

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT

सत्यमेव जयते

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous 3rd Bail Application No. 7714/2026
CNR: RJHC020466002026 | URN: CRLMB / 14050U / 2026

Chetan Verma S/o Madanlal, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Raigro Ka Mohalla, Ward No. 9, Kasba Jamwa Ramgarh, Thana Jamwa Ramgarh, Dist. Jaipur, Rajasthan. (At Present Confined In District Jail Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Hemant Vijay
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Vijay Singh Yadav, PP Mr. Onkar Singh Rajpurohit, PP Mr. Ram Prasad Sharma

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR JAIN

Order

06/08/2026

1. This third bail application under Section 483 of BNSS is filed by the applicant-accused **Chetan Verma S/o Madanlal** seeking bail in respect of a criminal case registered as FIR No.187/2023 dated 28.08.2023 registered at P.S. Jamwa Ramgarh, District – Jaipur Rural, for the offence under Sections 302 IPC and 3(2)(va) of SC/ST (POA) Act.
2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the matter and the investigation against him is complete and he is no more required in investigation. He further submits that there are no chance of fleeing of applicant accused from the jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court. The applicant does not

have any criminal antecedents. He also submits that the applicant undertakes not to repeat offence and cooperate with trial, which will take time.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner submitted that second bail application of present petitioner was dismissed on 6-11-2025, and since then, no other witness has been examined by the trial court. He also submitted that present petitioner has been arrested on 28-8-2023, and during period of three years, the trial court has not concluded the trial.
4. Learned counsel has further referred statement of PW-1 Mahesh Meena, PW-2 Purushottam, and PW-3 Mohan, and submitted that the allegation is upon Harsh Barolia, and not upon present petitioner. He referred the cross-examination and submitted that the evidence clearly suggests that soon before the incident, present petitioner has left the place of incident. He also referred the cross-examination and submitted that every witness has named Harsh, who assaulted several blows upon deceased, and the animosity was also between deceased and Harsh. At last, he submitted that the present petitioner was implicated only on the ground that soon before the incident, he was with other co-accused.
5. Aforesaid contentions were opposed by learned Public Prosecutor and learned counsel for the complainant. Learned counsel for the complainant has submitted that this Hon'ble Court has dismissed the second bail application of present petitioner on 6-11-2025 after considering the deposition of

three witnesses, there is no further material to consider present bail application.

6. Heard learned counsel for the parties and learned Public Prosecutor. Perused the material placed on record by both the parties.
7. First bail application of present petitioner was dismissed by this Court as withdrawn on 26-8-2025. Second bail application of present petitioner was dismissed on 6-11-2025, wherein we have observed as under:

"6. On 28.08.2023, Mahesh, the son of deceased Ramji Lal, lodged a report alleging that in the evening of 27.08.2023, his father was found dead with his neck slit. The complainant named Dharamveer @ Deepak, Harsh, and Chetan Verma for the commission of the murder of his father. After investigation, the police filed charges against Harsh, Chetan, and Dharamveer. The material on record indicates that, till date, three witnesses have been examined — PW1 Mahesh, PW2 Purushottam, and PW3 Mohan. We have considered the statements of all three witnesses. The CCTV footage was analyzed by the police, and the documents indicated that due to a light failure, nothing was recorded; however, the deceased Ramji Lal was seen arriving with three boys to purchase liquor. The evidence on record suggests that Harsh brutally assaulted the deceased in the presence of Chetan Verma and Dharamveer. The police investigation further indicates that even Chetan Verma assaulted the deceased with a broken glass bottle.

7. The police also collected fingerprints from the crime scene as well as from the bottle. A seizure memo dated 28.08.2023 indicates that the shirt and jeans recovered from the present petitioner by the police contained blood stains. The record further reveals that there were nine injuries on the deceased, and the conclusion drawn by the police suggests that 15-16 blows were inflicted on the neck of the deceased. The act is not only gruesome but also brutal in nature."

8. The second bail application of present petitioner was considered after recording statement of three witnesses, PW-1 Mahesh, PW-2 Purushottam, PW-3 Mohan. The statement of the counsel clearly indicate that no further statement has been recorded by the trial court after last statement of PW-3 Mohan. This clearly indicates that the trial court has not taken into consideration the fact that present petitioner is in custody since his arrest on 28-8-2023, which is almost three years. Since we have already considered the entire material on record while dismissing second bail application on 6-11-2025, therefore there is no material on record to consider the bail application of present petitioner except the period of custody.
9. The petitioner accused is in custody for last three years, and the pace of trial is very slow, which is not appreciable. The approach of the Presiding Officer is not appreciable particularly when three accused are in custody in the instant case. At the same time, counsel for the petitioner has filed third application to this Court without approaching the trial court. The second bail application was dismissed on merits on 26-8-2025 and no liberty was granted to petitioner to directly approach this Court. This type of practice to file bail application directly to this Court is not appreciable.
10. The facts and the material indicate that the alleged offence are of serious nature and role attributed to applicant is prima facie sufficient to consider complicity of applicant in the crime. Therefore, at this juncture, considering the evidence

collected so far, this is not a fit case to enlarge the applicant accused on bail.

11. Considering the gravity of allegations and overall facts and circumstances of the case, it is appropriate to dismiss the bail application of the applicant accused at this stage.
12. Accordingly, this third application for bail filed under Section 483 of BNSS preferred by **Chetan Verma S/o Madanlal** is hereby dismissed.
13. Since, the petitioner accused is in custody for approximately three years, therefore it is appropriate to direct the trial court to expedite the trial.
14. The trial court is directed to expedite the trial and try to conclude the same within a period of one year from date of receipt of copy of this order. The trial court is advised not to grant unnecessary adjournments.
15. The Office is directed to send a copy of this order by email to the trial Court.

(ASHOK KUMAR JAIN),J