

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT

सत्यमेव जयते

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous (Petition) No.4341/2022
CNR: RJHC020373992022 | URN: CRLMP / 7062U / 2022

1. Chooramana Singh S/o Sh. Tuhiram, R/o Village Sogar, Kumher, District Bharatpur (Raj).
2. Tuhiram S/o Vadiya, R/o Village Sogar, Kumher, District Bharatpur (Raj).
3. Smt. Ranveeri W/o Sh. Tuhiram, R/o Village Sogar, Kumher, District Bharatpur (Raj).
4. Devendra Singh S/o Sh. Narpat Singh, R/o Near Maharaja Property, Madarpur Road, Bharatpur.
5. Smt. Kamlesh W/o Sh. Devendra Singh, R/o Near Maharaja Property, Madarpur Road, Bharatpur.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through P.P.
2. Smt. Pooja Kumari W/o Sh. Chooraman Singh, R/o Village Surota, Kumher District Bharatpur (Raj).

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	None present
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Manvendra Singh Shekhawat, PP Mr. Pravendra Kuntal

JUSTICE ANOOP KUMAR DHAND

Order

28/07/2026

1. The the instant criminal misc. petition has been preferred with the prayer to quash the impugned FIR No.223/2022, registered with the Police Station Kumher, District Bharatpur for the offences punishable under Sections 323, 341, 498A and 406 IPC.

2. It has been averred in the instant petition that there is no *prima facie* case against the petitioners for registration of impugned FIR against them, as the allegations levelled therein are vexatious. The petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence, hence, a prayer has been made to quash the impugned FIR. It has also been averred in the instant petition that the petitioner Nos.2 and 3 are the parents-in-law of the complainant and they are old aged persons living separately and the petitioners No.4 and 5 are relatives of the petitioner No.1 and they are also residing separately in a remote area and they have no concern whatsoever with domestic affairs of the petitioner No.1 with his wife i.e. complainant respondent. Hence, a prayer has been made for quashing the impugned FIR.

3. *Per contra*, learned Public Prosecutor as well as counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant opposed the prayer and submitted that after investigation, a *prima facie* case has been found to be proved against the petitioner Nos.1 and 2 and no case has been found against the petitioner Nos.3 to 5. Counsel submits that under these circumstances, interference of this Court is not warranted.

4. Heard and considered the submissions made at the Bar and perused the material as well as the factual report available on the record.

5. The case set out in the impugned FIR reveals commission of cognizable offence. The correctness of the allegations cannot be examined, adjudged and adjudicated by this Court while exercising its inherent jurisdiction contained under Section 482 Cr.P.C. by conducting a mini trial or by conducting roving and

fishing inquiry to find out the truth behind the allegations levelled against the petitioner. Certainly, this task has been assigned to the Investigating Officer, who after thorough investigation in the present matter, has found *prima case* against the petitioners No.1 and 2 and has not found involvement of rest of the petitioners No.3 to 5.

6. In the considered opinion of this Court, the petitioners No.1 and 2 are at liberty to submit a representation before the Investigating Officer, who shall consider the same in accordance with law and would submit conclusion report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. before the concerned Court.

7. So far as the petitioner Nos.3 to 5 are concerned, the instant criminal misc. petition has become infructuous.

8. With the aforesaid observations, the instant criminal misc. petition stands disposed of. The stay application as well as all pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

9. The factual report dated 17.07.2026 is ordered to be retained on the record.

(ANOOP KUMAR DHAND),J