

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND, RANCHI
Criminal Revision No. 690 of 2025

Nasib Singh Kadiyan @ Mr. Katyan, aged about 50 years, S/o
Kawal Singh Kadian, residing at F-1200, Sun South Wind, PO and
PS – Amoli, District – Ahmedabad, Gujarat **Petitioner**

-- Versus --

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Indrajeet Kumar Chandel, son of R.D. Ram, resident of Qr. No. K-
2/34, Cross Road No.13, Telco Colony, PO and PS – Telco, Town –
Jamshedpur, District – East Singhbhum, Jharkhand

.... **Opposite Parties**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner	:-	Mr. Rajendra Krishna, Advocate
	:-	Mr. Dhananjay Kr. Pathak, Advocate
For the State	:-	Mr. Shailesh Kr. Sinha, Advocate
For O.P. No.2	:-	Mr. Apurv, Advocate
	:-	Mrs. Moushmi Chatterjee, Advocate

05/27.01.2026 I.A. No.8476 of 2025 has been filed for condoning the delay of
217 days in filing of the criminal revision petition.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the
discharge petition was rejected which has not been communicated to the
petitioner as he has left the place of trial after his retirement. He submits
that has been communicated to the petitioner after that criminal revision
petition has been filed and in view of that the delay of 217 days has
occurred. He submits in view of that the delay of 217 days may kindly be
condoned.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the prayer and
submits that sufficient ground is not there for condoning the delay of 217

days.

4. In view of above submission of learned counsel appearing for the parties and considering that the petitioner has retired in the year 2019 and the discharge petition has been dismissed on 07.08.2024 and it has been pointed out that the petitioner has left the place of trial as he was already retired and was residing at Ahmedabad and order was communicated later on.

5. The Court finds that sufficient ground is made out to condone the delay of 217 days, as such delay of 217 days is hereby condoned. I.A. No.8476 of 2025 is hereby allowed and disposed of.

6. This petition has been filed for quashing of the order dated 07.08.2024 passed in Complaint Case No.2246 of 2017 whereby the discharge petition filed by the petitioner has been rejected.

7. Mr. Shailesh Kr. Sinha, learned counsel appearing for the State at the outset submits that this matter is not maintainable in light of order of this Court passed in Cr. Revision No.843 of 2025 as the matter has been directly filed without availing the remedy of revision before the learned Sessions Judge. He further submits that the reasons have been given that is a detailed order and there is no exceptional circumstance disclosed in the present petition to file the present revision petition directly before the High Court.

8. In view of the above and looking into the judgment of this Court, Mr. Rajendra Krishna, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner on instruction seeks permission to withdraw this petition with liberty to move before the learned Sessions Judge by way of filing the revision

petition.

9. In view of the above, this petition is permitted to be withdrawn and disposed of with liberty to move before the learned Sessions Judge.

10. Learned Sessions Judge will decide the said criminal revision in accordance with law without prejudice to this order.

11. Pending petition, if any, also disposed of.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated 27.01.2026
Sangam/