

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT

सत्यमेव जयते

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

S.B. Criminal Appeal (Sb) No. 1169/2026
CNR: RJHC010621662026 | URN: CRLAS / 2679U / 2026

Kishan Lal S/o Rameshwar Lal, Aged About 41 Years, Village Ramsisar Bhedvaliya, Police Station Sardarshahar, Tehsil Sardarshahar, District Churu, Rajasthan. (Presently Lodged At Churu Jail)

----Appellant

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through PP
2. Bhagu Ram, Bandnau Utrada, Sardarshahar, District Churu, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

For Appellant(s) : Mr. Shreekant Verma

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

For Complainant(s) : Mr. Jaipal Singh

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL BENIWAL
Order

22/07/2026

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-appellants. The requisite details of the matter are tabulated herein below:

S.No.	Particulars of the Case	
1.	FIR Number	0171/2026
2.	Concerned Police Station	Sardarshahar
3.	District	Churu
4.	Offences alleged in the FIR	Sections 108 of BNS, 2023 and 3(2)(v) of SC/ST Act
5.	Offences added, if any	----
6.	Date of passing of impugned order	23.06.2026

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that no case for the alleged offences is made out against the appellant 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 accused based on conjectures and surmises.

2.1 He further submits that appellant has falsely been implicated in the present case. As a matter of fact, deceased Rakesh committed suicide, however, appellant neither instigated nor in any manner threatened or persuaded deceased Rakesh to commit suicide. He also submits that though the police, during investigation, has recovered three video clippings, wherein the deceased Rakesh before committing suicide has alleged that his cause of death is on account of the monetary dispute with the present appellant. However, he submits that the offence of abetment to commit suicide could be prima facie made out only if there is allegation or material to show that the appellant instigated the deceased to commit suicide.

While referring to the prosecution witnesses and their statements recorded under Section 180 BNS, 2023, learned counsel for the appellant submits that as a matter of fact, witnesses state that appellant has made payment to deceased Rakesh, who was working as an agricultural labourer in his agriculture field.

2.2 Based on these submissions, it is argued that the appellant, who is presently in judicial custody, 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 and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant oppose the appeal and submit that deceased Rakesh before committing suicide has recorded video wherein the reason for committing suicide is specifically attributed to the present appellant. The mobile phone of the deceased was recovered at the site of incident and call records reflect that the appellant had called the deceased on 23.04.2026 at 03:02 A.M. and the call lasted for 32 seconds and in the evening, Rakesh committed suicide. Further, the complainant (brother of the deceased) in the FIR so also in his statement recorded under Section 180 BNSS stated that the deceased had asked the complainant to come alongwith one Jagdish on 24.04.2026 to settle the amount with the appellant, however, just one day before i.e. on 23.04.2026, he committed suicide. A note was also written on the left hand of the deceased in which he has specifically named the appellant as the reason for committing suicide. In view of these facts, prima facie involvement of the appellant at this stage cannot be ruled out. Thus, the present case is not fit for enlargement of accused on bail.
4. Heard learned counsel for the appellant and learned Public Prosecutor as well as learned counsel appearing on behalf of

the complainant 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 fact that the deceased was working as agricultural labourer in the agriculture field of the appellant; the complainant in his statement recorded under Section 180 BNSS has stated that he alongwith one Jagdish were asked by the deceased to settle the amount with the appellant on 24.04.2026 however, suicide was committed a day prior i.e. on 23.04.2026; the call details reflect phone call made by the appellant to deceased on the same day the incident occurred; the note written on hand of the deceased; and the videos recovered from the mobile phone of the deceased, this Court is of the opinion that prima facie, the involvement of the appellant cannot be ruled out. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the appellant on bail at this stage.
6. Accordingly, the present appeal is dismissed.

(SUNIL BENIWAL),J