

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT
JODHPUR**

S.B. Criminal Revision Petition No. 661/2026

Vikram Singh S/o Sita Ram, Aged About 26 Years, R/o
Vasundhara Nagar Colony Makrana District Deedwana Kuchaman
Raj

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp
2. Bhanwar Singh S/o Kishan Singh, R/o Gobadi Kalla Tehsil
Makrana District Deedwana Kuchman Presently R/o
Jodhur Rajasthan

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Kaushal Gautam

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Sri Ram Choudhary, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP MATHUR
Order

03/07/2026

By way of filing the present criminal revision petition, the
petitioner has prayed for the following reliefs:-

*"It is, and therefore, most humbly respectfully prayed
that this Revision Petition may kindly be allowed, and the
impugned order dated 23.02.2026 passed in Sessions Case
No. 01/2026 by the Court of Add. 01, Parbatsar, may kindly
be Session Judge No. quashed and set may kindly be aside,
and the petitioner discharged from the charges leveled
against him.*

*Any other appropriate relief, which this Hon'ble Court
deems just and proper in favour of the petitioner, may
kindly be passed."*

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the learned
trial Court, while framing charges against the petitioner for the
offences under Sections 80(2) and 85 of the Bharatiya Nyaya
Sanhita, 2023, failed to consider that there is not an iota of
evidence available on record to indicate that the petitioner, by any
act or omission on his part, had abetted the deceased in any

manner or had ever subjected her to cruelty in connection with any demand for dowry. It was contended that the family members of the deceased have falsely implicated the petitioner owing to mala fides. Learned counsel further submitted that the learned trial Court failed to appreciate that the essential ingredients of the offences under Sections 80(2) and 85 of the BNS, 2023 are not made out in the present case. On these grounds, it was prayed that the order framing charges against the petitioner be quashed and set aside.

3. Heard.

4. Having perused the material available on record, this Court finds that the deceased committed suicide in her matrimonial home within seven years of her marriage. The statements recorded by the police under Section 180 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, *prima facie* indicate that the deceased was subjected to mental and physical cruelty by her husband, namely, the petitioner. It is well settled that, at the stage of framing of charges, the Court is only required to ascertain whether a *prima facie* case is made out against the accused on the basis of the material collected during investigation. The Court is not required to meticulously evaluate the entire evidence and material available on record or to record any definitive finding regarding the guilt of the accused. A revisional Court may interfere with an order framing charges only if the same suffers from patent illegality, perversity, or a jurisdictional error resulting in miscarriage of justice.

5. In the present case, this Court does not find any infirmity, illegality, or perversity in the impugned order warranting

interference in exercise of its revisional jurisdiction. Consequently,
the present criminal revision petition is dismissed.

(KULDEEP MATHUR),J

27-divya/-