

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 6023/2026

Ranjeet @ Mukesh S/o Hariram, R/o Nayapura, P.S. Uniyara, District Tonk, Presently Resident Of Village Naya Gaon, P.S. Mothpur, District Baran, Presently Resident Of Near Hanuman Temple, Hanuman Basti, Dadabadi, Thana Dadabadi, Kota. (Accused Petitioner Confined In Central Jail Kota).

----Accused-Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, through P.P.

----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Vikram Yadav, Amicus curiae
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Tapesht Agarwal, PP

HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SANGEETA SHARMA
Order

05/05/2026

1. The instant bail application has been filed on behalf of the accused-petitioner under Section 483 of B.N.S.S. in connection with FIR No. 111/2025 registered at Police Station Kunadi, District Kota City, for the offence(s) punishable under Section 305(a) & 331(4) of B.N.S., 2023.
2. Learned counsel for the accused-petitioner submits that the accused-petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He also submits that the accused-petitioner was arrested on 14.07.2025 and he is in judicial custody since 18.07.2025. He further submits that charge-sheet has already been filed and conclusion of trial may take long time, so no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the accused-petitioner in custody and therefore, prays that the accused-petitioner may be granted the benefit of bail under Section 483 of BNSS.

3. *Per contra*, learned Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the accused-petitioner hereinabove and it is further submitted that there are 19 criminal cases registered against the accused-petitioner in a span of 15 years i.e. 2011 to 2025, in different police stations of similar nature as well as other. Therefore, in view of the accused-petitioner's criminal background of 15 years, the accused-petitioner may not be granted the benefit of bail under Section 483 of BNSS.

4. Having regard to the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the parties, and keeping in view the fact that the accused-petitioner has a criminal antecedents involving 19 other criminal cases registered against him over a span of 15 years, this Court is not inclined to extend the benefit of bail to the accused-petitioner under Section 483 BNSS. Hence, this Court without expressing any opinion on the merits/demerits of the case does not deem it just and proper to enlarge the accused-petitioner on bail.

5. Accordingly, the present criminal misc. bail application is dismissed.

6. The observation made hereinabove is only for decision of the instant bail application and would not have any impact on the trial of the case in any manner.

(SANGEETA SHARMA),J