



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

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Second Bail Application No.
5724/2026

URN: CRLMB / 10217U / 2026

Yogesh @ Chotu S/o Ramvtar, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Nayi Basti, Tikoniya Bangali Colony, Sarkari Shochalya Ke Paas, Police Station Muraar, District Gwalior, Madhyapradesh (At Present In Central Jail, Jaipur)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State of Rajasthan, Through P.P.

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Sikander Ali Chopdar
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Amit Punia, PP Mr. Lakhan Singh Khatana, SHO, P.S. Mansarovar, Jaipur

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPMAN

Order

29/06/2026

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.524/2025 registered at Police Station Mansarovar, District Jaipur City (South) (Rajasthan) for offences punishable under Sections 305(a) & 331(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, (in short 'BNS') 2023.
2. The first bail application filed on behalf of the petitioner was dismissed as withdrawn by this Court vide order dated 29.08.2025. Now, 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 alleged offences are triable by Magistrate.



Counsel submits that admittedly, alleged stolen articles were recovered on 29.06.2025 while petitioner was arrested on 30.06.2025. Counsel submits that petitioner has been made accused solely on the basis of his past criminal antecedents. Counsel submits that co-accused Sachin Gohar has already been granted benefit of bail by this Court. It is submitted that trial will take considerable time in its conclusion. Further custody of the petitioner would not serve any fruitful purpose.

4. Learned Public Prosecutor opposes the submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioner. It is submitted that petitioner is habitual offender as forty four other cases have been registered against him.

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 stolen articles have already been recovered prior to the arrest of the petitioner, as also considering the fact that alleged offences are triable by Magistrate and further considering the period of incarceration which is about one year 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- **Yogesh @ Chotu S/o Ramvtar** shall be released on bail provided he furnishes a personal bond in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- together with two sureties in the sum of



Rs.50,000/- 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 after his release from the jail in other cases, 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