

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

Cr. Revision No. 873 of 2012

Ashok Kumar Mahto	Petitioner
Versus			
The State of Jharkhand	Opp. Party

With

Cr. Revision No. 875 of 2012

Raj Kumar Mahto	Petitioner
Versus			
The State of Jharkhand	Opp. Party

With

Cr. Revision No. 1039 of 2012

Sukhlal Mahto	Petitioner
Versus			
State of Jharkhand	Opp. Party

With

Cr. Revision No. 1049 of 2012

Udasi Mahtain	Petitioner
Versus			
The State of Jharkhand	Opp. Party

With

Cr. Revision No. 86 of 2013

Bishwanath Mahto	Petitioner
Versus			
The State of Jharkhand	Opp. Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner(s)	: Mr. N. K. Sahani, Advocate (In all the cases)
For the State	: Mr. Bishambhar Shastri, Advocate (In Cr. Rev. No. 873/2012) : Mr. Shekhar Sinha, Advocate (In Cr. Rev. No. 875/2012) : Mr. Sanjay Kr. Srivastava, Advocate (In Cr. Rev. No. 1039/2012) : Mr. Tapas Roy, Advocate (In Cr. Rev. No. 1049/2012) : Mr. Md. Hatim, Advocate (In Cr. Rev. No. 86/2013)

Through: Video Conferencing

05/05.04.2021

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) in all the cases has specifically submitted that so far as the allegation of demand of dowry is concerned, it is only against the husband, and all the family members have been made accused and convicted in the present case. The learned counsel has also submitted that in the order dated 10.03.2021, it has been recorded that in the statement under Section 313 of Cr.P.C., the age of mother-in-law was recorded as 50 years, but in fact the same was recorded as 48 years.
2. In response, the learned counsel for the opposite party-State have submitted that the evidence of P.W.-4 who is the complainant clearly indicates that there was demand of dowry by all the present petitioners and both the learned courts below have recorded this aspect of the matter. He submits that in view of concurrent findings , no interference is called for in revisional jurisdiction.
3. Arguments concluded.
4. Order is reserved.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Mukul