

IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, SAHARSA

Saharsa, Dated: - 14.05.2026

Present: - Dinesh Sharma, P.D. & S.J., Saharsa

Criminal Revision No. 9/2026

Jay Narayan Sah @ Tetar Sah & 6 Others Vs. The State of Bihar & 3Ors.

**IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,
SAHARSA**

Dated, Saharsa, the 14th May 2026

Present: - Dinesh Sharma, Principal Sessions Judge, Saharsa

Criminal Revision No. 09/2026

Jay Narayan Sah @ Tetar Sah & 6 Others Vs. The State of Bihar & 3 Ors.

In the matter of: -

1. Jay Narayan Sah @ Tetar Sah, aged about 65 years, S/o Late Ramji Sah,
2. Wakil Kumar @ Wakil Sah, aged about 30 years S/o Jay Narayan Sah @ Tetar Sah
3. Khushilal Sah @ Mushar Sah, aged about 45 years, S/o Late Parmeshwari Sah
4. Raja Sah @ Raja Kumar, aged about 25 years,
S/o Khushilal Sah @ Khushilal Sah @ Mushar Sah
5. Chhotu Kumar @ Chhotu Sah , aged about 20 years
S/o Khushilal Sah @ Mushar Sah
6. Kusumlal Sah aged about 60 years S/o Late Sirichan Sah
7. Birendra Sah aged about 35 years S/o Nago Sah
All resident of Village-Tariyama, Ward No. 4, P.S. Bakhtiyarpur, District- Saharsa
..... **Petitioners**

Vs

1. The State of Bihar
2. Murari Pd. Gupta S/o Late Basant Sah
3. Ratan Kumar S/o Chhotu Sah
4. Dinesh Sah S/o Basdev Sah
All 2 to 4 are resident of VillageTariyama, P.S.Bakhtiyarpur, District Saharsa.
.....**Opposite Parties**

Appearance :-

For the Petitioners	:- None
For the State (O.P. No. 1)	:- Sri Krishna Murari Prasad, Ld. P.P.
For the O.P. No. 2 to 4	:- None

ORDER

1. The instant revision petition has been filed by the petitioners/revisionists challenging the correctness, legality and propriety of the order dated 09.12.2025 passed by Ld. SDM., Simri Bakhtiyarpur, Saharsa passed in Miscellaneous Case No. 662/2025 whereby and whereunder the revisionists were directed to appear in person on 12.01.2026 in the court and to file show-cause as to why he should not be directed to furnish bonds/security in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- with two sureties in the like amount each to keep the peace for a period of one year.
2. Heard the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioners and Ld. P.P. for the State. On the other hand, the Ld. P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the

IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, SAHARSA

Saharsa, Dated: - 14.05.2026

Present: - Dinesh Sharma, P.D. & S.J., Saharsa

Criminal Revision No. 9/2026

Jay Narayan Sah @ Tetar Sah & 6 Others Vs. The State of Bihar & 3Ors.

prayer submitting that the impugned order is interlocutory one and Section 397(2) of Cr.P.C./ section 438(2) BNSS bars the filing of revision petition against the interlocutory orders.

3. Perused the revision petition and the grounds taken in the petition. It is averred in the petition that the order is bad in law and against the facts and circumstances of the case. It is further averred that the ancestors of petitioners are coming in peaceful possession over the land for more than 100 years. It is further averred that petitioners have got rent receipt and other document in support of their claim. It is further pleaded that the police report is wrong. It is prayed that the revision petition may kindly be admitted and after calling the trial court record and hearing the impugned order may kindly be set-aside.
4. The rival submission considered record perused. The petitioners/revisionists have challenged the preliminary notice issued by the Executive Magistrate calling upon them to show cause why they should not be required to furnish security for keeping the peace. At the outset, this Court must address the maintainability of this petition in light of the bar contained in Section 397(2) of the Cr.PC/section 438 (2) of the BNSS.
5. The impugned show cause notice, issued under the mandate of Section 126 of the BNSS, cannot be elevated to the status of a revisable order, as it fundamentally constitutes nothing more than statutory Information and a preliminary communication of executive apprehension. The notice serves as a status report of apprehension; the learned Magistrate, at this nascent stage, has neither affirmed the truth of the allegations nor adjudicated upon any facts, but has merely shared the substance of information received to invite a response from the petitioners/revisionists. There exists a total absence of Lis or a contested issue; the notice is merely the preface to the book of inquiry, and until the petitioners/revisionists files a reply, no legal conflict has been formally arisen for this Court to resolve. The show cause notice acts as a protective shield rather than a sword, providing the petitioners/revisionists with a important opportunity of purging, a window of natural justice where they may dissolve the cloud of suspicion by showing the notice to be legally stillborn or factually misplaced. In the opinion of this Court the notice possesses a non-executory and non-coercive

IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, SAHARSA

Saharsa, Dated: - 14.05.2026

Present: - Dinesh Sharma, P.D. & S.J., Saharsa

Criminal Revision No. 9/2026

Jay Narayan Sah @ Tetar Sah & 6 Others Vs. The State of Bihar & 3Ors.

character; it does not curtail physical liberty, mandate financial liability, or alter the petitioners/revisionist's legal status in any capacity. It merely requires an explanation. Consequently, as the notice does not transit from the realm of procedural information into the domain of adjudication, it remains purely interlocutory. To interfere at this stage would be to adjudicate upon a hypothetical grievance and bypass the exhaustion of remedies at the grassroots level, thereby violating the express legislative mandate and systemic discipline intended by section 397(2) of the Cr.PC/ section 438 (2) of the BNSS.

6. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Amarnath Vs The State of Haryana (1977) 4 SCC 137**, has held that *interlocutory orders are those which are purely interim or temporary and do not decide the important rights or liabilities of the parties*. The impugned order, in view of the discussions made herein above and in the light of the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the considered opinion of this Court, is an interlocutory order and revision against such orders is barred under Section 397(2) of Cr.P.C./438(2) of BNSS.
7. If the petitioners/revisionists believe the notice is legally stillborn, vague, or the Ld. Executive Magistrate was not competent to issue, the proper and most efficacious remedy is to appear before the learned Executive Magistrate and raise these specific preliminary objections. The law presumes that the Ld. Executive Magistrate, upon being shown a valid legal flaw or a lack of factual basis, will exercise his power under section 137 BNSS to discharge the notice and drop the proceedings.
8. To entertain a revision at this premature stage would not only result in a piecemeal inquiry but would also frustrate the very objective of preventive justice by stalling the inquiry through litigious maneuvers. The revisional Court should not be converted into a forum of first impression for procedural flaws that the subordinate court is fully competent to correct.
9. **However, it is clarified that if, after the petitioners/revisionists have appeared and shown valid cause, be it on grounds of law, jurisdiction, or fact, the learned Magistrate fails to consider the same and arbitrarily decides to proceed further with the inquiry, such a decision would then ripen into an Intermediate Order. In such a contingency, where a formal decision**

IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, SAHARSA

Saharsa, Dated: - 14.05.2026

Present: - Dinesh Sharma, P.D. & S.J., Saharsa

Criminal Revision No. 9/2026

Jay Narayan Sah @ Tetar Sah & 6 Others Vs. The State of Bihar & 3Ors.

to proceed is made despite a patent legal bar, the petitioners/revisionists shall be at liberty to approach this Court again, as the bar of Section 438 (2) of the BNSS would no longer impede the corrective jurisdiction of this Court. [Emphasis added]

10. Consequently, as the impugned order is currently purely interlocutory in nature, the present revision is hit by the bar of section 397(2) of the Cr.PC/ section 438 (2) of the BNSS. The revision petition is, therefore, **dismissed as not maintainable.**
11. The petitioners/revisionists are advised to approach the Court of the learned Executive Magistrate and file a detailed reply showing cause against the notice. It is expected that the learned Magistrate shall consider all legal and factual objections raised by the petitioners/revisionists with an independent application of mind before proceeding further with the inquiry. [Emphasis added].
12. A copy of this order be sent to the court concerned for information and needful.
13. Announced in open Court today on this 14th May 2026. File be consigned to Record Room, as per rules.

Dictated & corrected by:

Sd/-

(DINESH SHARMA)

Sessions Judge, Saharsa
14.05.2026

Order passed by:

Sd/-

(DINESH SHARMA)

Sessions Judge, Saharsa
14.05.2026

Date of Judgement/Order	14.05.2026
Date of Reserving Judgement/Order	14.05.2026
Uploading Date	21.05.2026
Uploaded by	Javed Haider Steno

IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, SAHARSA

Saharsa, Dated: - 14.05.2026

Present: - Dinesh Sharma, P.D. & S.J., Saharsa

Criminal Revision No. 9/2026

Jay Narayan Sah @ Tetar Sah & 6 Others Vs. The State of Bihar & 3Ors.