HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 13951/2026
CNR: RJHC020840372026 | URN: CRLMB / 25801U / 2026

Mukesh alias Bullu son of Tanaram age 27 years, resident of Lakhawalidhani, Tan Amarsar, Police Station Amarsar, District Jaipur (Rjasthan) at present lodged In The High Security Jail, Ajmer.

----Petitioner

Versus

State of Rajasthan, through the Public Prosecutor

----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Ashvin Garg with Mr. Nonit Hatila
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. N.S. Dhakar, PP Mr. Sunil Kumar Jangir, SHO, Police Station Kotwali Sikar, through VC
For Complainant(s)	:	Mr. Harendra Singh Sinsinwar

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPMAN

Order

27/10/2026

1. This bail application under Section 483 of BNSS has been filed on behalf of the petitioner, who has been arrested in connection with FIR No.816/2022 registered at Police Station Udyognagar (Sikar), District Sikar for offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 302, 307, 396 & 120B of IPC and Sections 3/25 & 7/27 of the Arms Act.

2. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. Counsel submits that admittedly, petitioner was not present at the place of incident. He submits that he has been implicated with the aid of Section 120B of IPC. It is submitted that similarly situated co-

accused namely- Sarjeet Singh S/o Sube Singh has been granted benefit of bail by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 24.04.2026 in SLP (Crl.) No.5580 of 2026 after considering the period of incarceration. Counsel submits that the case of the present petitioner is also on identical footing. It is submitted that trial is likely to take considerable time in its conclusion. Counsel further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 13.12.2022 and further custody of the petitioner would not serve any fruitful purpose.

3. Learned State Counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant vehemently opposes the submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioner. It is submitted that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner in connection with the alleged incident in which two persons have lost their lives. It is further submitted that petitioner is a habitual offender as three other cases have been registered against him.

4. I have considered the contentions.

5. Having regard to the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case; considering the arguments advanced by both the parties, especially considering the material available on record, as also the fact that co-accused- Sarjeet Singh S/o Sube Singh has been granted the benefit of bail from the Hon'ble Supreme Court and case of the present petitioner is not distinguishable from that of the co-accused and trial is likely to take considerable time in its conclusion as well as looking to the period of custody which is more than three years and ten months, but without commenting

anything on the merits/demerits of the case, this Court deems it fit and proper to allow the bail application.

6. This bail application is accordingly allowed and it is directed that accused-petitioner – **Mukesh alias Bullu son of Tanaram**, shall be released on bail provided he furnishes a personal bond in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- together with two sureties in the sum of Rs.50,000/- 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.

7. Considering the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, it is made clear that the accused-petitioner shall not involve in any other offence(s) during currency of the bail and he shall mark his presence in first week of every month in the concerned police station till December, 2027.

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

9. If any breach 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 him by this Court.

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

11. 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

21/LALIT MOHAN