

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous 2nd Bail Application No. 15408/2025

Satveer Singh S/o Netram, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Village Khohari, Police Station Sadar Deeg, District Deeg (Presently Confined In Sub Jail Deeg, Bharatpur)

-----Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Rajasthan, Through P.P.

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Yogesh Kumar Sharma
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Rajesh Choudhary, GA-cum- AAG with Mr. Vivek Choudhary, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPMAN

Order

13/02/2026

1. This second bail application has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, on behalf of the petitioner, who has been arrested in connection with FIR No.21/2025 registered at Police Station Sadar Deeg, District Deeg (Raj.) for offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 103(1), 109(1) & 331(8) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, (in short 'BNS') 2023. After completion of investigation, Police filed charge-sheet in this case for offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 103(1), 109(1), 331(8), 118(2) & 61(2)(a) of BNS, 2023 and Sections 3/25(6) & 3/27 of the Arms Act.
2. The first bail application filed on behalf of the petitioner was dismissed by this Court vide order dated 01.08.2025. After dismissal of the first bail application, prosecution witnesses have been examined thus, this second bail application has been filed.

3. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. Counsel submits that after rejection of the first bail application, prosecution witnesses have been examined during the course of trial. Counsel submits that mere presence of the petitioner has been shown at the place of incident. He further submits that no special act of the petitioner has been mentioned in the charge-sheet and mere presence of the petitioner at the place of incident as a silent spectator would not attract any criminal liability towards him. It is submitted that petitioner has not caused any injury on the person of the deceased nor to the injured. Counsel further submits that the presence of the petitioner was natural as his house is situated in front of the place of incident. Counsel submits that similarly situated accused persons named by the witnesses in their statements have not been charge-sheeted by the police. It is submitted that an application to implead them as accused under Section 190 of Cr.P.C has also been declined by the concerned Court. It is contended that there are no criminal antecedents against the petitioner and trial will take considerable time in its conclusion. Counsel submits that the petitioner is in custody since 05.03.2025 and further custody of the petitioner would not serve any fruitful purpose.

4. Per contra, learned Public Prosecutor vehemently opposes the submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner has played an active role in the incident as he was present at the place of incident with other co-accused persons and they were holding deadly weapons. Counsel submits that in

the alleged incident, one person has lost his life and one person has suffered grievous injury as a result of which, one of his leg has been amputated. Counsel submits that first bail application filed by the petitioner was dismissed by this Court on merits by way of passing a detailed order and as such, there is no substantial change in circumstances to entertain this second bail application. He urges that looking to the nature and gravity of the offence as well as the evidence that has come on record so far, the petitioner does not deserve the indulgence of bail.

5. I have considered the contentions.

6. Having regard to the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the parties, especially considering the fact that there is no material change in the circumstances to entertain this second bail application, as also considering the fact that witnesses have supported the prosecution case during the course of trial as well as looking to the nature and gravity of offence, but without expressing any opinion on merits/demerits of this case, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

7. Accordingly, this Second Bail Application stands dismissed.

8. The observations made hereinabove are only for decision of the bail application and would not have any impact on the trial of the case in any manner.

(ANIL KUMAR UPMAN),J