

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**  
**Cr.M.P. No. 864 of 2011**

-----

1. Ramesh Kumar Choudhary, son of late Dwarika Prasad Choudhary
2. Laxmi Devi, wife of Ramesh Kumar Choudhary
3. Vijay Sharma @ Bijay Sharma, son of late Madan Lal Sharma  
All residents of Baghmara Bazar, Post +P.S.-Baghmara, District-  
Dhanbad ... .. Petitioners

Versus

- 1.The State of Jharkhand
2. Prabhu Kumar Kandoi, son of late Banarsi Lal Kandoi, resident of  
Baghmara Road (Near Parbati Service Station), P.O. Nawagarh, P.S. Barora,  
District-Dhanbad ... .. Opposite Parties

With

**Cr.M.P. No. 2600 of 2013**

-----

Prabhu Kumar Kandoi, son of late Banarsi Lal Kandoi, resident of Near  
Prabati Service Station, Baghmara Road, P.O. Mewagarh, P.S. Barora,  
District- Dhanbad (Jharkhand ... .. Petitioner

Versus

- 1.The State of Jharkhand
2. Ramesh Kumar Choudhary, son of late Dwarika Prasad Choudhary,  
Resident of Baghmara Bazar, P.O. Baghmara, P.S. Baghmara, District-  
Dhanbad (Jharkhand) ... .. Opposite Parties

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI**

For the Petitioners : Mrs. Lokeshwari Banerjee, Advocate  
(in Cr.M.P. No. 864/2011)  
Mr. M.B. Lal, Advocate  
(in Cr.M.P. No. 2600/13)

For the State : A.P.P.

For the O.P. No. 2 : Mr. M.B. Lal, Advocate  
(in Cr.M.P. No. 864/2011)  
Mrs. Lokeshwari Banerjee, Advocate  
(In Cr.M.P. No. 2600/13)

**04/05.04.2021** Heard Mrs. Lokeshwari Banerjee, learned counsel for the  
petitioners (in Cr.M.P. No. 864/2011), Mr. M.B. Lal, learned counsel for the  
petitioners in Cr.M.P. No. 2600/13, learned A.P.P. for the State, Mr. M.B. Lal,  
learned counsel for the O.P. No. 2 in Cr.M.P. No. 864/2011 and Mrs.  
Lokeshwari Banerjee, learned counsel for the O.P. No. 2 in Cr.M.P. No.  
2600/13.

These petitions have been heard through Video Conferencing in

view of the guidelines of the High Court taking into account the situation arising due to COVID-19 pandemic. None of the parties have complained about any technical snag of audio-video and with their consent this matter has been heard.

These two criminal miscellaneous petitions have been tagged together.

In Cr.M.P. No. 864/2011, one complaint case being C. P. Case No. 1880 of 2010 filed by the complainant was under challenge.

In Cr.M.P. No. 2600 of 2013, proceeding of 138 N.I. Act was under challenge in which judgment has been delivered.

Status report has been received in Cr.M.P. No. 864 of 2011 which suggests that witnesses have been examined. The matter is of the year, 2011.

In that view of the matter, no relief can be extended to the petitioners, Accordingly, Cr.M.P. No. 864 of 2011 stands dismissed.

In Cr.M.P. No. 2600 of 2013 which arises out of Complaint Case No. 967 of 2010 has already been disposed of and the judgment of the same has been supplied by the learned counsel for the petitioner on email of the Court which is taken record.

In that view of the matter, Cr.M.P. No. 2600 of 2013 has become infructuous. Accordingly, Cr.M.P. No. 2600 of 2013 stands dismissed as infructuous.

I.A. No. 887/2016 (in Cr.M.P. No. 864/2011) stands dismissed as infructuous.

**(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)**

Satyarthi/-