

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, GAYA
Criminal Revision No. 86/2025

P R E S E N T : Pradeep Kumar Malik,
 Sessions Judge, Gaya
 Gaya, dated- The 3rd July, 2026

Sanjay Singh-----Petitioner /Revisionist

Versus

The State of Bihar & Anr-----Opposite party

Ld. lawyer for the petitioner/revisionist:- Sri S.K. Dwivedi,
 Advocate

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

O R D E R

(1) The present criminal revision petition has been preferred against the order dated 28.06.2024 passed by Shri Akshay Narang, J.M.F.C., Gaya in connection with Complaint Case No. 320/2014, whereby the process under Section 82 Cr.P.C. has been ordered to be issued against the petitioner.

(2) The ld. P.P. submits that this revision application is time barred by limitation for more than nine months, so limitation should be decided first.

(3) While moving the petition filed under section 5 of the Limitation Act the ld. counsel appearing for petitioner submits that the petitioner had no knowledge about the case. He further submits that the petitioner was in private job and was performing work from Patna to Delhi. He further submitted that when the petitioner visited his house after taking leave, he got the knowledge about the case as well as process in terms of section 82 Cr.P.C. from co-villagers on 13.05.2025 and thereafter he applied for certified copy and after getting the same filed this revision

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, GAYA
Criminal Revision No. 86/2025

application. The ld. counsel prays that delay in filing this revision may be condoned.

(4) The ld. P.P. opposes the prayer of petitioner for condoning the delay. He submits that the court first resorts all the possible steps available before it like summons, BW, NBW thereafter process under section 82 Cr.P.C. had been directed to be issued. He further submits that this revision has arisen out of complaint case of year 2014 related with bouncing of cheque. He further submits that as per complaint petition, legal notice has also been served upon the petitioner by the complainant. It is, therefore, very hard to comprehend the reasons advanced by ld. counsel appearing for the petitioner for delay in filing this revision application. He prays that petition filed under section 5 of the Limitation Act may be rejected.

(5) Heard both sides. From perusal of petition filed under section 5 of the Limitation Act of the petitioner, it transpires that the reasons assigned by the petitioner for delay in filing this revision application do not appear to be convincing, which is barred by limitation for more than nine months and as such petition filed under section 5 of the Limitation Act on behalf of petitioner deserves to be dismissed and is accordingly dismissed.

Consequently, this revision application stands dismissed at the stage of admission itself.

(6) Let a copy of this order be sent to the court concerned.

(Dictated and corrected)

Sd/-
(P.K. Malik)
Sessions Judge, Gaya
03.07.2026