाला के जमानत एवं प्रतिभूति के आधार पर 3500000 (पैंतिस लाख रुपये) का धान सरकार के रोक टोक के द्वारा दे दिया गया ताकि जल्द रकम कर मेरी जमीन को फर्जी आधार हेतु बेचा सम्बन्ध मे मुझे बिहार स्टेट फूड सप्लाइज कॉरपोरेशन लिमिटेड भागलपुर द्वारा अभी तक मेरे उक्त कागजात एवं तथा कथित फर्जी कागजात की सम्पुष्टि के लिए नहीं बुलाया गया।

यह सारा लूट खसोट मेरी सम्पत्ति को निशान बनाने के बाद किया गया क्योंकि दिनांक 31.01.2013 के पूर्व भी अजगैबीनाथ इन्टर प्राइजेज सुल्तानगंज के अभय कुमार सिंह का कारोबार बिहार स्टेट फूड एण्ड सिविल सप्लाइज कॉरपोरेशन लिमिटेड भागलपुर से चल रहा था पर उस दरम्यान कोई घपला नहीं हुआ। जनवरी 2013 में मुझसे धोखाधड़ी कर केवाला हासिल करते ही उन्हें 35 लाख रुपये का धान बिहार स्टेट फूड एण्ड सिविल सप्लाइज कॉरपोरेशन लिमिटेड भागलपुर द्वारा सुपुर्द कर दिया गया और वह भी बिना किसी चावल वसूली के जो एक संदेश स्पष्ट विषय है एवं तत्कालिन जिससे प्रबंधक सोभेन्द्र चौधरी एवं अजगैबीनाथ इन्टर प्राइजेज के मालिक अभय कुमार सिंह के अपराधिक षडयंत्र को दर्शाता हूँ। दोनों ने मिल कर सरकारी सम्पत्ति का घोटाला करते हुए मेरे साथ भी धोखा धड़ी किया है।

वर्तमान जिला प्रबंधक उपेन्द्र प्रसाद भी उनके द्वारा किये गये



उपराधिक कार्य का बचाव कर रहे हैं और संभवतः यह काम श्री अभय कुमार सिंह से अनुचित लाभ के प्रभाव से कर रहे हैं क्योंकि अब तक अजगैबीनाथ इन्टर प्राईजेज सुल्तानगंज या अभय कुमार सिंह के विरुद्ध कोई कार्रवाई नहीं की जा रही है जबकि यह मामला दिनांक 04.09.2014 के समाचार पत्र हिन्दुस्तान में प्रकाशित एवं प्रचारी हो चुकी है। उधर कुछ दिनों से मुझे परोक्ष रूप से चुप रहने के लिए धमकाया भी जा रहा है। मैं उन व्यक्तियों को नहीं पहचानती पर निश्चित ही वे अभय कुमार सिंह के शुभ चिन्तक है क्योंकि चुप नहीं रहने पर जान से मार देने की धमकी दी गई है। इस संबंध में मुझे विभिन्न जगहों से तथ्यों की जानकारी लेने में काफी समय लग गया इसलिए मैं यह आवेदन आज श्रीमान् को दे रहा हूँ।

इन परिस्थितियों में श्रीमान् से निवेदन है कि इन अभियुक्तों पर एवं इनमें शामिल अन्य व्यक्तियों पर प्राथमिकी दर्ज कर सरीक एवं शीघ्र कार्यवाही करने की कृपा की जाय ताकि एक असहाय महिला की जानमाल की रक्षा सुनिश्चित हो सके।

इसके लिए मैं श्रीमान् का सदा आभारी बनी रहूँगी।

लेखक  
राजीव रंजन  
अधिवक्ता  
व्यवहार न्यायालय  
भागलपुर

आवेदिका  
प्रतिमा कुमारी  
13.12.2014  
(श्रीमति प्रतिमा कुमारी)  
पति श्री मनोज कुमार  
निवासी काला टोला थाना  
बरियारपुर, जिला मुंगेर।

जवालर लाल मंडल  
पिता— स्व. जगदीश मंडल  
साकिन शाहाबाद  
थाना सुल्तानगंज  
9973631343”

15. It would also be apposite to reproduce para-25-28 of the legal report of the Hon'ble Supreme Court as available through **Pankaj Kumar Case** (supra), which is as under:-

“25. Though, it is true that the plea with regard to inordinate delay in investigations and trial has been raised before us for the first time but we feel that at this distant point of time, it would be unfair to the appellant to remit the matter back to the High Court for examining the said plea of the appellant. Apart from the





fact that it would further protract the already delayed trial, no fruitful purpose would be served as learned counsel for the State very fairly stated before us that he had no explanation to offer for the delay in investigations and the reason why the trial did not commence for eight long years. Nothing, whatsoever, could be pointed out, far from being established, to show that the delay was in any way attributable to the appellant.

**26.** Moreover, having regard to the nature of the accusations against the appellant, briefly referred to above, who was a young boy of about eighteen years of age in the year 1981, when the acts of omission and commission were allegedly committed by the concerns managed by his parents, who have since died, we feel that the extreme mental stress and strain of prolonged investigation by the Anti-Corruption Bureau and the sword of Damocles hanging perilously over his head for over fifteen years must have wrecked his entire career.

