



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

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous II Bail Application No. 9066/2026
CNR: RJHC010619122026 | URN: CRLMB / 19637U / 2026

Sunil Kumar S/o Ramesh Kumar, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Musa Police Station Sadar Mansa District Mansa Punjab. (At Present Lodged In Central Jail Jodhpur)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp
2. Ranaram S/o Bhanwararam, R/o Gumanpura Dechu Phalodi District Phalodi Rajasthan

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. NS Birkh
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Prem Singh Panwar, PP Mr. SK Choudhary

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YOGENDRA KUMAR PUROHIT

Order

28/07/2026

1. The instant second bail application has been filed by the applicant **Sunil Kumar S/o Ramesh Kumar** under Section 483 BNSS against the order impugned passed by learned court below in connection with **FIR No.57/2025** registered at **Police Station Dechu District Phalodi** for the offence(s) under **Sections 137(2) and 64(1) of BNS and Section 3/4 of POCSO Act.**

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the case. He submits that first bail application was dismissed on 30.10.2025 with liberty to file fresh bail application after statement of prosecutrix. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the statement of the prosecutrix, recorded as PW-2, has already been concluded. Learned counsel drew the Court's attention to the relevant portion of the statement of the prosecutrix recorded before the police and marked as



Exhibit D-1, in which she stated that no wrongful act was committed with her and thereafter her father lodged missing report at Dechu Police Station which was confronted to her during her deposition. Upon such confrontation, she admitted that she had informed the police of the facts mentioned in portion A and B. He further submits that applicant is behind the bars and trial may take long time to conclude thus, he deserves to be enlarged on bail.

3. Per contra, learned Public Prosecutor and learned counsel for the complainant opposed the bail application.

4. Perused the statement of the prosecutrix recorded as PW-2, wherein she admitted the portion A & B in her statement recorded before the police, marked as Exhibit D-1 regarding no wrong or sexual Act being committed with her. Considering the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties, and looking to the overall facts and circumstances of the case, without commenting on the merits and demerits of the case, this court deems it just and proper to enlarge the applicant on bail.

5. Accordingly, the second bail application under Section 483 BNSS is allowed and it is ordered that the accused-applicant shall be enlarged on bail in the aforesaid FIR provided he furnishes a personal bond in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- with two sureties of Rs.50,000/- each to the satisfaction of the learned Lower Court for his appearance before the court concerned on all the dates of hearing as and when called upon to do so.

(YOGENDRA KUMAR PUROHIT),J