

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT

सत्यमेव जयते

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 2695/2026

Mukesh Kumar S/o Shri Peeraram, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Ganv Sukwasani, Police Station Degana, District Nagaur, At Present At Plot No. 101, Mahdev Chai Hotel Ke Upar, Vigyan Nagar, Police Chowki Ke Pass, Vigyan Nagar Kota. (Raj.) (At Presently Confined In District Jail Kota).

-----Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Rajasthan, Through PP

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Pawan Kumar Verma
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Jitendra Singh Rathore, PP Mr. Kuldeep Sharma

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP TANEJA
Order

25/02/2026

1. This bail application has been filed by the accused-petitioner under Section 483 of BNSS in connection with FIR No.337/2025 registered at Police Station Anantpura, District Kota City, for the offence(s) punishable under Section(s) 316(2), 112(2), 351(2), 318(4) & 61(2)(b) of BNS and Section(s) 66D of the IT Act.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the accused-petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he has nothing to do with the alleged offences. Learned counsel further submits that the other co-accused person, namely Saurabh Chandmal, has already been enlarged on bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, vide order dated 23.01.2026, in *S.B. Criminal Misc. Bail Application No.672/2026*. Learned counsel also submits that the parties have amicably settled their dispute by way of compromise.
3. Learned counsel further contends that there is no criminal case pending against the petitioner, he is in custody since 06.12.2025 and no further recovery is required to be made from him. He also submits that charge-sheet has already been filed in the matter and trial will

considerably take long time in its conclusion, so no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody, therefore, the benefit of bail under Section 483 BNSS may be granted to the accused-petitioner.

4. *Per contra*, learned Public Prosecutor opposes the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner hereinabove.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant does not dispute the factum of compromise and submits that the complainant has no objection if the petitioner is enlarged on bail in view of the compromise arrived at between the parties.

6. 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 there is no criminal antecedent against the petitioner, compromise has been arrived at between the parties, the other co-accused person has already been enlarged on bail, charge-sheet has been filed and trial will take considerably 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.

7. Therefore, the bail application under Section 483 BNSS is **allowed** and the accused-petitioner, namely **Mukesh Kumar S/o Shri Peeraram**, is ordered to be released on bail, provided he furnishes a personal bond in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- with two sureties of Rs.50,000/- 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