

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
AT JODHPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 8464/2026
CNR: RJHC010573952026
URN: CRLMB / 18381U / 2026

Manroop S/o Ramratan, Aged About 22 Years, Resident Of
Talriya Bas, Rasisar, Police Station Nokha, At Present Gali No 2,
Rajiv Nagar, Mukaprasad Nagar P.s.mukaprasad Nagar, Bikaner
(Presently Lodged In Centrail Jail Bikaner)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through PP

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Rajiv Bishnoi
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Narendra Gehlot, PP with Mr. Om Prakash Choudhary

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR JAIN

Order

14/07/2026

1. The present bail application under Section 483 of BNSS is filed by the applicant-accused **Manroop S/o Ramratan** seeking bail in respect of a criminal case registered as FIR No.187/2024 dated 04.07.2024 registered at P.S. Bhichhwal, District- Bikaner, for the offence under Sections 103(1), 115(2), 126(2), 125, 191(2), 191(3), 190, 109(2), 61(2)(a) of BNS and Section 27 Arms Act.
2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the matter and the investigation against him is complete and he is no more required in investigation. He further submits that there are no chance of fleeing of applicant accused from the jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court. He also submits that the

applicant undertakes not to repeat offence and cooperate with investigation/trial, which will take time.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, while referring to the order dated 12.05.2026 passed by this Court, submitted that this Hon'ble Court considered the bail applications of Manish and Vikas Nayak @ Viksa on the ground that the names of both the accused were not reflected in the FIR registered by the complainant (PW-2, Saddam) and his statement was recorded before the trial Court and, without specifically assigning any role or involvement to the present petitioner, he referred to the name of the present petitioner for the first time before the trial Court. He also submitted that the disclosure was made by complainant while deposing as a prosecution witness. He also referred to the prosecution story and submitted that the present petitioner has been charged only on the basis of vicarious liability with the aid of Section 3(5) of the BNS. He further submitted that no recovery has been effected from the petitioner and that the petitioner is seeking bail on the ground of parity, with two other accused, who were granted bail.
4. Learned Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the bail application and submitted that the allegations are grave and serious in nature.
5. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner-accused and learned Public Prosecutor. Perused the material placed on record by both the parties.
6. This Court while considering bail application of Manish and Vikas Nayak @ Viksa on 12.05.2026 has observed as under:

"6. On the basis of a report submitted in the evening of 04.07.2024 by PW-2 regarding the wrongful restraint, assault and consequent death of Shahrukh, as well as injuries sustained by several other persons who were part of the complainant's convoy, FIR No. 187/2024 was registered at Police Station Beechwal, District Bikaner. After filing of the charge-sheet, three witnesses were examined, including PW-2 Saddam Hussain, who is the complainant and informant of the FIR. Two other injured witnesses, PW-1 Barkat Ali and PW-3 Narendra Kumar, who were also part of the convoy, were examined for the prosecution and both turned hostile and not supported the case of prosecution. Admittedly, both the applicants were not named in the FIR by PW-2. Even in the statements recorded under Section 180 of the BNSS, neither the complainant nor the injured witnesses named the petitioners. The material indicates that the names of both the petitioners were revealed for the first time on 13.07.2024, when the Investigating Officer examined Rustam as an eyewitness, whose presence has been doubted by the defence. No specific role, except omnibus allegations, has been attributed to the applicants and no specific assertion regarding their role or involvement has been made in Rustam's statement."

7. We have considered the statement of PW-2, Saddam, particularly the cross-examination referred to by the learned counsel for the petitioner, and have also considered the recommendation of the police assigning the role and involvement of the present petitioner at the time of forwarding the case for trial. Except for the fact that the present petitioner is involved in three criminal cases other

than the present case, the petitioner stands on parity with the co-accused who have been granted bail.

8. Upon hearing the arguments and perusing the record, we have found that the applicant-accused is no more required in the investigation and he is in custody for quite some time. The further proceedings will take its own time, therefore, looking to entirety of facts and circumstances of the case and without expressing any opinion on merits of the case, the Court deems it appropriate to grant bail to the applicant-accused.
9. Thus, the instant bail application filed on behalf of applicant-accused **Manroop S/o Ramratan**, is hereby allowed and the applicant-accused is ordered to be released on bail upon furnishing a personal bond of ₹50,000/- with two sureties of like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court with the following conditions:-
 - (i) The applicant-accused shall not tamper with evidence or influence the witness in any manner.
 - (ii) The applicant-accused shall not indulge in any criminal activity and shall not repeat any criminal offence punishable under the Law.
 - (iii) The applicant-accused shall attend the hearing of the Trial Court on the date fixed by the Trial court or as and when asked to appear before the Trial Court.
 - (iv) In case of any violation of above conditions, the bail granted to the applicant-accused shall be liable to be canceled.

10. The Registry is directed to send a copy of this order to the Trial Court through E-mail.

(ASHOK KUMAR JAIN),J

2/Abdul Raoof Khan/698