




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



S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous III Bail Application No. 15667/2025

Hani Singh S/o Saroj Singh, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Jalupura, Police Station Thana Paliganj, District Patna (Bihar) At Present Resident Of Near Jagdamba School, Nangal Jalsa Bohra, Jaipur Thana Kardhani, Jaipur (Rajasthan) (At Present Confined In Central Jail, Jaipur).

-----Accused-Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through PP

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Girish Khandelwal, Adv.
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. N.S. Dhakar, PP with Mr. M.S. Shekhawat, PP and Mr. Shriram Dhakad, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPMAN

Order

10/12/2025

1. This third bail application under Section 483 of BNSS has been filed on behalf of the petitioner, who has been arrested in connection with FIR No.90/2025 registered at Police Station Kardhani, District Jaipur (West) for offences punishable under Sections 109(1), 189(4) & 308(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, (in short 'BNS') 2023 and Sections 3/25 of Arms Act. After completion of investigation, police filed charge-sheet in this matter.
2. The first bail application filed on behalf of the petitioner was dismissed as withdrawn by this Court vide order dated 27.03.2025 while giving liberty to renew the prayer for bail after submission of result of investigation and second bail application of the



petitioner was dismissed on merit vide order dated 24.07.2025.

Thus, this third bail application has been preferred.

3. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. Counsel submits that now dispute has been resolved by the parties amicably and other co-accused persons have been granted benefit of bail by this Court as well as learned trial Court. Counsel further submits that there is one criminal antecedent of the petitioner, wherein he is on bail. Counsel contends that trial will take considerable time in its conclusion. Counsel further contends that petitioner is in custody since 04.02.2025 and further custody of the petitioner would not serve any fruitful purpose.

4. Learned Public Prosecutor opposes the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner and submits that there is serious allegation against the petitioner of causing firearm injuries on the person of complainant as well as other injured and both of them have sustained firearm injuries. Learned counsel for the complainant does not dispute the factum of compromise. He has no objection, if this bail is accepted.

5. I have considered the contentions.

6. Having regard to the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case; considering the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the parties, especially the fact that parties have entered into compromise; other co-accused persons have been granted benefit of bail by this Court as well as learned trial Court and trial will take considerable time in its conclusion as well as looking to the period of custody, but without commenting anything



on the merits/demerits of the case, I deem it fit and proper to allow the third bail application.

7. This third bail application is accordingly allowed and it is directed that accused-petitioner **Hani Singh S/o Saroj Singh** shall be released on bail provided, he furnishes a personal bond in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) together with two sureties in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) each to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court with the stipulation that he shall appear before that Court and any court to which the matter is transferred, on all subsequent dates of hearing and as and when called upon to do so.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not involve in similar offence(s) during currency of bail granted by this Court. The petitioner is further directed to mark his presence in the concerned police station in first week of every month, till trial is concluded.

9. Concerned SHO shall enter the attendance of the petitioner in the Roznamcha. In case the petitioner fails to mark his presence in the concerned police station, as directed above, the concerned SHO is directed to immediately report the matter to the concerned Court in this regard.

10. If breach of any of these conditions is reported or come to the notice of the Court, the same shall alone be a reason for the trial Court to cancel the bail granted to the petitioner by this Court.

11. Office is directed to send a copy of this order to the concerned SHO for necessary compliance.



12. 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

MADAN/19