

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

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 8852/2026
CNR: RJHC010632482026
URN: CRLMB / 19216U / 2026

Heera Lal S/o Amba Lal, Aged About 35 Years, Kayo Ka Nohra
Village Shobhagpura Ps Sikher Tehsil Badgaon District Udaipur
Rajasthan. (Presently Lodged At Sub Jail Mavli)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Public Prosecutor

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Sachin Acharya, Sr. Adv. assisted by Mr. Jitendra Mohan Choudhary
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Urja Ram Kalbi, PP Mr. Jitendra Ojha for complainant

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL BENIWAL

Order

09/07/2026

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	158/2026
2.	Date of lodging FIR	11.06.2026
3.	Concerned Police Station	Dabok
4.	District	Udaipur
5.	Offences alleged in the FIR	Section 420 IPC.
6.	Offences added, if any	

2. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case and false allegations have been levelled against him. The offence alleged

against the present petitioner is triable by Magistrate. As a matter of fact, the reason for lodging the present FIR was that the mutation entry was made while ignoring one of the co-sharer, who is the present complainant. Subsequently, an affidavit was filed stating that the name of the complainant had been inadvertently omitted from the mutation entry and the petitioner has no objection if the complainant's name is entered in the mutation register in accordance with her lawful share. He also submits that the dispute between the parties, with regard to the revenue entry, is already pending before the competent court so also before the revenue court. He further submits that petitioner would not object in the revenue proceedings wherein the name of complainant is to be entered as share holder with her brothers. The petitioner is in judicial custody since 24.06.2026 and the trial will take sufficiently long time, therefore, he deserves to be enlarged on bail.

3. Learned Public Prosecutor so also learned counsel for the complainant vehemently oppose this bail application.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

5. Having considered the rival submissions, facts and circumstances of this case and after perusing the case diary so also considering the fact that the offence alleged against the petitioner is triable by the Magistrate; the petitioner has no objection if the name of the complainant is entered in the mutation register as per her lawful share; the dispute relating to the mutation entry is already pending before competent civil court as well as the revenue court is to be finally decided therein, 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- **Heera Lal S/o Amba Lal**, 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