



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

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous (Petition) No. 10018/2026
CNR: RJHC011058492026 | URN: CRLMP / 16892U / 2026

Ganesh Raj Bansal S/o Late Shri Ram Prasad Bansal, Aged About
60 Years, Resident Of I-273, Ward No. 1, Civil Lines
Hanumangarh Junction, District Hanumangarh.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp
2. Shri Richhpal Singh Kharra S/o Shri Ratan Lal, Resident
Of 436, Vaishali Nagar, Jaipur City, Jaipur

-----Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Muktesh Maheshwari Mr. Kunal Upadhyay
For Respondent No.1	:	Mr. Deepak Choudhary, AAG
For Respondent No.2	:	Mr. Hastimal Saraswat

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

Order

16/10/2026

1. This criminal misc. petition under Section 528 of BNSS has been filed on behalf of the petitioner for quashing of the FIR No.669/2026 registered at Police Station Hanumangarh Junction, District Hanumangarh for the offences punishable under Sections 351(3), 61(2), 111(2)(b) of BNS, 2023.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present petitioner is 60 years old aged senior citizen and a sitting MLA of district Hanumangarh. It is submitted that the present impugned FIR has been lodged by the complainant-respondent No.2 viz. Richhpal Singh Kharra alleging therein that, one Honey Boxer



[CRLMP-10018/2026]

called him on 03.01.2026 and threatened him to kill him. It is further alleged that the said threatening was allegedly given on behalf of the present petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the alleged threat was said to be given on 03.01.2026; however, the present impugned FIR was lodged on 07.10.2026 with the delay of more than 10 months. It is further submitted that there is no allegation in the impugned FIR that the present petitioner threatened the complainant-respondent No.2.

2.2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is a longstanding rivalry between both the parties, owing to which the present impugned FIR has been lodged. Apart from this, many other FIRs have also been lodged at the behest of the complainant-respondent No.2.

2.3. It is also submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that in the FIR Nos.624/2026 and 625/2026 registered at Police Station Hanumangarh Junction, District Hanumangarh, in which the present petitioner was also one of the accused, were quashed and set aside by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 23.09.2026 passed in S.B. Criminal Misc. Petition Nos.9090/2026 and 9089/2026. It is further submitted the FIR No.641/2026 registered at Police Station Hanumangarh Junction, District Hanumangarh was also lodged against the present petitioner, which was challenged by him by way of S.B. Criminal Misc. Petition No.9665/2026, wherein the present petitioner was granted protection from his arrest.

2.4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in such circumstances, it is much clear that the petitioner, who is a sitting





[CRLMP-10018/2026]

MLA of district Hanumangarh and a senior citizen of 60 years, is being harassed by the complainant-respondent No.2 and his companions. It is further submitted that in the present FIR, there is no direct allegation against the present petitioner of giving any threat to anyone. Furthermore, the FIR has been lodged with a delay of almost 10 months from the so called threat of 03.01.2026; therefore, the impugned FIR lodged against the present petitioner is liable to be quashed.

3. Per contra, learned AAG as well as learned counsel for the complainant-respondent No.2 have opposed the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner and submit that the serious allegations against the petitioner have been made in the impugned FIR. It is stated that the statements of the complainant-respondent No.2 is yet to be recorded; therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to seek any relief in this misc. petition.

3.1. Learned counsel for the complainant-respondent No.2 has drawn attention of this Court to the judgments rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **M/s. Neeharika Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors. (Criminal Appeal No.330/2021)** reported in **AIR 2021 SC 1918**. He has also referred to newspaper clippings containing allegations against the present petitioner and alleging that he is a land grabber in District Hanumangarh. On the basis of the aforesaid submissions, learned counsel contends that the present petitioner is not entitled to any relief in the matter.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.



[CRLMP-10018/2026]

5. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case particularly the fact that the petitioner is a senior citizen of 60 years old and a sitting MLA of district Hanumangarh, this Court deems it proper to grant protection to the present petitioner with a direction to join the investigation.

5.1. In view of the above, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation; however, he shall not be arrested in connection with the FIR No.669/2026 registered at Police Station Hanumangarh Junction, District Hanumangarh, without further order of this Court.

6. List the matter after 8 weeks.

(ASHUTOSH KUMAR),J

Abhishek Kumar
Court No. 14 (2043)
S.No. S-A/25