IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 1145 OF 2003

SUKHDEO JHA

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

STATE OF BIHAR & ORS.

Respondent(s)

ORDER

Respondents 2 to 8 were tried for offences punishable under Sections 147,

148, 323, 324, 448, 379 and 302 IPC. The trial Court, by its judgment dated

1/5/2000, acquitted them.

2. The appellant, who is the informant, filed Criminal Revision No.599/2000

before the High Court. According to him, adequate steps were not taken by the trial

Court to secure the attendance of the prosecution witnesses and that had led to a

wrong acquittal. The High Court, by order dated 4/10/2002, rejected the revision

petition as it found that the trial Court had taken all reasonable steps for securing the

attendance of the witnesses. The said order is under challenge in this appeal by

special leave.

3. We find that two witnesses who were examined turned

.....2.

- 2 -

hostile. In spite of summons issued to other witnesses, none appeared. By a detailed

order dated 19/4/2000, the trial Court, after noticing the facts and non-appearance of

witnesses, closed the prosecution evidence. Thereafter the statement of the accused

was recorded and the trial Court proceeded to judgment. The grievance of the

appellant that he was not notified of the position of the case and that he was not

summoned has no basis. In fact at the relevant point of time appellant himself was a

declared absconder in some other criminal case and surfaced only long after the

judgment of the trial Court in this matter. As the two witnesses who were examined

had turned hostile and no other witnesses were forthcoming in spite of issue of

summons and non-bailable warrants, the trial Court had no option but to proceed on

the basis of the evidence on record and acquit the respondents. The order dated

19/4/2000 of the trial Court shows that adequate steps were taken to secure the

presence of the witnesses and the High Court has also examined the entire matter and

found no ground to interfere.

4. In view of the above, the appeal is dismissed.

(R.V. RAVEENDRAN)	•
J	•

(Dr. MUKUNDAKAM SHARMA)

NEW DELHI; JUNE 25, 2008.