

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

S.B. Criminal Revision Petition No. 558/2023

S.s. Jain S/o Late Shri Maya Chand Jain, Aged About 61 Years,
R/o 131 M. Road Bhopalpura Udaipur

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

Connected With

S.B. Criminal Revision Petition No. 854/2023

Prabhu Lal Dendor S/o Huka Dandore, Aged About 58 Years,
Khumanpura, Post Dariyati, Teh. Chikhli, Dist. Dungerpur (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Manoj Bhandari, Sr. Adv, assisted by Ms. Sapna Vaishnav
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. VS Rajpurohit, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BALJINDER SINGH SANDHU

Order

27/03/2026

The present revision petitions have been filed by the petitioners under Section 397 of Cr.P.C. against the judgment passed by the learned Special Court ACD No.1 Udaipur in special sessions case No. 75/2022 whereby the learned Court below has taken cognizance and has framed charge under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act r/w Section 120-B of IPC against the petitioners.

The main contention raised in the present revision petition, challenging the charges framed by the learned trial Court against the petitioners, is that for offences under the Prevention of Corruption Act allegedly committed by persons who are serving in the Central Government within the territorial jurisdiction of State Agencies, the ACB has no jurisdiction to register the criminal case and to proceed with the investigation and file charge-sheet, and the same comes within the jurisdiction of the Central Bureau of Investigation.

Learned Public Prosecutor submits that the core question involved in this case was considered by the Coordinate Bench of this Court in bunch of petitions which was led by **CRLMP No.2819/2025 titled as Mukesh Singh vs. State of Rajasthan**. Both the parties, does not dispute the fact that the question involved in the petition is no res integra and has been decided by the Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 01.09.2025. Further the said judgment was challenged before the Hon'ble Apex Court and the same has been affirmed in **SLP Nos.1104-1108/2026** vide order dated 27.01.2026. In view of the same, the main contention raised by the petitioner does not survive.

However, so far as the other contentions raised by the petitioner regarding the fact that the petitioner was not present at the place of incident and no work was pending when the trap proceedings were undertaken, it is seen that the same is to be considered by the learned trial Court after due evaluation of the evidence on record. While framing the charges, learned trial Court has, prima facie taken into consideration the material available on

record and based upon the same, the charges have been framed. The defence of the petitioner is certainly to be considered during the trial and therefore, this Court does not find any ground for interference in the charges framed by the learned trial Court.

Accordingly, the present criminal revision petitions are dismissed. However, the petitioner certainly shall be at liberty to raise all the contentions before the learned trial Court.

(BALJINDER SINGH SANDHU),J

214-215-Jatin/-