



1

WP-3100-2012

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT GWALIOR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE AMIT SETH

ON THE 15th OF OCTOBER, 2025WRIT PETITION No. 3100 of 2012*SMT.ANJU YADAV**Versus**STATE OF M.P*

.....
Appearance:

None for the petitioner.

Ms. Ekta Vyas - P.L. for respondents/State.

.....

ORDER

1. The instant writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India prays for the following reliefs:-

"a) That, the respondent no. 4 may kindly be directed to include the marksheet of the petitioner indicating the correct date of birth her statement taken under section 161 and also under section 164 of the C.R.P.C. in the investigation report and same to be forwarded in the S.T. No. 385/10 pending before VIth A.S.J., Gwalior.

(b) That, F.I.R. registered at the crime no. 257/2010 under section 363, 366, 120-B, 34 against the 7 innocent persons to be set aside and the same time session trial no. 385/10 pending before the court of VIth A.S.J., Gwalior may kindly be dropped.

c) That, the accused person in S.T. no. 385/10 may kindly be acquitted from all charges as no offence is made against them.

d) That, respondent no. 4 may be directed to have proceeding against the respondent no. 5 for submitting a fabricated documents as per prescribed 82 law.

2. The respondents/State had moved an application for appropriate directions bearing I.A. No.778/2000, paragraphs 3 and 4 whereof reads as



under:-

3. That, after filing of the instant petition learned trial court below has concluded the trial and vide order dated 31.10.2012 final order has been passed in the matter against accused Ranveer Singh, Sunil Kumar, Dheerendra Singh, Anar Singh, Shreedevi and Smt. Shobha whereas one of the co-accused Satendra Yadav was declared absconding after due appreciation of the oral as well as documentary evidence available on record. A Copy of the judgment dated 31.10.2012 is marked herewith as Annexure A/1.

4. That, in the light of above mention further development in the matter the purpose of present writ petition had rendered infructuous and in such circumstances the petition filed by the petitioner is deserves to be dismissed.

3. In view of the above, since the trial is already concluded, the petition is dismissed as having been rendered infructuous.

(AMIT SETH)
JUDGE

Van