

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT

सत्यमेव जयते

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 2434/2026

Aarif S/o Munna, R/o Village Kanchanpur Police Station Kanchanpur, District Dholpur. (At Present Confined In District Jail, Dholpur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through PP

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Dushyant Jain
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Vivek Sharma, PP Mr. Ram Ratan Gurjar

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP TANEJA

Order

19/02/2026

1. This bail application has been filed by the accused-petitioner under Section 483 of BNSS in connection with FIR No. 348/2025 registered at Police Station Kanchanpur, District Dholpur, for the offence(s) punishable under Section(s) 190, 191(2) & 109(1) BNS and Section 3/25 of the Arms Act.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the accused-petitioner, who is an innocent person, has been falsely implicated in this case and he has nothing to do with the alleged offences. Learned counsel further submits that neither any overt act has been specifically attributed to the petitioner nor his name is mentioned in the FIR. Learned counsel also submits that the only allegation, against the petitioner, mentioned in the order of learned Trial Court is that he was driving the vehicle in which the

other co-accused persons were allegedly seated and the allegation of causing gun-shot injury is also attributable to other co-accused namely, Anand.

3. Learned counsel further contends that the co-accused namely, Krishan Kumar @ K.K. has already been enlarged on bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, vide order dated 21.01.2026, in **S.B. Criminal Misc. Bail Application No.981/2026 (Krishan Kumar @ K.K. v. State of Rajasthan)** and the case of the petitioner also stands on same footing. He also submits that the petitioner is in custody since 02.01.2026; no recovery is required to be made from him and trial will take considerably long time in its conclusion, so no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody and therefore, prays that the benefit of bail under Section 483 BNSS may be granted to the petitioner on the ground of parity.

4. *Per contra*, learned Public Prosecutor and learned counsel for the complainant oppose the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner hereinabove, however, they are not in a position to refute the fact that the other co-accused, namely Krishna Kumar, has already been enlarged on bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court.

5. Taking into consideration the overall facts and circumstances of the case; considering the arguments advanced by learned counsel for both the parties, the fact that the other co-accused has already been enlarged on bail and trial will take long time in its conclusion, thus, without commenting anything on the merits /

demerits of the case, this Court deems it just and proper to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

6. Therefore, the bail application under Section 483 BNSS is **allowed** and the accused-petitioner, namely **Aarif S/o Munna**, is ordered to be released on bail, provided he furnishes a personal bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- with two sureties of Rs.25,000/- each to the satisfaction of the Trial Court, with the stipulation that the petitioner shall appear before that Court on all subsequent dates of hearing and as and when he is called upon to do so.

(SANDEEP TANEJA),J

SAHIL SONI /21