




**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR**



S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous II Bail Application No. 2006/2026
Bablu Gurjar @ Arjun Son Of Madanlal Gurjar, Aged About 27
Years, Resident Of Jagdish Ji Mandir Ke Samne, Goner, Police
Station Shivdaspura, District Jaipur (South), Rajasthan (At
Present Confined In Central Jail Jaipur).

-----Accused-Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Rajasthan, Through P.P.

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Rajveer Singh Gurjar, Adv.
For Respondent(s) : Ms. Arti Sharma, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPMAN
Order

04/05/2026

1. This second bail application has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS on behalf of the petitioner, who has been arrested in connection with FIR No.633/2025 registered at Police Station Kho Nagoriyan, District Jaipur City (East) for the offences punishable under Section 8/21 of NDPS Act. After completion of the investigation, police filed charge-sheet in this matter.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that first bail application of the petitioner was dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to renew the prayer for bail after framing of charges. Now, charges have been framed. Thus, this second bail application has been preferred by the petitioner.
3. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the accused-petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. He submits that similarly situated co-accused persons have already been granted benefit of bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court. However, petitioner has been denied bail solely on the basis of



pendency of 48 other cases, out of which, two are under the NDPS Act. He further submits that in 22 cases, petitioner has been acquitted and he has been booked solely on the basis of pendency of other cases. He argues that trial of the case will take considerable time in its conclusion. He contends that the petitioner is in custody since 03.11.2025 and further custody of the petitioner would not serve any fruitful purpose.

4. Learned Public Prosecutor opposes the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender, as 48 other cases have been registered against him. However, she fairly concedes that in 22 cases, petitioner has been acquitted.

5. I have considered the contentions.

6. Having regard to the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case; considering the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner, especially the fact that similarly situated co-accused persons have been granted benefit of bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court; petitioner has been acquitted in 22 cases out of 48 cases registered against him; charge-sheet has been filed and trial will take time in its conclusion as well as looking to the period of custody, but without commenting anything on the merits/demerits of the case, I deem it proper to allow this second bail application.

7. This second bail application is accordingly allowed and it is directed that accused-petitioner- **Bablu Gurjar @ Arjun Son Of Madanlal Gurjar** shall be released on bail provided, he furnishes a personal bond in the sum of Rs.5,00,000/- together with two



sureties in the sum of Rs.2,50,000/- each to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court with the stipulation that he shall appear before that Court and any Court to which the matter is transferred, on all subsequent dates of hearing and as and when called upon to do so.

8. Considering the criminal antecedents, it is made clear that the accused-petitioner shall not involve in any other offence(s) during currency of the bail and he shall mark his presence in first and third weeks of every month in the concerned police station, till trial is concluded.

9. Concerned SHO shall record the presence of the petitioner in Roznamcha. In case the petitioner fails to mark his presence in the concerned police station, as directed above, the concerned SHO is directed to immediately report the matter to the concerned Court in this regard.

10. If any breach of these conditions is reported or come to the notice of the Court, the same shall alone be a reason for the trial Court to cancel the bail granted to him by this Court.

11. Office is directed to send a copy of this order to the concerned SHO for necessary compliance.

12. The observations made hereinabove are only for decision of the instant bail application and would not have any impact on the trial of the case in any manner.

(ANIL KUMAR UPMAN),J