

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 4750/2026

Anil Kumar S/o Shri Mahendra Singh, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Gram Kalwa, Tehsil Buhana, District Jhunjhunu, (Raj.) Presently Residing 51, Rajendra Nagar, Sirsi Road, Jaipur (Raj.) And Land Record Inspector, Circle West, Tehsil Jaipur. (At Present Accused Confined In Central Jail, Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Deepak Chauhan with Mr. Ashok Choudhary, Mr. Sudarshan Rajawat and Mr. Vikas Gurjar
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Vijay Singh Yadav, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR JAIN

Order

05/05/2026

1. The present bail application under Section 483 of BNSS is filed by the applicant-accused **Anil Kumar S/o Shri Mahendra Singh**, seeking bail in respect of a criminal case registered as FIR No.57/2026 dated 01.03.2026 registered at P.S. CPS Jaipur District - ACB Jaipur, for the offence under Sections 7 and 12 of PC Act and 61(2) of BNS.
2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the matter and the investigation against him is complete and he is no more required in investigation. He further submits that there are no chance of fleeing of applicant accused from the

jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court. He also submits that the applicant undertakes not to repeat offence and cooperate with trial, which will take time.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that petitioner was working as land reform Inspector and no work was pending with him on date of alleged trap. He further submitted that though police has filed a charge-sheet but no cognizance has been taken by the trial court as the prosecution sanction has not been received from the disciplinary authority. He further submitted that considering the list of witnesses and other documents, the trial will take time and same cannot be concluded within time bound manner therefore petitioner is entitled for bail. He further submitted that the allegation upon the petitioner is that he has demanded bribe on behalf of SDM but no action has been taken against SDM.
4. Learned Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the bail application and submitted that the allegations are grave and serious in nature. He has also filed a report received from concerned Police Station.
5. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner-accused and learned Public Prosecutor. Perused the material placed on record by both the parties.
6. The complainant Ankit has filed a complaint to the ACB alleging that Takasma (division/partition) is pending with the SDM and he received a call from Anil Kumar (Girdavar) to meet him and after meeting him he demanded ₹5lacs. The complaint was verified and after verification, a trap was led by ACB. The accused petitioner has agreed to take ₹3 lacs

for the Sub-Division Officer (SDO)-I First and ₹80,000/- for himself. The petitioner accused was caught red handed with bribe amount of ₹3,80,000/- on 27.02.2026. After the trap FIR No.57/2026 dated 01.03.2026 was registered at P.S. CPS, Jaipur under Sections 7 and 12 of Prevention of Corruption (Amended) Act, 2018 and Section 61(2) of BNS. After concluding investigation, a charge-sheet has already been filed against the petitioner but investigation is kept pending against Rajesh Jakhar, SDM under Section 193(9) of BNSS.

7. The material on record indicated that petitioner was working as Land Record Inspector (Girdawar) and he himself called complainant and offer to assist in pending work with SDM and demanded ₹5 lacs. The material indicated that petitioner has already accepted ₹20,000/- on 24.02.2026 at the time of verification but he caught when he was accepting bribe of ₹3,80,000/-. The act of petitioner is serious in nature though prosecution sanction has not been issued by competent authority. ACB has not investigated the role of Mr. Rajesh Jakhar, SDM for the allegations levelled in the instant case.
8. The Prevention of Corruption Act was amended in 2018 to strengthen the existing legal framework and address the limitation under the original Act of 1988 regarding prosecution of corrupt officers. Considering the object behind amendment and also the act of present petitioner, wherein he has demanded bribe from an agriculturist for division of his agricultural land and that too while working as an

employee in the office of Collector, therefore this is not a fit case to enlarge petitioner on bail, at this stage.

9. The facts and the material indicate that the alleged offence are of serious nature and role attributed to applicant is prima facie sufficient to consider complicity of applicant in the crime. Therefore, at this juncture, considering the evidence collected so far, this is not a fit case to enlarge the applicant accused on bail.
10. Considering the gravity of allegations and overall facts and circumstances of the case, it is appropriate to dismiss the bail application of the applicant accused at this stage.
11. Accordingly, the application for bail filed under Section 483 of BNSS preferred by **Anil Kumar S/o Shri Mahendra Singh** is hereby dismissed. In case, prosecution sanction is not accorded within a period of 60 days, the petitioner is entitled to file a bail application.

(ASHOK KUMAR JAIN),J