

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT

सत्यमेव जयते

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
AT JODHPUR

S.B. Criminal Appeal (Sb) No. 1172/2026
CNR: RJHC010590082026 | URN: CRLAS / 2689U / 2026

Bhagwanaram Alias Vikram S/o Lalchand, Aged About 21 Years,
R/o 7 Lc, Police Station Jetsar, District Sriganganagar, Rajasthan
(At Present Lodged In District Jail Hanumangarh) Date Of Arrest
- 29-01-2026

----Appellant

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Public Prosecutor
2. Jagdish S/o Late Hetram, R/o Ward No. 03, Badopal,
Pilibanga, District Hanumangarh, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

For Appellant(s) : Mr. Anupam Jayani

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Urja Ram Kalbi, PP
Mr. Arshdeep Jatta for
Mr. Pankaj Gupta for complainant

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL BENIWAL

Order

05/08/2026

1. The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked by way of
filing an appeal under Section 14-A(2) of SC/ST (Prevention
of Atrocities) Act, 1989, at the instance of accused-appellant.
The requisite details of the matter are tabulated herein
below:

S.No.	Particulars of the Case	
1.	FIR Number	034/2026
2.	Concerned Police Station	Pilibanga
3.	District	Hanumangarh
4.	Offences alleged in the FIR	Under Sections 103(1), 115(2), 126(2), 189(2) of BNS, 2023 and Section 3(1)

		(s) and 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Act.
5.	Offences added, if any	Section 117(2) of BNS, 2023.
6.	Date of passing of impugned order	28.04.2026

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that no case for the alleged offences is made out against him and his incarceration is not warranted. There are no factors at play in the case at hand that may work against grant of bail to the accused-appellant and he has been made an accused based on conjectures and surmises.
- 2.1 He further submits that vide order dated 01.07.2026 passed in S.B. Criminal Appeal (S.B.) No.904/2026, co-accused-Jagdeep has been granted bail by this Court. The role assigned to the co-accused-Jagdeep is not distinguishable from the role assigned to the present appellant.
- 2.2 Based on these submissions, he submits that the appellant, who is in judicial custody since 29.01.2026, is entitled to be enlarged on bail as the trial will take sufficiently long time to conclude.
3. Contrary to the submissions of learned counsel for the appellant, learned Public Prosecutor so also learned counsel for the complainant oppose the appeal and submit that the present case is not fit for enlargement of appellant on bail. However, they are not in a position to refute the fact that the role assigned to the co-accused-Jagdeep is not

distinguishable from the role assigned to the present appellant.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.
5. Considering the submissions made by learned counsel for both the parties; the facts and circumstances of the case; the challan papers and the facts that co-accused-Jagdeep has been granted bail by this Court; the role assigned to the co-accused-Jagdeep is not distinguishable from the role assigned to the present appellant; the appellant is in judicial custody since 29.01.2026; and that the prosecution has not expressed any apprehension qua the appellant fleeing away from justice, in case he is enlarged on bail, this Court is of the considered view that no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the appellant behind bars for an indefinite period. Thus, without expressing any opinion on merits/demerits of the case, this Court is of the opinion that the appeal filed by the appellant deserves to be allowed.
6. Consequently, the instant appeal is allowed. The impugned order dated 28.04.2026 passed by the learned Special Judge, SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Cases, Hanumangarh is set aside. It is ordered that the accused-appellant-**Bhagwanaram Alias Vikram S/o Lalchand**, arrested in connection with aforesaid FIR, shall be released on bail, provided he furnishes a personal bond of Rs.50,000/- and two sureties of Rs. 25,000/- each to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court with the stipulation to appear before that

Court on all dates of hearing and as and when called upon to do so.

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

79/Ajay Singh