

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

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 6529/2026  
URN: CRLMB / 11736U / 2026

Bantu @ Banti S/o Bhogiram, R/o Atiraj Ka Pura, Police Station  
Kanchanpur, District Dholpur. At Present In District Jail, Dholpur.

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

---

|                   |   |                              |
|-------------------|---|------------------------------|
| For Petitioner(s) | : | Mr. Harendra Singh Sinsinwar |
| For Respondent(s) | : | Mr. Vijay Singh Yadav, PP    |
| For Complainant   | : | Mr. Mohammad Shahid Hassan   |
|                   |   | Mr. Dushyant Jain            |
|                   |   | Mr. Udit Sapra               |

---

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRAMIL KUMAR MATHUR**

**Order**

**21/07/2026**

1. The petitioner has preferred the present bail application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) in connection with FIR No. 347/2025 registered at Police Station Kanchanpur, District Dholpur, for the offences punishable under Sections 189(2), 115(2), 126(2), 127(2), 109(1), 351(2) and 352 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS).
2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Public Prosecutor and learned counsel for the complainant. Perused the material available on record.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is further

submitted that though the allegation against the petitioner is that he caused firearm injuries to the injured Jaswant, the medical report indicates that the injuries attributed to the petitioner are simple in nature and caused by a blunt object. The petitioner has been in judicial custody since 25.12.2025. It is also submitted that though 28 criminal cases have been registered against the petitioner, he has already been acquitted in 14 of those cases. The charge-sheet has been filed and the trial is likely to take considerable time. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in judicial custody and, accordingly, the bail application deserves to be allowed.

4. Per contra, learned Public Prosecutor and learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the bail application. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that the petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR and is alleged to be the kingpin of the incident. It is contended that the petitioner, in furtherance of the common intention along with co-accused assaulted Udham Singh, Shailendra, Jaswant and Vijay Singh and fired at Jaswant hitting him between his legs and caused injuries. Though the injury attributed to the petitioner is reported to be caused by a blunt weapon, the allegation in the FIR specifically attributes the use of a firearm by petitioner. It is further submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender and that 28 criminal cases are pending against him, including seven cases involving offences relating to attempt to murder and rest with other serious crimes. It is also contended that the statements of the complainant and other material witnesses are yet to be recorded

and, considering the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, there is every likelihood that, if released on bail, he may intimidate or influence the complainant and the injured witnesses. Therefore, considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, it is prayed that the bail application be dismissed.

5. I have considered the rival submissions and perused the material available on record. The allegations in the FIR disclose that the petitioner is specifically attributed with role of using firearm in the commission of offence inflicting injuries to the scrotum of injured Jaswant. It is also not disputed that the petitioner has an extensive criminal antecedent, with as many as 28 criminal cases having been registered against him, including cases relating to attempt to murder and other serious offences. The statements of complainant and injured witnesses are yet to be recorded before the trial Court.

6. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations, the specific role attributed to the petitioner, and stage of trial coupled with his criminal background, this Court is of the considered opinion that no case for grant of bail is made out.

7. Accordingly, the bail application stands dismissed.

(PRAMIL KUMAR MATHUR),J