

G.O. No. 221 of 2016
State of Jharkhand (through
Avinash Kumar) Vrs Om Prakash
Chopra & other.
Date of Judgment: 22.06.2026
P.O. - Ashish Agarwal, S.D.J.M,
Seraikella



District:- Seraikella-Kharswan

**IN THE COURT OF SHRI ASHISH AGARWAL, SUB-DIVISIONAL
JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, SERAIKELLA-KHARSWAN**

Dated:- June 22nd, 2026

**Present: Shri. Ashish Agarwal
S.D.J.M. Seraikella-Kharswan**

**G.O. Case No. 221/2016
CNR No. JHSK03-001016-2016**

Complainant	State of Jharkhand (through Avinash Kumar)
Represented By	APP.
Accused	1. Om Prakash Chopra, 2. Manoj Chopra Both S/o Lt. Mohan Lal Chopra, R/o – House no. 34, Road no. 4, Adityapur Garden, PS- Adityapur, Distt- Seraikella- Kharsawan, Jharkhand. 3. M/s Singhbhum Mechinomeal Pvt. Ltd. Adityapur, Jamshedpur
Represented By	Shri, K.N. Agrawal, Ld. Advocate

Charges Under Section :- 14 (1A), 14(1B) of E.P.F. & M.P. Act

J U D G E M E N T

1. The above named accused persons stands trial for the offense punishable under section 14 (1A), 14(1B) of E.P.F. & M.P. Act for which the charge was framed and explained and read over on 24.04.2025 against the accused persons named above to which they denied, pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

Facts

2. The case of the prosecution, in nutshell is that on asking the accused persons have failed to submit the annual returns of their company Singhbhum Machinometal Pvt. Ltd., to the Assistant Provident Fund Commissioner, Sub Regional Office Jamshedpur for the year of the period of currency 10/1993 to 10/2011 contribution card within month from the date of expiration in accordance with the provisions containing in paragraph 35, 42 & 43 of the Employees Provident Fund Scheme. Hence this case.

Cognizance

3. The Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Jamshedpur has submitted Prosecution report 330 dated 01.06.2016 against above named accused persons. Accordingly, the Cognizance of the aforesaid offense has been taken u/s 14 (1A), 14(1B) of E.P.F. & M.P. Act vide

order dated 02.06.2016 against the accused persons named in the prosecution report.

Substance of accusation

4. After the appearance of the accused persons before the trial court, police papers were supplied to them and thereafter Substance of the accusation was explained as stated herein above vide order dated 24.04.2025 u/s 14 (1A), 14(1B) of E.P.F. & M.P. Act to which they pleaded their innocence, and thus they was put under trial and case was fixed for Prosecution evidence.

Prosecution Evidence

5. During the course of the trial, the prosecution has produced no witness.

In order to prove its case, the prosecution has adduced

Evidence:-

	Rank	Name	Nature of evidence
Oral Evidence		NIL	

List of document exhibited by the Prosecution:

Documentary Evidence	Sr no.	Description of Documents	Proved by	Status
		NIL		

6. On 09.04.2026 after giving sufficient opportunity, prosecution evidence was closed and case was posted for recording statement under section 313 of Cr.P.C.

Statement Under Section 313 Cr.P.C.

7. The accused persons were examined on 22.05.2026 and their statement was recorded under the provisions of section 313 Cr.P.C, wherein they have once again denied the evidence available against them and claimed to be innocent. Thereafter, the Defense Evidence was closed 22.05.2026.

Defense Evidence:- NIL

8. Subsequently on the request of defence counsel, defence evidence was closed and record was fixed for arguments.

Arguments

9. Heard the arguments of both the parties. The defence strongly argued that it is a case of no evidence. Hence prayed that the accused persons be acquitted. On the other hand, prosecution has

argued that charges has been proved and accused be convicted.

10. Now I shall discuss the evidence to determine whether the prosecution has been able to prove the charge beyond all reasonable doubts.

FINDINGS

11. In this case, the prosecution has not examined any witness. Thus on careful consideration of the aforesaid the court is of the opinion that prosecution has failed to prove its charge brought against the accused beyond all reasonable doubts, and therefore the accused is entitled to get the benefit of the doubts hence the benefit of doubt is extended to the accused. Therefore, on careful examination of case record, it is apparent that not even an iota of evidence favorable to prosecution, or to strengthen the prosecution story has been adduced by it, the Court therefore, finds and holds accused persons '**not guilty**'.

