

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 2911/2026

Utkarsh Kashyap S/o Anoop Kumar Kashyap, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Village Bahta Chand, P.s. Kotwali, District Hardoi (Up), At Present Director Taskar Global Pvt. Ltd. G-1273, Phase-II, Opp. Shivani Public School, Transport Nagar, P.S. Sarojani Nagar South, District Lucknow (Up) (At Present Confined In Central Jail Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through PP

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Jitendra Bhakar, Adv. Mr. Akshaya Varma, Adv.
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Manvendra Singh, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH SHRIMALI

Order

20/02/2026

1. This bail application has been filed on behalf of the petitioner under Section 483 of BNSS, who has been arrested in connection with FIR No.407/2025 registered at Police Station Bajaj Nagar, District Jaipur City (East) for offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 316(2) & 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (in short, 'BNS'), 2023.
2. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. Learned counsel contends that alleged offences are triable by Magistrate. It is contended that as per prosecution case, complainant took franchisees from Taskar Global Pvt. Ltd. to open a retail pharmacist store at the location of the complainant and in this regard, an agreement was executed between the Company and

the complainant. It is contended that petitioner was simply the witness of the said agreement and there is no allegation in the FIR against the petitioner that any amount was paid to him. It is contended that it is an admitted case that entire amount was paid to the company. Learned counsel submits that bare perusal of the FIR would reveal that there is commercial transaction between the parties and in the garb of criminal investigation, complainant wants to recover the amount paid by him to the Company. It is submitted that several other cases are shown to be registered against the petitioner and same are also registered against the Company and being an employee, petitioner has been implicated in these cases. It is submitted that trial will take time in its conclusion. Learned counsel submits that petitioner is in custody since 06.02.2025 and further custody of the petitioner would not serve any fruitful purpose.

3. Per contra, learned Public Prosecutor opposes the submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioner.

4. Heard. Perused the material available on record.

5. Having regard to the totality of the facts and circumstances; considering the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner, especially considering the fact that the accused-petitioner is serving as the Operational Head in the company and the alleged offences are triable by Magistrate; so also the fact that reason of dispute is commercial transaction; trial will take considerable time in its conclusion as well as looking to the custody period, but without expressing any opinion on

merits/demerits of this case, I deem it proper to allow the bail application.

6. This bail application is accordingly allowed and it is directed that accused-petitioner- **Utkarsh Kashyap S/o Anoop Kumar Kashyap**, shall be released on bail provided he furnishes a personal bond in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh Only) together with two sureties in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty 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.

7. 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 week of every month in the concerned police station, till trial is concluded.

8. Concerned SHO shall enter 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.

9. 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.

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

11. 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.

(CHANDRA PRAKASH SHRIMALI),J

GAURAV SHARMA /12