HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Revision Petition No. 63/2026
CNR: RJHC020027912026 | URN: CRLR / 107U / 2026

1. Durgapuri Son Of Shri Bhurapuri, Resident Of Village Bajor, Gokulpura, Sikar Rajasthan.
2. Omprakash Puri Son Of Shri Durgapuri, Resident Of Village Bajor, Gokulpura, Sikar Rajasthan.
3. Vikas Puri Son Of Shri Durgapuri, Resident Of Village Bajor, Gokulpura, Sikar Rajasthan.
4. Manju Devi Wife Of Durgapuri, Resident Of Village Bajor, Gokulpura, Sikar Rajasthan.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through P.P.
2. Lalchand Son Of Shri Kanpuri, Aged About 36 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 6, Jhujhara Ka Math, Bajor Police Station Gokulpura District Sikar.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Susheel Pujari Mr. Rahul Kumar Sharma Ms. Urmila Devi Choudhary
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Jitendra Singh Rathore, P.P.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRAVEER BHATNAGAR
Order

26/10/2026

The present criminal revision petition has been preferred by the petitioners against the impugned order dated 25.11.2025 passed by the Additional Session Judge No.1, Sikar in Sessions Case (C.I.S.) No.118/2025, whereby charges under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 117(2), 110, 3(5), 352 and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, was directed to be framed against the petitioners.

Digitally signed by
DANISH USMANI
Date: 2026.10.28
09:55:00 IST

It is contended by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the injury sustained to injured Urmila was found to be grievous in nature, though not dangerous to life as the injured Urmila sustained a linear fracture on roof of the orbit. The other injured Lalchand sustained injury at his head, however, it was also found to be simple in nature. Thus, there was no intention of the petitioners to cause murderous injury to the injured, therefore, learned counsel for the petitioners prays that upto the extent of framing charge under Section 110 of BNS, the order may be set aside.

Learned Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the present criminal revision petition and supported the order passed by the learned trial Court.

Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

The trial Court, after considering the entire material available on record and particularly the injuries received to the injured Urmila Devi found that *prima facie* there is ample material against the petitioners to frame charge under Section 110 of BNS. The FIR was lodged by injured Lalchand in which it was mentioned that petitioners assaulted him, his wife and Urmila with the aid of axe and rods and Urmila Devi sustained grievous injury.

A perusal of the record shows that Urmila Devi sustained three injuries and for injury Nos.1, 2 and 3, X-ray was advised, injury No.2 was found to be simple in nature and injury Nos.1 and 3 were grievous in nature. In the X-ray report of the injured Urmila Devi, a linear fracture of roof of orbit and base of skull at the right side was found. Similarly, Lalchand also sustained three

injuries and for injury No.1, X-ray was advised, injury No.1 of injured Lalchand was lacerated wound on the parietal region. Similarly, for injury No.2 also X-ray was advised and after X-ray, 5th Metacarpal and feelings bones were found to be fractured.

It is settled law that for framing charges, the Court has to see whether there exists *prima facie* case against the petitioner. Upon perusal of the record, it is clear that there was enough material present before the trial Court to frame charge under Section 110 of BNS, as both the injured sustained injuries at their skull. Therefore, considering the aforesaid facts, this Court does not find any perversity in the order passed by the learned trial Court.

Accordingly, the present criminal revision petition being devoid of merit is hereby dismissed.

Pending application(s), if any, also stand(s) dismissed.

(PRAVEER BHATNAGAR),J

DA-24/DANISH USMANI