**27.** Be that as it may, the prosecution has failed to show any exceptional circumstance, which could possibly be taken into consideration for condoning the prolongation of investigation and the trial. The lackadaisical manner of investigation spread over a period of four years in a case of this type and inordinate delay of over eight years (excluding the period when the record of the trial court was in the High Court), is manifestly clear.

**28.** Thus, on facts in hand, we are convinced that the appellant has been denied his valuable constitutional right to a speedy investigation and trial and, therefore, criminal proceedings initiated against



him in the year 1987 and pending in the Court of the Special Judge, Latur, deserve to be quashed on this short ground alone.”

16. In terms of the direction of this Court dated 09.04.2025, the Senior Superintendent of Police, Bhagalpur, has filed a counter affidavit dated 19.04.2025 stating therein about the status of investigation, which suggests that in the present case a Final Form No.110 of 2020 dated 09.04.2020 was submitted as “**mistake of law**” against the petitioner.

17. In view of the aforesaid factual and legal submissions, this Court is of the view that there is no doubt regarding the maintainability of the present quashing petition in view of changed circumstances.

18. It would be apposite to reproduce the judgment dated 06.02.2018 passed in Cr. Misc. No.11396 of 2015 for sake of convenience, which is as under:-

“1. This application under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure has been filed for quashing of the First Information Report of Bhagalpur Kotwali (Aadampur) P.S. Case No. 924 of 2014 instituted for the offences under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120 (B) of the Indian Penal Code.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the second First Information Report has been filed by Pratima Kumari for the same occurrence for which earlier First Information Report has been filed on 11.11.2014 by one Jawahar Lal Mandal, uncle of the informant (Pratima Kumari) of this case. It has further been submitted that for the same occurrence two First Information Reports cannot be registered.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon a decision reported in (2013) 6 SCC Page 348 (Amit Bhai Anil Chandra Shah Vrs. Central Bureau of Investigation and Another.).

5. Learned A.P.P. has appeared and submitted that in both the First Information Report the informant is different. The facts of both First Information Reports are also not the same. Both the FIRS have not been lodged for the same set of transaction of the offence.

6. This Court after perusing the instant First Information Report finds that it has been lodged by Pratima Kumari, levelling allegation against accused persons as named in the First Information Report. The petitioner is also named in the instant First Information Report. In the earlier First Information Report which has been lodged by uncle of the informant Jawahar Lal Mandal, only one Abhay Kumar Singh was named. He has made request in the First Information Report for making investigation in the case as he also suspects hands of other accused persons in the occurrence.

7. Therefore, this Court after looking into both the First Information Reports does not find that both the First Information Reports have been lodged for the same set of transactions of the offence. The police has



power to investigate the allegation made in separate case on its own merit. The police cannot be restrained from investigating the case merely because of filing of earlier First Information Report by one Jawahar Lal Mandal, in which the statement has been made that he suspects the hands of other accused persons also in the occurrence.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has no grievance with the investigation of the police in the First Information Report. He is aggrieved by the second First Information Report in which he has been named by the informant Pratima Kumari.

9. This Court at this stage cannot give any finding with regard to correctness of the allegation in the instant First Information Report. This can only be found out after proper investigation by the police.

10. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to quash the First Information Report.

11. This Criminal Miscellaneous application is accordingly dismissed.”

19. It would further be apposite to reproduce the order dated 07.09.2018 passed by Hon’ble Supreme Court in Special Leave Petition (Crl.) Diary No(s).30123 of 2018, which is as under:-

“UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

Delay condoned.



The special leave petition is dismissed.

Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.”

20. It would also be relevant to re-produce the legal report of Hon’ble Supreme Court as available through **Vinod Kumar, IAS case** (supra), which is as under:-

“UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

This petition filed under Article 32 of the Constitution seeks quashing of Criminal complaints/FIRs mentioned in Annexure P-3. Annexure P-3 in turn refers to 28 cases filed or initiated against the petitioner including cases listed at Sl. Nos. 12 and 24 where conviction was recorded against the petitioner on 24.09.2018 and 10.08.2018 respectively.

In the facts and circumstances of the case, we see no reason to entertain this petition under Article 32. The petitioner, if so advised, can always file appropriate applications under the Code of Criminal Procedure (“The Code”, for short) seeking quashing of the individual criminal cases or complaints.

At this stage, Ms. Sonia Mathur, learned Senior Advocate submits that the petitioner had approached the High Court on earlier occasions filing applications under Section 482 of the Code which were later withdrawn.

The law on point as held by this Court in “Superintendent and Remembrancer of Legal Affairs,



West Bengal vs. Mohan Singh & Ors.” reported in SCC (1975) 3 706 is clear that dismissal of an earlier 482 petition does not bar filing of subsequent petition under Section 482, in case the facts so justify.

Needless to say that as and when any appropriate application under the Code is preferred by the petitioner, the same shall be dealt with purely on its own merits without being influenced by the dismissal of the instant writ petition.

Pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.”

