

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, GAYA
Criminal Revision No. 14/2026

P R E S E N T : Pradeep Kumar Malik
Sessions Judge, Gaya
Gaya, dated- The 28th April, 2026

Chamaruddin Ansari @ Kamrudin Miyan-----Petitioner /Revisionist
versus
The State of Bihar & Ors-----Opposite parties

Ld. lawyer for the petitioner/revisionist:- Sri Awadhesh Kumar
Advocate

Ld. lawyer for the State:-Sri Sindhu Bhushan Ojha, P.P.

O R D E R

(1) By way of filing this revision application, the petitioner has ag-grieved from the impugned order dated 04-03-2025 passed by the court of ACJM-V, Gaya in relation to G.O. Case No. 180/2009 whereby the ld. ACJM ordered to issue process U/s 82 Cr.P.C. against the revisionist and there after the process has been issued on 22-08-2025 which was pasted on the door of the revisionist on 30-10-2025.

(2) The ld. counsel appearing for petitioner submits that on the basis of complaint the cognizance U/s 40 Bihar Mines and Mineral Conces-sion rule and 405, 406 IPC have taken by the learned CJM on 23-11-2009. The summons has been issued against the applicant on 25-11-2009 and B/W has been issued on 15-12-2010 without service of summon and there after N.B.W. has been issued on 10-08-2011 against the applicant.

(3) Ld. counsel for the petitioner further submits that on 04-03-2025, the learned court ordered to issue process U/s 82 Cr.P.C. which was is-sued on 22-08-2025 and which was pasted on the door of revisionist on 30-10-2025. He further submitted that it is apparent from the order sheet

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, GAYA
Criminal Revision No. 14/2026

that the summon has not been served upon the revisionist or the police did not complied the order of B.W. and N.B.W. issued against the revisionist.

(4) Ld. counsel for the petitioner submitted that there is some delay in filing of the present revision petition and the petition U/S 5 of the limitation act has also been filed with the ground for condonation of delay. He further prayed to admit the case after condonation of delay in filing.

(5) Per contra, the ld. counsel for State opposed the condonation of delay which is beyond the condonation period.

(6) I have considered the aforesaid submissions advanced by both parties and impugned order as well as the report of the sheristedar. I find that the delay on the part of the petitioner exceeds the grace period of 90 days. Accordingly, this revision petition is **dismissed**.

Let a copy of order be sent to the court concerned forthwith.

(Dictated and corrected)

Sd/-
Sessions Judge, Gaya
28-04-2026