



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



S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 7320/2026

CNR: RJHC010552142026

URN: CRLMB / 16102U / 2026

Manish S/o Ashok, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Hudko Colony, P.s.
Kotwali Nimbahera, District Chittorgarh (Raj).

----Applicant

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Pushkar Taimini
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Hathi Singh Jodha, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP SHAH

Order

08/07/2026

1. The applicant has filed the present bail application under Section 482 of BNSS being aggrieved against the order dated 25.05.2026 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge No.3, Udaipur (Rajasthan) in Sessions Case No. 155/2026, whereby the bail application filed by the accused-applicant under Section 482 of B.N.S.S. was rejected. The accused-applicant is apprehending his arrest, pursuant to the F.I.R. No.35/2025 registered at Police Station Dhanmandi, District Udaipur for the offences punishable under Sections 3, 4 & 25 of the Arms Act.
2. Heard learned counsel for the applicant as well as the learned Public Prosecutor and perused the material available on record.



3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been implicated solely on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Dilip Singh @ Dilip. He refers to the disclosure statement at page No.69 of the paper book, wherein co-accused Dilip Singh @ Dilip has stated that he had wrongly mentioned the name of the applicant. Learned counsel further submits that, except for the aforesaid disclosure statement, there is no material available on record to connect the applicant with the alleged offence. Learned counsel, therefore, prays that the benefit of anticipatory bail be granted to the accused-applicant.

4. *Per contra*, learned Public Prosecutor opposes the bail application and submits that, looking to the 10 criminal cases and criminal antecedents of the applicant, it cannot be said that the applicant has been falsely implicated. He further submits that the applicant has been absconding and that an arrest warrant was issued against him long back, which is evident from paragraph 6 of the impugned order dated 25.05.2026. Learned Public Prosecutor, therefore, submits that, considering the fact that the applicant has been evading arrest for a considerable period, he does not deserve to be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

5. Having considered the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the fact that the applicant has been evading arrest and has other 10 criminal case and criminal antecedents, and also considering that the present case is not one where there is absolutely no material on record to connect the applicant with the alleged offence or where no FIR has been registered against



him, this Court is of the opinion that no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

6. Accordingly, the present bail application is dismissed.

(SANDEEP SHAH),J