

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous (Petition) No.6908/2025

1. Govind Ram Meena S/o Shri Late Gyarsi Lal Meena, Aged About 68 Years, R/o Village Dudawala, Post Jeetawala, Tehsil Bassi, P.s. Kanota, District Jaipur.
2. Mangal Chand Meena S/o Shri Govind Ram Meena, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village Dudawala, Post Jeetawala, Tehsil Bassi, P.s. Kanota, District Jaipur.
3. Har Lal Meena S/o Shri Govind Ram Meena, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Village Dudawala, Post Jeetawala, Tehsil Bassi, P.s. Kanota, District Jaipur.
4. Jay Ram Meena S/o Shri Govind Ram Meena, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village Dudawala, Post Jeetawala, Tehsil Bassi, P.s. Kanota, District Jaipur.
5. Bharat Meena S/o Shri Govind Ram Meena, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Dudawala, Post Jeetawala, Tehsil Bassi, P.s. Kanota, District Jaipur.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Public Prosecutor.
2. Dr. Vijendra Meena S/o Shri Syopal Meena, Aged About 53 Years, R/o 3, Arihant Nagar, Jamdoli, Agra Road, Jaipur.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Vinod Kumar

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Amit Kumar Gupta, PP

JUSTICE ANOOP KUMAR DHAND

Order

11/11/2025

1. By way of filing this criminal misc. petition, a challenge has been led to the impugned FIR No.801/2025 registered with Police Station Kanota, District Jaipur City (East) for the offences under

Sections 115(2), 126(2), 189(2), 305(a), 326(g) and 333 BNS, 2023.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are having 1/4th share in the subject land and other co-sharers are in-connivance with the complainant, who were keeping an evil eye over the land of the petitioners and want to sell the same. Learned counsel submits that when the incident was caused by him on 28.09.2025 by which he wanted to get the forceful possession of the subject land. Learned counsel submits that the petitioners reported the matter to the concerned Police Station, but no FIR was registered. Learned counsel submits that in counter-blast to the aforesaid, the instant FIR has been lodged by the complainant with the vague allegations, hence, interference of this Court is warranted.

3. *Per contra*, learned Public Prosecutor opposes the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners and submits that the contents of the FIR reveals that the alleged offences are cognizable, which are required to be investigated by the Investigating Agency, hence, interference of this Court is not warranted.

4. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the view that the allegations made in the FIR are subject matter of the investigation and the same cannot be quashed by this Court under its inherent jurisdiction under Section 528 BNSS.

5. However, the petitioners would be at liberty to approach the Investigating Officer by way of filing a representation, who shall consider the same strictly in accordance with law.



6. The Investigating Officer is directed to consider the averments of the same and in case, he comes to the conclusion that a cognizable offence is made out against the petitioners, then he shall ensure the compliance of the mandatory provisions contained under Section 35 of the BNSS.

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

(ANOOP KUMAR DHAND),J