21. It would further be apposite to reproduce para-5 of the counter affidavit dated 19.04.2025 as filed on behalf of Senior Superintendent of Police, Bhagalpur regrading status of case, which is as under:-

“5. That it is submitted that after receiving of Letter No.10525 dated 11.04.2025 from one office of Advocate General, Bihar Patna the answering opposite party sought a report vide Memo No.290 dated 16.04.2025 from the Superintendent of Police, Nagar, Bhagalpur and the Superintendent of Police, Nagar, Bhagalpur after perusal of record of Jogasar P.S. Case No.924 of 2024 (Earlier named as Bhagalpur Kotwali (Adampur) P.S. Case No. 924 of 2014) submitted report vide letter No.2207 dated 16.04.2025 stating therein that for the same occurrence Sultanganj P.S. Case No.284 of 2014 was registered for the offences under Sections 420, 406, 467, 468, 469 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code in which Charge Sheet/Final



Form No.34 of 2015 submitted before the court below and as such in this present case Final Form No.110 of 2020 dated 09.04.2020 was submitted as mistake of law (Vidhi Ki Bhul) before the court below and investigation of this case had been closed.”

22. In view of the aforesaid, it is submitted by learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that no case is made out against the petitioner in view of the golden principles as available in para-102 of the **State of Haryana vs. Bhajan Lal and Ors.** reported in **1992 Supp (1) SCC 335**, which is as under:-

“102. In the backdrop of the interpretation of the various relevant provisions of the Code under Chapter XIV and of the principles of law enunciated by this Court in a series of decisions relating to the exercise of the extraordinary power under Article 226 or the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Code which we have extracted and reproduced above, we give the following categories of cases by way of illustration wherein such power could be exercised either to prevent abuse of the process of any court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice, though it may not be possible to lay down any precise, clearly defined and sufficiently channelised and inflexible guidelines or rigid formulae and to give an exhaustive list of myriad kinds of cases wherein such power should be exercised.



(1) Where the allegations made in the first information report or the complaint, even if they are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety do not prima facie constitute any offence or make out a case against the accused.

(2) Where the allegations in the first information report and other materials, if any, accompanying the FIR do not disclose a cognizable offence, justifying an investigation by police officers under Section 156(1) of the Code except under an order of a Magistrate within the purview of Section 155(2) of the Code.

(3) Where the uncontroverted allegations made in the FIR or complaint and the evidence collected in support of the same do not disclose the commission of any offence and make out a case against the accused.

(4) Where, the allegations in the FIR do not constitute a cognizable offence but constitute only a non-cognizable offence, no investigation is permitted by a police officer without an order of a Magistrate as contemplated under Section 155(2) of the Code.

(5) Where the allegations made in the FIR or complaint are so absurd and inherently improbable on the basis of which no prudent person can ever reach a just conclusion that there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.

(6) Where there is an express legal bar engrafted in any of the provisions of the Code or the concerned Act (under which a criminal proceeding is instituted) to the institution and continuance of the proceedings and/or where there is a specific provision in the Code or the





concerned Act, providing efficacious redress for the grievance of the aggrieved party.

(7) Where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge.”

23. From perusal of FIR, it appears that the petitioner was posted at the relevant point of time as District Manager of the Corporation at Bhagalpur. The allegation against the petitioner is founded upon suspicion, as he is the Managing Director in connivance with the main co-accused Abhay Kumar Singh, approved the mortgage of land of the informant on behalf of the Department and proceeded accordingly, benefiting the main co-accused. It also appears that the informant herself filed an affidavit before the Corporation regarding the mortgage of her land. It transpires that for the same occurrence, two FIRs were lodged, which is apparent from the counter affidavit filed by SSP, Bhagalpur dated 19.04.2025, where the first case, which was lodged by the uncle of the informant, the petitioner was not named but in present case, which was lodged by the informant herself after initiation of certificate proceedings, the police, after



investigation, submitted a final form against this petitioner as discussed above, mentioning a mistake of law. The aforesaid charge-sheet was submitted in the year 2020 itself, whereafter no progress was made before the court concerned till date. The petitioner is facing the trauma of criminal prosecution for the last 15 years. Taking note of the allegation in its entirety against the petitioner as raised through FIR and also in view of the supplementary affidavit dated 19.04.2025, where the final form was submitted against the petitioner as mistake of law, it can be safely said that *prima facie* no cognizable offence was made out against the petitioner.

24. Accordingly, in view of the aforesaid factual and legal discussions, the police case bearing Bhagalpur (Adampur) P.S. Case No.924 of 2014 dated 13.12.2014 arraying the petitioner as one of the co-accused and also taking note of the charge-sheet, as discussed aforesaid, the FIR of Bhagalpur (Adampur) P.S. Case No.924 of 2014 with all its consequential proceedings, if pending before the learned trial court, is hereby quashed/set aside *qua*



petitioner.

25. Hence, the present quashing petition stands allowed.

26. Let a copy of this judgment be sent to the court concerned without any delay.

(Chandra Shekhar Jha, J.)

Sanjeet/-

AFR/NAFR	AFR
CAV DATE	06-05-2025
Uploading Date	17-06-2025
Transmission Date	17-06-2025

