

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

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 2444/2026

Manish Soni S/o Hemraj, Aged About 37 Years, Resident Of Near
Raghunath Dwara Lakhotiyo Ka Chowk Jaitaran Police Station
Jaitaran District Beawer At Present Lodged In Sub Jail Jaitaran

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. RS Choudhary Mr. Shaitan Singh Mr. Kailash Chander Mr. SS Gour
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Hanuman Prajapati, PP Mr. Shailendra Gwala for complainant

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL BENIWAL

Order

24/02/2026

1. This application for bail has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of BNSS (old Section 439 of Cr.P.C.). The requisite details of the matter are tabulated herein below:

S.No.	Particulars of the Case	
1.	FIR Number	11/2026
2.	Date of lodging FIR	08.01.2026
3.	Concerned Police Station	Jaitaran
4.	District	Beawar
5.	Offences alleged in the FIR	420, 419, 467, 465, 468, 471, 474 and 120-B of the IPC
6.	Offences added, if any	

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case and false allegations have

been levelled against him. The allegation levelled in the present FIR is that the petitioner forged the signature of the then Executive Officer. The disputed patta was issued on 15.03.2024. The signature of the Executive Officer showing on the patta belongs to a person who was not posted on the date of issuance, as she had already been relieved from the post on 02.01.2024.

2.1 The petitioner is the owner of the land in respect of which the disputed patta is alleged to have been issued. The petitioner submitted an application seeking conversion of the land, and thereafter the land was converted and sub-divided into plots. The petitioner deposited the requisite amount as per law for conversion of the land as well as for issuance of the patta. The petitioner has neither cheated nor caused any loss to any person. However, merely on the apprehension that the patta bears the signature of a person who was not posted at the relevant time, the petitioner has been implicated in the present case. In fact, the patta was prepared along with other pattas that were prepared prior to 02.01.2024; however, due to an incorrect mention of the date, the present FIR has been lodged. The FIR in question has been challenged by the petitioner in a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C., wherein an interim order was granted by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 12.02.2026. However, the petitioner was arrested on 08.02.2026, just prior to the passing of the said interim order.

2.2 The offences alleged against the present petitioner are triable by Magistrate. The petitioner is in judicial custody since 08.02.2026 and the trial will take sufficiently long time, therefore, he deserves to be enlarged on bail.

3. Per contra, learned Public Prosecutor and learned counsel for the complainant vehemently oppose the bail application and submit that there are serious allegations of forging the signature of the Executive Officer at the time when the patta was issued in the name of the present petitioner. The FIR has been lodged by the present Executive Officer. It is alleged that the petitioner committed fraud upon the Municipality and obtained the patta in collusion with the Chairman. The Chairman is stated to have issued a No Objection Certificate (NOC), despite not being authorized to do so at the time when the patta was subsequently registered.

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

5. Having considered the rival submissions, facts and circumstances of this case and after perusing the case diary so also considering the fact that the offences alleged against the present petitioner are triable by Magistrate; the patta was issued to the petitioner for the land which was owned by the present petitioner; by issuance of the disputed patta, petitioner has neither caused loss or gain to any third party; and the issue as to whether the signature on the patta is forged or not, is a question which is to be decided in the trial, in the considered opinion of this Court, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars for an indefinite period as the trial will take sufficiently long time. Thus, without expressing any opinion on merits/demerits of the case, this Court is of the opinion that the bail application filed by the petitioner deserves to be accepted.

6. Accordingly, the bail application filed under Section 483 of BNSS is allowed. It is ordered that petitioner- **Manish Soni S/o Hemraj**, shall be released on bail in connection with the aforesaid FIR; provided he executes personal bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- with two sound and solvent sureties of Rs.25,000/- each to the satisfaction of learned trial Court for his appearance before that court on each and every date of hearing and whenever called upon to do so till the completion of the trial.

7. It is however, made clear that findings recorded/observations made above are for limited purposes of adjudication of bail application. The trial court shall not get prejudiced by the same.

(SUNIL BENIWAL),J

20-ajayS/-