

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 4156/2026

Smt. Manbhar W/o Mansingh, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Village Tontpura, Police Station Sapotra, District Karauli (Raj.). (At Present Confined In Women Jail, Bharatpur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Public Prosecutor Sikar.

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Anshuman Saxena with Mr. Pallav Jhalani
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Vijay Singh Yadav, P.P. Mr. Sanjay Mehrish

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI CHIRANIA

Order

19/03/2026

1. This misc. bail application has been filed by the petitioner Smt. Manbhar W/o Mansingh, aged about 27 years, who was arrested by the police in connection with the FIR bearing No.309/2025 dated 18.10.2025 registered at Police Station Sapotra, District Karauli for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 189(2), 115(2) and 329(3) of B.N.S., 2023.
2. Learned counsel submitted that the bail application filed by the petitioner was rejected by the Sessions Judge, District Karauli vide order dated 19.02.2026, thereafter, the petitioner has preferred this bail application under Section 483 of B.N.S.S.
3. Learned counsel submits that on account of some altercation and land related issues, the incident as reported in the FIR took place, however, she has not played any specific role in the alleged

incident. Learned counsel further submits that it is alleged that the petitioner caught hold of one of the injured person, namely, Kavita, who sustained certain injuries. However, no injuries suffered by the injured Kavita are serious, rather simple in nature.

4. Learned counsel submits that the police after conducting the investigation have filed the charge-sheet on 13.01.2026 and no recovery is required to be made from the petitioner. He further submits that the complainant, Brahmsingh failed to make any specific allegation against the present petitioner except that the petitioner caused injury to injured Kavita, and therefore, she has not played any major/serious role in the incident. In view thereof, learned counsel prays that the present petitioner may be enlarged on bail by this Court.

5. Learned Public Prosecutor strongly as well as the learned counsel for the complainant strongly opposed the bail application.

6. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that the petitioner being a lady was involved with the other persons in causing injuries and in killing two persons, namely, Pinki and Ramjilal, who died in the alleged incident, therefore, she may not be enlarged on bail.

7. This Court, after hearing the learned Public Prosecutor and learned counsel for the complainant noted from the contents of the FIR, the role as assigned to the present petitioner is only of catching the injured person, Kavita by hand, who as per the medical report, suffered certain simple injuries.

8. This Court further noted that the alleged incident occurred on 18.10.2025, whereas the medical examination was conducted on 11.11.2025, i.e. after a delay of almost 24-25 days. There is no

justification in this regard that as to why the medical examination was not conducted, if the person has suffered serious injuries.

9. Be that as it may. This Court, after considering the fact that the petitioner is a lady and has no criminal antecedents of any nature. Without commenting on the merits of the case, this Court is inclined to enlarge the present petitioner on bail by allowing the present bail application.

11. Accordingly, the bail application filed under Section 483 B.N.S.S. is allowed and it is directed that accused-petitioner **Smt. Manbhar W/o Mansingh**, shall be released on bail, provided she executes a personal bond in a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- with two sound and solvent sureties of Rs.50,000/- each to the satisfaction of learned trial Court for her appearance before that Court on each and every date of hearing and whenever called upon to do so, till the completion of the trial. The petitioner is further directed not to take undue advantage or misuse of liberty granted by this Court. It is made clear that the observation, as made by this Court in the bail application, will not affect the trial of the case.

(RAVI CHIRANIA),J