



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

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Second Bail Application No.
4333/2026

Vikram Singh S/o Ram Singh, aged about 21 years, R/o Sarsop,
Police Station Chauth Ka Barwara, District Sawai Madhopur (Ra-
jasthan) (At present confined in District Jail Sawai Madhopur)

----Petitioner

Versus

State of Rajasthan through P.P.

----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Pankaj Kumar Sharma with Mr. Manjeet Saini
For Respondent(s)	:	Ms. Arti Sharma, PP with Mr. Onkar Singh, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPMAN

Order

01/05/2026

1. This second bail application under Section 483 of BNSS has been filed on behalf of the petitioner, who has been arrested in connection with FIR No.224/2025 registered at Police Station Choth Ka Barwada, District Sawai Madhopur (Rajasthan) for offences punishable under Sections 318(4) & 319(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, (in short 'BNS') 2023 and Section 66D of Information Technology (Amendment) Act, 2008. After completion of investigation, police filed charge-sheet in this matter.

2. The first bail application filed on behalf of the petitioner was dismissed by this Court on merits vide order dated 13.01.2026 however, liberty was granted to the petitioner to renew the prayer for bail before the learned trial Court under Section 480(6) of BNSS (Corresponding to Section 437(6) of Cr.PC), if trial is not completed within a period of 60 days from the first date fixed for



recording the prosecution witnesses. Pursuant thereto, petitioner filed bail application before the learned trial Court however, same was dismissed by the learned trial Court. Thus, this second bail application has been filed on behalf of the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. Counsel submits that charges were framed against the petitioner on 05.01.2026 and the first date for recording the prosecution evidence was fixed on 17.01.2026. Counsel submits that more than three months have passed since the first date fixed for recording the prosecution evidence, but the trial is still pending. It is submitted that the alleged offences are triable by Magistrate. It is submitted that apart from one other case, no case is pending against the petitioner, and even in that case, the benefit of bail has been granted to the petitioner by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court. It is submitted that trial will take considerable time in its conclusion. Counsel further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 19.11.2025 and further custody of the petitioner would not serve any fruitful purpose.

4. Learned Public Prosecutor opposes the submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioner.

5. I have considered the contentions.

6. Having regard to the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case; considering the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the parties, especially considering the fact that alleged offences are triable by Magistrate, as also considering that petitioner is in custody since 19.11.2025 and trial will take



considerable time in its conclusion, but without commenting anything on the merits/demerits of the case, I deem it fit and proper to allow the second bail application.

7. This second bail application is accordingly allowed and it is directed that accused-petitioner- **Vikram Singh S/o Ram Singh** 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.

8. Considering the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, 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 conclusion of the trial.

9. 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.

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 the petitioner by this Court.

11. Office is directed to send 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