

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

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 7766/2026
CNR: RJHC010575682026
URN: CRLMB / 17066U / 2026

Praveen Singh S/o Vikram Singh @ Viram Singh, Aged About 25
Years, Resident Of Maliya Kalaliya Police Station Sendra District
Beawar At Present Lodged In Sub Jail Jaitaran

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. RS Choudhary
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Urja Ram Kalbi, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL BENIWAL

Order

08/07/2026

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	72/2026
2.	Date of lodging FIR	09.04.2026
3.	Concerned Police Station	Sendra
4.	District	Beawar
5.	Offences alleged in the FIR	Sections 64(2)(m), 140(2), 61(2) and 78(2) of BNS.
6.	Offences added, if any	Section 64(1) of BNS.

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 present FIR was lodged on

09.04.2026 for the alleged incident which is stated to have occurred on 06.10.2025. The petitioner is aged about 25 years and the prosecutrix is aged about 33 years and is a married woman. He submits that the present FIR is nothing but a counter attack of the earlier FIR lodged by the petitioner on 22.10.2025 against the family members of the prosecutrix. In the said FIR, the accused has been chargesheeted on 31.12.2025 and as a counter attack, the present FIR has been lodged on 09.04.2026. In the present FIR it is alleged that one Govind informed the prosecutrix that her husband has been detained by the present petitioner and other co-accused. Thereafter, she went to the bus stand with Govind and later, she went to Pali, where the present petitioner was present. The investigation has been concluded and Govind, who is stated to have dropped the prosecutrix to the bus stand, has not even been chargesheeted. Though the prosecutrix has alleged sexual assault in her complaint so also in the statements recorded under Sections 180 and 183 BNSS, however, on the face of allegation, the same is not trustworthy. More so, the allegation of committing sexual assault is based on an obscene photo and video which are stated to have been recorded by the petitioner while committing the said crime. After investigation, no case under I.T. Act, 2000 has been made out against the petitioner nor any obscene photo or video has been recovered during the investigation. The petitioner is in judicial custody since 16.05.2026 and the trial will take sufficiently long time, therefore, he deserves to be enlarged on bail.

3. Learned Public Prosecutor vehemently opposes this bail application and submits that on basis of allegations levelled in the FIR and further statement of prosecutrix recorded under Sections 180 and 183 BNSS, the petitioner is not entitled to be enlarged on bail.

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

5. Having considered the rival submissions, facts and circumstances of this case and after perusing the challan papers so also considering the statements recorded under Sections 180 and 183 BNSS; the fact that the present FIR is lodged on 09.04.2026 for an incident which occurred on 06.10.2025; the allegation of committing sexual assault is primarily based on basis of prosecutrix being blackmailed on the basis of certain obscene photo and video which are said to have been taken by the petitioner while committing the said crime, however, police after investigation, has not made out any case under IT Act, 2000, against the present petitioner nor any such obscene photo and video have been recovered, 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- **Praveen Singh S/**

o **Vikram Singh @ Viram Singh**, 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