

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

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Second Bail Application No.
4701/2025

Manju D/o Bhajanlal, R/o Mukandpura, Police Station Mitrapura,
District Sawai Madhopur. (At Present Confined In District Jail,
Sawai Madhopur).

----Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Rajasthan, Through PP

----Respondent

Connected With

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Second Bail Application No.
4702/2025

Dholuram S/o Kesar Lal, R/o Ghata Police Station Mitrapura,
District Sawai Madhopur. (At Present Confined In District Jail,
Sawai Madhopur).

----Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Rajasthan, Through PP

----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Tarun Jain
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Shriram Dhakad, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPMAN

Order

07/04/2025

1. These instant second bail applications have been filed under Section 483 of BNSS on behalf of the petitioners, who have been arrested in connection with FIR No.138/2023 registered at Police Station Mitrapura, District Sawai Madhopur for the offences under Sections 143, 323, 341, 342, 327, 384, 365, 364A, 368, 395, & 419 of IPC and Section 66C of IT Act. Later on, police filed charge-

sheet in this matter for the offences punishable under Sections 323, 341, 327, 384, 365, 364A, 368 & 120B of IPC and Section 66C of IT Act.

2. First bail applications of the petitioners were dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to renew the prayer of bail after recording testimony of the complainant/victim. Now, complainant/victim has been examined during the course of trial. Thus, these second bail applications have been preferred by the petitioners.

3. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that the accused-petitioners have falsely been implicated in this case. Counsel submits that during the course of trial, victim has not alleged anything against the petitioners. Counsel submits that victim has clearly stated in his cross-examination that it is true that petitioners have not committed any incident with him. There are no criminal antecedents of the petitioners and trial will take considerable time in its conclusion. Petitioners are in custody since 01.09.2024 and further custody of the petitioners would not serve any fruitful purpose.

4. Learned Public Prosecutor opposes the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners.

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 petitioners, as also the material available on record in the form of charge-sheet and Court testimony of the victim recorded during the course of trial; absence of criminal antecedents of the petitioners as well as looking to the custody

period, but without commenting anything on the merits/demerits of the case, I deem it proper to allow these bail applications.

7. These second bail applications are accordingly allowed and it is directed that accused-petitioners **-(1) Manju D/o Bhajanlal & (2) Dholuram S/o Kesar Lal**, shall be released on bail provided each of them furnishes a personal bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand Only) together with two sureties in the sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand Only) each to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court with the stipulation that they 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. The observations made herein above are only for decision of the instant bail applications and would not have any impact on the trial of the case in any manner.

(ANIL KUMAR UPMAN),J