

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

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 8942/2026
CNR: RJHC010636342026
URN: CRLMB / 19415U / 2026

Inder Singh S/o Shri Mohan Rawat, Aged About 32 Years,
Resident Of Semla Ka Badiya Police Station Asind District
Bhilwara (At Present Lodged In District Jail, Bhilwara)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through PP

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Tirath Raj Singh Sodha Mr. Rajendra Singh Charan
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Lalit Kishore Sen, PP
For Complainant	:	Mr. Manohar Singh

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL BENIWAL

Order

13/07/2026

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	104/2026
2.	Date of lodging FIR	01.05.2026
3.	Concerned Police Station	Asind
4.	District	Bhilwara
5.	Offences alleged in the FIR	Section 108 of the BNS
6.	Offences added, if any	--

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case and false allegations have been levelled against him. He argues that though the allegation in

the FIR is that the petitioner instigated the deceased- Lalita to commit suicide by consuming poison, the material collected during the investigation does not support the said allegation. Learned counsel submits that the transcript of the dying declaration forms part of the charge-sheet wherein the deceased did not allege anywhere that the petitioner was in possession of any obscene videos, which, according to the prosecution, constituted the main cause that instigated her to commit suicide.

2.1 Learned counsel further submits that during the course of investigation, the statement of the petitioner was recorded, wherein he stated that he and the deceased, Lalita, were earlier in a relationship and were about to do *Nata* marriage. However, subsequently, he came to know that Lalita was allegedly in a relationship with one Vijay, which led to disputes between them. Learned counsel also refers to certain screenshots, wherein the deceased is stated to have sent a message reading, "Miss you Viju". He submits that the petitioner had stated that he would circulate the screenshot which states "Miss you Viju".

2.2 Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a bare perusal of the FIR would reveal that the sole allegation against the petitioner is that he was in possession of obscene photographs and videos of the deceased and was threatening to make the same viral. However, despite a thorough investigation, the police have not recovered any such photographs or videos and no offence under Information Technology Act, 2000 is either alleged in the FIR or been found to be made out after the investigation. It is, therefore, submitted that the allegations levelled against the

petitioner are totally false. The petitioner is in judicial custody since 03.05.2026 and the trial will take sufficiently long time, therefore, he deserves to be enlarged on bail.

3. Learned Public Prosecutor and learned counsel for the complainant vehemently oppose this bail application and submit that in view of the dying declaration, the petitioner is not entitled to be enlarged on bail.

4. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Public Prosecutor and perused the material available on record.

5. Having considered the rival submissions, facts and circumstances of this case and after perusing the charge-sheet so also considering the fact that the principal allegation in the FIR is that the deceased - Lalita consumed poison on account of the instigation by the petitioner and the alleged harassment on the basis of obscene photographs and videos, however, no such photographs or videos have been recovered during the course of investigation and no offence under the Information Technology Act, 2000 is found to be made out after investigation; even in the statement made by the deceased prior to her death, there is no allegation that the petitioner was in possession of any obscene photographs or videos; and there is no material available on record to indicate the date, time or place at which the petitioner allegedly instigated the deceased; and further considering that the prosecution has not expressed any apprehension that the petitioner if enlarged on bail would flee from justice, 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- **Inder Singh S/o Shri Mohan Rawat** 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