



HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 8488/2026

Jitendra Sharma S/o Mohan Lal Sharma, R/o Village Post Bishan-pura Charanwas, Tehsil Chomu District Jaipur. At Present No. 11-12, Above Town House Hotel, Third Floor, Manika Vihar First, Near G.d. Palace, Mangyawas Road, Mansarovar, Jaipur. The Then Executive Engineer, Public Health Engineering Department, Phulera, Jaipur.

-----Petitioner

Versus

State of Rajasthan, Through P.P.

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Chandra Shekhar
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Vijay Singh Yadav, P.P. Mr. Vivek Choudhary, P.P.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI CHIRANIA (V.J.)

Order

1.	Date of conclusion of Arguments	19.06.2026
2.	Date on which the judgment was reserved	19.06.2026
3.	Whether the full judgment or only operative part is pronounced	Full
4.	Date of pronouncement	22.06.2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.
2. The accused-petitioner Jitendra Sharma S/o Mohan Lal Sharma, an Executive Engineer, working in the Department (hereinafter to be referred as '**Petitioner**') has moved this bail application under Section 482 of B.N.S.S., 2023 apprehending his arrest in connection with the FIR No.245/2024 dated 30.10.2024 registered at Police Station ACB, Rajasthan, Jaipur, for the



offences punishable under Sections 7(c), 9, 10, 13(1)(A) read with 13(2), 12, Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (Amendment 2018) & 409, 466, 467, 468, 471, 477A and 120B I.P.C., 1860.

3. Learned counsel submitted that the accused-petitioner has not committed any offence and further has no relation with the tender process as reported in the FIR. Learned counsel further submitted that the petitioner simply went to the office of the IRCON along-with certain persons without any official purpose. Learned counsel further pointed out that the ACB, after conducting the investigation, has filed the charge-sheet and therefore, no interrogation or recovery is required to be made from the petitioner in the given facts and circumstances of the case. In view thereof, learned counsel prayed that the petitioner may be extended the benefit of bail.

4. Learned Public Prosecutor opposed the anticipatory bail application by submitting that the petitioner, being an Executive Engineer, went to the office of the IRCON and despite knowing about the fake experience certificate of the IRCON, neither took any action nor informed the Department about such fraud. Being the senior official of the Department, he knowingly did not disclose the correct facts and therefore, his role is apparent in the complete process as pointed out in the impugned FIR.

5. This Court considered the fact that the complete tender process involves various officials of the Department including the petitioner herein, who is working and posted as Executive Engineer. It is noted that the petitioner went to the office of IRCON and despite being aware about the fake certificates did not



take any action or informed the Department, which clearly disclose his involvement in the complete offence.

6. Be that as it may.

7. After considering the overall facts and circumstances and the fact that this Court has dismissed the bail applications of the other co-accused persons under Section 483 B.N.S.S., 2023, this Court finds no reason to grant anticipatory bail to the accused-petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the instant bail application filed under Section 482 BNSS is hereby dismissed.

(RAVI CHIRANIA (V.J.)),J