

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

S.B. Criminal Appeal (Sb) No. 1108/2026
CNR: RJHC010603442026
URN: CRLAS / 2535U / 2026

Bharat Singh S/o Hadmat Singh, Aged About 25 Years, R/o
Panthedi, Police Station Sayla, District Jalore Raj.. (At Present
District Jail Jalore)

----Appellant

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through PP
2. Rakesh Kumar S/o Shankra Ram, R/o Pathedi,
Sayla,jalore, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

For Appellant(s)	:	Mr. BR Choudhary
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Urja Ram Kalbi, PP Mr. Ravindra Singh Bhati, AGA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL BENIWAL

Order

16/07/2026

1. Learned Public Prosecutor submits that notice issued to
respondent No.2 has been served.
2. Service report dated 05.07.2026 is taken on record.
3. 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	10/2026
2.	Concerned Police Station	Sayla
3.	District	Jalore

4.	Offences alleged in the FIR	Sections 126(2), 115(2), 119(1) and 3(5) of BNS, 2023 and Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) and 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Act, 1989
5.	Offences added, if any	Section 3(2)(v) SC/ST (Prevention of Attrocities) Act
6.	Date of passing of impugned order	02.06.2026

4. 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.
- 4.1 He further submits that the appellant has falsely been implicated in the present case. While referring to the injury report, he submits that no injuries have been caused. The only allegation is that some foul words were spoken and casteist remarks were made. He further submits that incident did not take place at a public place, therefore, no case of SC/ST Act is made out.
- 4.2 Based on these submissions, it is argued that the appellant, who is in judicial custody since 18.05.2026, is entitled to be enlarged on bail as the trial will take sufficiently long time to conclude.
5. Contrary to the submissions of learned counsel for the appellant, learned Public Prosecutor opposes the appeal,

however, he is not in a position to refute the fact that no injury is reported in the Injury report.

6. Heard learned counsel for the appellant and learned Public Prosecutor and perused the material available on record.
7. Considering the submissions made by learned counsel for both the parties; the facts and circumstances of the case; the challan papers and the fact that appellant is in judicial custody since 18.05.2026 and no injury is indicated in the injury report, 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.
8. Consequently, the instant appeal is allowed. The impugned order dated 02.06.2026 passed by the learned Special Judge, SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Cases, Jalore is set aside. It is ordered that the accused-appellant- **Bharat Singh S/o Hadmat Singh** 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.
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