

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.620 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.- Year-0 Thana- District- Nalanda

=====
Minta Devi, Wife of Jitendra Paswan, Resident of Village - Telmar, P.O.-
Telmar, P.S.- Harnaut, District - Nalanda, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

=====
Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Jyoti Ranjan Jha, Advocate
Mr. Shristi Rani, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Anant Kumar, APP
For the opposite party : Mr. Mohit Shriwastava, Advocate
=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL JUDGMENT**

Date : 16-01-2026

Today the record has been put up under the heading
'For Orders (On Petition)', but with consent of the parties, I
intend to dispose of this revision petition at this stage itself.

2. Heard learned counsels for the parties.

3. The petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated
08.05.2024 passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court,
Saran at Chapra in Miscellaneous Case No. 119/2021, arising
out of Maintenance Case No. 08(M)/2013 whereby and
whereunder miscellaneous case filed on behalf of the petitioner
has been dismissed.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner is aggrieved by the aforesaid order as the



petitioner filed the aforesaid miscellaneous case for scrutinizing the original record/evidence and to take evidence of all the witnesses afresh, who have been examined, on the ground that there has been tempering with the record and certain pages were replaced from the evidence of witnesses of the petitioner, who is also the petitioner before the court of learned Principal Judge, Family Court. The petitioner cited specific instance where records were found manipulated and signatures of the learned Presiding Officers were fabricated. However, learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Saran at Chapra did not consider the facts and dismissed the miscellaneous case of the petitioner. The learned counsel further submits that the matter is very serious, still the learned Principal Judge, Family Court failed to appreciate this fact that even the signatures of the then Presiding Officer was different at different places. The learned counsel further submits that the learned trial court failed to appreciate the fact that the learned counsel for the other side in collusion with the court staff had changed all the original evidences/documents and forged the signature of learned Presiding Officer on the last pages of each deposition. Thus, learned counsel submits that the impugned order is not sustainable and the same be set aside.



5. Mr. Mohit Shrivastava, the learned counsel, who appears *suo moto* on behalf of the opposite party of Maintenance Case No.08(M)/2013, vehemently contends that there is no merit in the submission of learned counsel for the petitioner. The learned counsel further submits that the learned trial court has passed the order after consideration of each and every contention of the petitioner and the order does not need any interference. The learned counsel also submits that the learned Single Judge of this Court, *vide* order dated 04.03.2016 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 40161 of 2014, directed the learned Family Court to dispose of the maintenance case within four months without granting unnecessary adjournment to any party.

6. Perused the record.

7. On perusal of the impugned order, I find that the learned trial court has considered each and every contention of the petitioner. The learned trial court has also considered the difference in signatures of the then learned Presiding Officers and finally came to the conclusion that there was no manipulation and fabrication in the documents. Further the prayer of the petitioner for examining all witnesses afresh is simply out of question since it is matter of 2013 and all witnesses have been examined from both sides and any re-



examination or fresh examination could only be under the extant statutory provisions and cannot be for asking of the petitioner.

8. Since I do not find any infirmity or illegality in the impugned order, the same is affirmed. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

9. The learned trial court is directed to proceed with the matter and expeditiously dispose of it.

10. Consequently, pending interlocutory application, if any, stands disposed of.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

V.K.Pandey/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	17.01.2026
Transmission Date	17.01.2026

