SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			UKHC010131702025 **CRLR/527/2025** Sachin Yadav --Revisionist **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Vikas Kumar Guglani, Advocate for the revisionist. 2. Mr. Akshay Latwal, A.G.A. for the State. 3. The present criminal revision has been filed challenging the judgment and order dated 06.03.2025 passed by the court of learned 2nd Additional Session Judge, Rudrapur, Udham Singh Nagar in Session Trial No. 144 of 2024, State of Uttarakhand Vs. Sachin Yadav. 4. Learned counsel for the revisionist submits that by the impugned order, charges under Section 105, 125-B and 281 of BNS have been framed against the revisionist. It is further submitted that even on bare perusal of the FIR or on the basis of the statement recorded by the Investigating Officer during investigation, *prima facie* no offence under Section 105 of BNS is made out against the present revisionist. 5. Per contra, learned counsel for the State submits that at the time of framing of charge, the Court has to reach to a conclusion on the

basis of the statement recorded under Section 180 of BNS and furthermore there should be sufficient material collected by the Investigating Officer for framing of charges. It is further submitted that on the basis of the statement recorded by the Investigating Officer under Section 180 of BNS and other materials produced by the Investigating Officer, it has clearly come out that the vehicle was driven by the revisionist rashly and negligently, which hit the e-rickshaw, on which, the deceased was a co-passenger and e-rickshaw broke into pieces.

6. Having considered the rival submissions and the material placed on record, this Court is of the view that since there was sufficient material placed before the court while framing the charges, no jurisdictional error, perversity or material irregularity is made out in the impugned order warranting interference in revisional jurisdiction. Furthermore, it is also true that the scope of criminal revision is very restricted. It is exercised just to examine the correctness, legality or propriety of any finding, sentence or order. Evaluation and appreciation of evidence is not desired unless some admissible evidence is ignored or inadmissible evidence is taken into consideration. The learned court below has exercised its discretion in a judicious manner and the same does not suffer from any illegality or impropriety.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Revision is devoid of merit and is liable to be dismissed and is hereby dismissed.

(Alok Mahra J.)
20.08.2026

Ujjwal