



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



S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 6088/2026

Chandra Mohan S/o Ramnath, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Kotdi
Pateda, Police Station Sadar Baran, District Baran (Raj.)
Presently Confined At Central Jail, Baran.

-----Petitioner

Versus

State of Rajasthan, through PP

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. P.C. Sharma Ms. Arpita Joshi Mr. Raj Singh
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Vijay Singh Yadav, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GANESH RAM MEENA

Order

24/04/2026

1. This bail application has been filed by the accused petitioner u/S 483 BNSS in connection with FIR No. 529/2025 registered at Police Station Kotwali Baran, District Baran for offence u/S 103(1), 61(2) & 3(5) of the BNS.

2. Learned counsel for the accused petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that in the FIR, lodged by the eye witness, the accused petitioner has not been named as a person in the vehicle, which hit the motorcycle of the deceased. He further submits that in the FIR, it has only been stated that the accused petitioner and some other persons were having enmity with the complainant party. He also submits that the informant eye witness has specifically named all those persons who were seen in the vehicle, which hit the



motorcycle of the deceased. He also submits that the accused petitioner is in custody since 18.09.2025 and after completion of investigation, the police has already submitted charge-sheet in the matter.

3. Learned Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed the bail application and submits that during investigation it has come out that the accused petitioner, after doing *reki* had intimated the other accused who were in the vehicle as regards the departure of the deceased on motorcycle. Learned Public Prosecutor also submits that there is an evidence of call conversation between the accused petitioner and the other co-accused before and after the alleged incident.

4. Considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the accused petitioner as well as learned Public Prosecutor and also perused the challan papers.

5. As per the contents of the FIR, which has been lodged by the eye witness Sukhveer, who is said to be gone by the motorcycle, behind the motorcycle on which the deceased was going. In the report, it has been stated that in the vehicle, which hit the car, Vinod @ Monu, Neeraj Lashkari, Deshraj Bairwa and Golu were seen. The present accused petitioner has not been shown to be the person in the vehicle. In the statements of the Sukhveer and Chandrakala, recorded u/S 180 BNSS, who is also said to be the another eye witness, have not named the petitioner as a person sitting in the vehicle which hit the deceased.

Both the eye witnesses have stated that they were having enmity with certain persons including the petitioner. The statements of Sukhveer has also been recorded u/S 183 BNSS and



in the said statements, he has not named the present accused petitioner.

6. Learned Public Prosecutor has placed before this Court the factual report as regards the investigation of the case and in the said factual report, it has been stated that one of the co-accused Vinod had hired three persons namely; Neeraj, Deshraj and Kamal for this offence.

7. As per the factual report, the only allegation against the present accused petitioner is of making *reki* and informing the other co-accused as regards the departure of the deceased on the motorcycle, but on perusal of the charge-sheet, there seems to be no incriminating evidence to substantiate this allegation. The accused petitioner is said to be in custody since 18.09.2025.

8. Taking into consideration the overall facts and circumstances of the case and more particularly the fact that the accused petitioner has not been named as a person sitting in the vehicle, which hit the deceased and he has also not been named as a person hired by the co-accused Vinod for committing this offence, this Court, without expressing any opinion on merits or demerits of this case, deems just and proper to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

9. Accordingly, this bail application is allowed and it is directed that accused-petitioner shall be released on bail provided that he furnishes a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lac Only), together with two sureties in the sum of Rs. 50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand Only)(each) to the satisfaction of the Trial Court with the stipulation that he shall appear before that Court or any Court to which the matter is transferred, on all



subsequent dates of hearing and as and when called upon to do
so.

(GANESH RAM MEENA),J

Gaurav Srivastava /63