HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
AT JODHPUR

S.B. Criminal Revision Petition No. 1361/2022
CNR: RJHC010783492022 | URN: CRLR / 3278U / 2022

Ratan S/o Shri Devanath, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Bhanej Ps Suhagpura Dist. Pratapgarh Raj.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp
2. Dhanji S/o Shri Ravji Nath, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Datiyar Ps Suhagpura Dist. Pratapgarh Raj.
3. Rajmal S/o Shri Dhanji Nath, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Datiyar Ps Suhagpura Dist. Pratapgarh Raj.
4. Kailash S/o Shri Dhanji Nath, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Datiyar Ps Suhagpura Dist. Pratapgarh Raj.
5. Smt. Monika W/o Shri Rajmal Nath, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Datiyar Ps Suhagpura Dist. Pratapgarh Raj.
6. Mangilal S/o Shri Ravji Nath, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Datiyar Ps Suhagpura Dist. Pratapgarh Raj.
7. Ishwar S/o Shri Mangilal Nath, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Datiyar Ps Suhagpura Dist. Pratapgarh Raj.
8. Narayan S/o Shri Mangilal Nath, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Datiyar Ps Suhagpura Dist. Pratapgarh Raj.
9. Ramlal S/o Shri Mangilal Nath, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Datiyar Ps Suhagpura Dist. Pratapgarh Raj.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Raghuveer Singh Bhati
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Ramesh Dewasi, PP Mr. Vijay Kumar Gaur

---

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA BORANA

Order

10/08/2026

1. The present revision petition has been filed aggrieved of order dated 28.09.2022 passed by learned Sessions Judge, Pratapgarh in Sessions Case No.70/2022 whereby application under Section 190 (1), Cr.P.C. as filed on behalf of the complainant, stood rejected.

2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that despite there being ample material available on record to suggest that Dhan Ji, Rajmal, Kailash, Monika, Mangilal, Narayan, Ishwar, Ramlal etc. were also involved in the incident in question, no cognizance was taken against the said accused persons.

3. Counsel submits that eye witness Meera i.e. the sister of the deceased specifically deposed that these people were equipped with various weapons and caused the death of her brother, but the same has cursorily been ignored by the learned Trial Court.

4. Heard the Counsels. Perused the record.

5. It is evident that order impugned pertains to the year 2022 and since then, the trial has reached the final stage. Vide the order impugned, the learned Trial Court observed that there was nothing available on record to take cognizance against the alleged accused at that point of time.

6. After perusing the record, this Court is in consonance with the findings as recorded by the learned Trial Court.

7. At the request of learned counsel for the petitioner, the Court even perused the Court statements of the alleged eye witness Meera (PW-3). The same also does not reflect any such material so as to justify taking of cognizance against the alleged accused.

8. No case for interference in the order impugned is made out. The revision petition is hence, **dismissed**.

9. Stay petition and pending applications, if any, stand **disposed of**.

(REKHA BORANA),J

205/Manila Arora