

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, GAYA
Criminal Revision No. 146/2025

P R E S E N T : Pradeep Kumar Malik,
 Sessions Judge,
 Gaya

Gaya, dated- The 18th July, 2026

Firoz Alam-----Petitioner/Revisionist

Versus

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

Ld. lawyer for the petitioner/revisionist:- Sri Pravin Kumar,
 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 11.06.2025 passed by Sri Abhinav Raj, J.M.F.C., Gaya in connection Complaint Case No. 247/2024, whereby the summoning order has been passed for the offense punishable under section 323, 379, 427, 504 of IPC.

(2) The ld. P.P. submits that this revision application is time barred by limitation of almost three 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 petitioners submits that petitioner could not receive summon so he was not aware about the impugned order. He further submits that the family member of petitioner learnt about impugned order on 12.11.2025 and on 13.11.2025 he filed an application for obtaining relevant documents, which was received on

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, GAYA
Criminal Revision No. 146/2025

24.11.2025. He prays that delay in filing was not intentional and it may be condoned as it has been filed within time from the date of knowledge.

(4) The ld. P.P. opposes the prayer of petitioner for condoning the delay. He submits that on the basis of complaint case impugned order taking cognizance has been passed. He further submits that there should be sufficient explanation for delay in filing this criminal revision, which significantly lacks here. He further submits that petition seeking condonation of delay has not contained at all how his family members learnt about passing of impugned order and in a very casual manner explanation of delay has been referred in the petition filed under section 5 of the Limitation Act, which can not be entertained and deserves to be dismissed.

(5) While concurring the submissions advanced by ld. P.P., this court does not find reason assigned by the ld. counsel appearing for the petitioner for delay in filing this criminal revision sufficient. The court is of the view that such a long period of delay, beginning from the last day of limitation that has been prescribed till the day on which this appeal has been filed, should have been explained step by step by the petitioner so as to substantiate his claim that there was no laches on part of him. In this case, the petitioner has failed to show sufficient cause of delay in filing this revision application and as such this court is not inclined to entertain the petition filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act seeking condonation of delay and it deserves to be dismissed and is accordingly dismissed.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, GAYA
Criminal Revision No. 146/2025

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

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

(Dictated and corrected)

Sd/-
(P.K. Malik)
Sessions Judge, Gaya
18.07.2026

Web Copy-Civil Court, Gaya