

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT

सत्यमेव जयते

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
AT JODHPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 4700/2026
CNR: RJHC010370912026
URN: CRLMB / 10692U / 2026

1.

Harish S/o Jaggannath, Aged About 30 Years, Falan Umariya Police Station Chourasi District Doongarpur. Presently Lodged At District Jail Doongarpur
2.

Ranchood Lal S/o Dhanna, Aged About 25 Years, Bedasa Falan Umariya Police Station Chourasi District Doongarpur. Presently Lodged At District Jail Doongarpur

-----Petitioners

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)

:

Mr. Umesh Kant Vyas

For Respondent(s)

:

Mr. Lalit Kishor Sen, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL BENIWAL

Order

16/07/2026

1. This application for bail has been filed by the petitioners 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	184/2025
2.	Date of lodging FIR	20.10.2025
3.	Concerned Police Station	Chaurasi
4.	District	Dungarpur
5.	Offences alleged in the FIR	Section 103(1) of BNS.
6.	Offences added, if any	

2. After attempting to argue for some time, learned counsel for the petitioners does not want to press the present bail application qua petitioner No.1-Harish at this stage.

3. Accordingly, the present bail application is dismissed as not pressed qua petitioner No.1-Harish.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner No.2-Ranchood Lal has been falsely implicated in the case and false allegations have been levelled against him. He further submits that the present case is a case of circumstantial evidence. Though petitioner No.2 is stated to have been consumed liquor along with other co-accused persons, however, his role in the present crime is not established and he has been made accused in the present case merely based on suspicion. The principal allegation is against co-accused Harish.

4.1 While referring to the inquiry note of co-accused Harish, learned counsel submits that Harish admitted this fact that it was he, who inflicted head injury to deceased Kalpesh. There is no evidence available on record to connect the present petitioner with the crime in question. The petitioner No.2 is in judicial custody since 26.10.2025 and the trial will take sufficiently long time, therefore, he deserves to be enlarged on bail.

5. Learned Public Prosecutor vehemently opposes this bail application, however, he is not in a position to refute the fact that principal allegation is against co-accused Harish, who himself has admitted during inquiry that he caused injury to the deceased which resulted in his death.

6. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Public Prosecutor and perused the material available on record.

7. Having considered the rival submissions, facts and circumstances of this case and after perusing the challan papers so also considering the facts that the petitioner No.2 is in judicial custody since 26.10.2025; allegation of inflicting head injury to deceased Kalpesh is on co-accused Harish and who himself admitted this fact during inquiry; prima facie, there is no material to connect the present petitioner to the crime in question; and that the prosecution has not expressed any apprehension qua the petitioner No.2 fleeing away from justice, in case he is enlarged on bail, 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.

8. Accordingly, the bail application filed under Section 483 of BNSS is allowed qua petitioner No.2. It is ordered that petitioner No.2- **Ranchood Lal S/o Dhanna**, 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.

9. 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

61/Ajay Singh/663