ORDER

12. In view of above findings, discussions, and analysis, I come to the conclusion that the prosecution has failed in proving the charges u/s 14 (1A), 14(1B) of E.P.F. & M.P. Act against the accused persons namely **1. Om Prakash Chopra, 2. Manoj Chopra and 3. M/s**

G.O. No. 221 of 2016
State of Jharkhand (through
Avinash Kumar) Vrs Om Prakash
Chopra & other.
Date of Judgment: 22.06.2026
P.O. - Ashish Agarwal, S.D.J.M,
Seraikella

Singhbhum Mechinomeal Pvt. Ltd. Accordingly, the accused persons are hereby acquitted for the charges u/s 14 (1A), 14(1B) of E.P.F. & M.P. Act. As a result, his bailors are discharged.

This judgment is delivered by me in open court today.

(Dictated, Corrected and Signed by me).

Ashish Agarwal
Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate
Seraikella
Date : 22.06.2026

Ashish Agarwal
Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate
Seraikella
Date : 22.06.2026

Annexure-I

 District:- Seraikella-Kharswan <u>IN THE COURT OF SHRI ASHISH AGARWAL, SUB-DIVISIONAL</u> <u>JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, SERAIKELLA-KHARSWAN</u> Dated:- June 22nd, 2026 Present: Shri. Ashish Agarwal S.D.J.M. Seraikella-Kharswan <u>G.O. Case No. 221/2016</u> CNR No. JHSK03-001016-2016	
Complainant	State of Jharkhand (through Avinash Kumar)
Represented By	APP.
Accused	1. Om Prakash Chopra, 2. Manoj Chopra Both S/o Lt. Mohan Lal Chopra, R/o – House no. 34, Road no. 4, Adityapur Garden, PS- Adityapur, Distt- Seraikella- Kharsawan, Jharkhand. 3. M/s Singhbhum Mechinomeal Pvt. Ltd. Adityapur, Jamshedpur
Represented By	Shri, K.N. Agrawal, Ld. Advocate`

Annexure-II

In order to prove its case, the prosecution has adduced

Evidence:-

Oral Evidence	Rank	Name	Nature of evidence
		NIL	

List of document exhibited by the Prosecution:

Documentary Evidence	Sr no.	Description of Documents	Proved by	Status
		NIL		

Annexure – IV

List of witnesses by defense: NIL

Annexure – V

Documents Exhibited Form The Side Of Defense:-

	Sr no.	Description of Documents	Proved By	Status
		NIL		

G.O. No. 221 of 2016
State of Jharkhand (through
Avinash Kumar) Vrs Om Prakash
Chopra & other.
Date of Judgment: 22.06.2026
P.O. - Ashish Agarwal, S.D.J.M,
Seraikella

Annexure - VI

Synopsis

Date of alleged offense	Year of 1993-2011
Date of prosecution report	01.06.2016
Date of Cognizance	02.06.2016
Date of substance	24.04.2025
Date of closing of Prosecution Evidence	09.04.2026
Date of recording statement under section 313 Cr.P.C.	22.05.2026
Date of closing Defense Evidence	22.05.2026
Arguments closed on	16.06.2026
Date of Judgment	22.06.2026

Annexure - VII

Rank of accused	Name of accused	Date of arrest/surrender	Date of release on Bail	Offense charge with	Whether acquitted or convicted	Sentence imposed	Period of detention undergone during trial for the purpose of section 428 Cr.P.C
1.	Om Prakash Chopra,	N.A.	N.A. ^{u/s} .	U/s 14 (1A), 14(1B) of E.P.F. & M.P.	Acquitted	N.A.	N.A.
2.	Manoj Chopra	N.A.	N.A. ^{u/s} .	U/s 14 (1A), 14(1B) of E.P.F. & M.P.	Acquitted	N.A.	N.A.
3.	M/s Singhbhum Mechinome al Pvt. Ltd	N.A.	N.A. ^{u/s} .	U/s 14 (1A), 14(1B) of E.P.F. & M.P.	Acquitted	N.A.	N.A.