

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous 4th Bail Application No. 3257/2026

Sangram Singh S/o Late Shri Jagmal Singh, aged about 28 years, R/o Village Kirdoli Badi, Police Station Nechhwa, District Sikar, at present Tenant Bombay Paint Wali Gali, Laxmi Nagar, Police Station Jhotwara, Jaipur.
(At present in Central Jail, Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

The State of Rajasthan, through P.P.

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Lakhan Sharma with Mr. Ram Prasad Sharma, for Mr. Prahlad Sharma
For Respondent(s)	:	Ms. Arti Sharma, P.P.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPMAN

Order

07/05/2026

1. This fourth bail application has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, on behalf of the petitioner, who has been arrested in connection with FIR No.1186/2022 registered at Police Station Kardhani, District Jaipur Jaipur (West) for offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 302 and 120B of IPC and Section 3/25 of the Arms Act. After completion of investigation, police filed charge-sheet in this matter for offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 302, 120B and 109 IPC & Sections 3/25 and 3/25(6) Arms Act.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the first bail application preferred on behalf of the petitioner was dismissed vide order dated 11.12.2023, thereafter two other bail

applications were filed by the petitioner for grant of interim bail on the ground of illness of his mother and same were accepted and interim bail was granted to the petitioner and after expiry of interim bail period, the petitioner himself surrendered and presently he is confined in jail. Counsel submits that till date, seven witnesses have been examined including the person who prepared analysis of the viral video thus, this fourth bail application has been preferred.

3. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the accused-petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. It is submitted that none of the witnesses have alleged anything against the petitioner. Counsel submits that the previous bail applications of the petitioner were dismissed in light of the conclusions recorded in Paragraph no.17 of the charge-sheet, where it has been mentioned that the petitioner was present at the place of incident to assist the co-accused in committing the alleged crime. Counsel submits that trial will take considerable time in its conclusion as till date, only 7 prosecution witnesses have been examined, out of 36 cited prosecution witnesses. It is contended that petitioner is in custody since 11.02.2023 and as such, he has suffered incarceration more than three years and two months. It is submitted that the petitioner is a young boy aged about 28 years and continued detention will ruin his entire life. Counsel submits that co-accused persons namely Raghvendra Singh @ Banti and Bhoopendra Alian Bhoopi have already been granted benefit of bail by considering the period of their incarceration by this Court. At this stage, learned counsel submits

that out of nine criminal cases registered against the petitioner, he has already been acquitted in three cases. He further submits that though petitioner is visible in video but there is no active role of the petitioner in the alleged crime. Counsel submits that the petitioner is willing to comply with all conditions that may be imposed by this Court. No fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in further custody.

4. Per contra, learned Public Prosecutor vehemently opposes the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. Learned Public Prosecutor submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender as nine cases have been registered against him. She further submits that after rejection of the previous bail application, there is no substantial change in circumstances and it is evident from the record that the petitioner was also present at the scene of crime. However, he fairly concedes that in other cases, he has been granted benefit of bail.

5. I have considered the contentions. Perused the material available on record.

6. Having regard to the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case; considering the arguments advanced by both the parties, especially considering the material available on record in the form of charge-sheet, as also the fact that none of the witnesses have alleged anything against the petitioner, so also the fact that the petitioner is a young boy aged about 28 years and trial will take considerable time in its conclusion as well as looking to the custody period, which is more than three years and two

months, but without commenting anything on merits/demerits of this case, I deem it proper to allow this fourth bail application.

7. This fourth bail application is accordingly allowed and it is directed that accused-petitioner - **Sangram Singh S/o Late Shri Jagmal** Singh, shall be released on bail provided he furnishes a personal bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand Only) together with two sureties in the sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand Only) 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 of the petitioner, it is ordered that accused-petitioner shall not involve in any other offence(s) during currency of the bail and he shall mark his presence in first week of every month in the concerned police station.

9. Concerned SHO shall enter the attendance of the petitioner in the Roznamcha. In case the petitioner fails to mark his presence in the concerned police station, 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 sent a copy of this order to the concerned SHO for necessary compliance.

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

(ANIL KUMAR UPMAN),J

8 - RAVI KHANDELWAL