




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



S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 4473/2026

Dharmendra S/o Laxminarayan, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Village Gahlod,
Police Station Peeplu, District Tonk, Rajasthan. (Presently Confined In
District Jail Tonk).

----Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Rajendra Yadav Ms. Anisha Yadav Mr. Ashish Bagadi
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Jaiprakash Tiwari, PP Mr. Aman Ali

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRAMIL KUMAR MATHUR
Order

07/05/2026

1. The petitioner has preferred this bail application under Section 483 of BNSS in FIR No.142/2025 registered at Police Station Peeplu, District Tonk for offences under Sections 109(1), 115(2), 126(2) and 189(2) of BNS 2023.
2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Public Prosecutor as well as learned counsel for the complainant and perused the material available on record.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits that no overt act has been attributed to the present petitioner. Though the petitioner was named in the FIR, however, as per the statement of the injured Kaluram recorded during the course of investigation, the petitioner had no active participation in the commission of alleged offence. He is behind the bars since 18.12.2025 though six cases have been reported against him but in all the cases he is already on bail. Charge-sheet has already been filed. The trial of



the case will take considerable time, therefore, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in further custody, consequently, the bail application of the petitioner may be allowed.

4. Learned Public Prosecutor and learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the bail application and submit that in the FIR lodged by the complainant Raju the petitioner has specifically been named as a member of the group which attacked the injured Kaluram and the deceased Mukesh which ultimately resulted in the death of Mukesh. It is further submitted that the presence of the petitioner Dharmendra, at the place of occurrence has been clearly established by the statements of the eye-witnesses as well as other witnesses recorded during the course of investigation. The petitioner played an active role in identifying and facilitating the assault upon the injured and the deceased and contributed to the commission of the offence which resulted in the death of Mukesh. Hence, the petitioner is not entitled for grant of bail.

5. On consideration of the rival submissions and material available on record particularly the fact that petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR and his presence at the place of occurrence has been established during investigation but without expressing any opinion on merits/demerits of the case, I am not inclined to grant benefit of bail to the petitioner.

6. Consequently, the bail application under Section 483 B.N.S.S. is dismissed.

(PRAMIL KUMAR MATHUR),J