




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



S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous 2nd Bail Application No. 4382/2026

Soyal S/o Arsad, aged about 18 Years, r/o Village Lalpur, PS
Kaman, District Deeg (Raj.)

(At present accused petitioner confined in Sub-Jail Deeg)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan through PP

-----Respondent

Connected With

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous 2nd Bail Application No. 4383/2026

1. ES Mohammad S/o Jafru, aged about 23 years, R/o Village
Ahalwadi, PS Jurhara, District Deeg (Raj.)

2. Sahil @ Sabir @ Shahib S/o Aasu, aged about 26 years, R/o
Village Ahalwadi, PS Jurhara, District Deeg (Raj.)

3. Tarif @ Aarif S/o Hanif, aged about 29 years, r/o Villaage
Sahsan, P.S. Jurhara, District Deeg (Raj.)

At present Accused petitioners confined in Sub-Jail Deeg)

---Accused-Petitioners

Versus

State Of Rajasthan through PP

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Ankit Khandelwal
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Shri Ram Dhakar, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP TANEJA
Order

24/03/2026

1. These second bail applications have been filed by the
accused-petitioners under Section 483 of BNSS in connection with
FIR No.375/2025 registered at Police Station Jurhera, District
Deeg for offence(s) under Section(s) 319(2), 318(4), 338, 336(3),
340(2), 317(5), 303(2), 308(2), 313, 61(2)(a) of BNS and Section
66-D of IT Act.



2. The first bail applications were dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file afresh, after filing of charge-sheet.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the accused-petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case and have nothing to do with the alleged offences. Learned counsel further submits that after investigation, charge-sheet has been filed in these matters and petitioners are not required for further custodial interrogation.

Learned counsel also submits that there are no criminal antecedents against petitioners, ES Mohammad, Sahil @ Sabir @ Shahib and Soyal and only four cases are pending against accused Tarif @ Aarif, out of which two cases are of similar nature. He further submits that the petitioners are in custody since 14.12.2025 and no recovery is required to be made from the petitioners; therefore, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioners in custody, hence, petitioners may be enlarged on bail.

4. Per contra, learned Public Prosecutor opposes the bail applications and submits that the said offences involve serious cyber fraud activity. He further submits that there are nine complaints against Tarif @ Aarif and one complaint against ES Mohammad on the National Cyber Crime Reporting Portal. Hence, benefit of bail should not be granted to the petitioners.

5. In response thereof, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that all the complaints against the petitioners are false, moreover, in the complaints against Tarif @ Aarif and ES Mohammad, a meagre amount of Rs.2,87,056/- and Rs. 3,000/- is involved, respectively.



6. Taking into consideration the overall facts and circumstances of the case; considering the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioners, the fact that investigation has been completed; charge-sheet has already been filed and conclusion of trial will take considerable long time, without commenting anything on the merits / demerits of the case, this Court deems it just and proper to enlarge the petitioners on bail.

7. Therefore, the second bail applications are allowed and accused-petitioners (1) **Soyal S/o Arsad**, (2) **ES Mohammad S/o Jafu**, (3) **Sahil @ Sabir @ Shahib S/o Aasu** and (4) **Tarif @ Aarif S/o Hanif** are ordered to be released on bail, provided, each of them furnishes a personal bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- with two sureties of Rs.25,000/- each to the satisfaction of the trial Court, with the stipulation that the petitioners shall appear before that Court on all subsequent dates of hearing and as and when called upon to do so.

8. The accused - petitioners are directed to mark their presence before the concerned Police Station on the 5th date of every month till conclusion of trial. The SHO of the concerned Police Station shall forward petitioners' attendance report to the trial Court on the same day of each month.

9. In case of any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Public Prosecutor shall be at liberty to move an application against the petitioners for cancellation of bail before the concerned Court.

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

(SANDEEP TANEJA),J