HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Bail Cancellation Application No. 144/2026
CNR: RJHC020955832026 | URN: CRLBC / 216U / 2026

Satyapal Singh S/o Pratap Singh, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Nagla Churaman Ps Sewar, Bharatpur.

----Applicant-Complainant

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

----Non-Applicant

2. Jagveer Singh S/o Shri Sahab Singh, Aged About 53
3. Maya W/o Shankar Singh, Aged About 62 Years,
4. Tannu S/o Shankar Singh, Aged About 20 Years,
5. Moo D/o Shankar Singh, Aged About 16 Years, Through Her Father Shankar Singh S/o Raghunath.
6. Shankar Singh S/o Raghunath, Aged About 55 Years,
All R/o Nagla Churaman, Ps Sewar, Dist. Bharatpur.

----Accused-Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Munendra Singh Fouzdar, Adv.
For State	:	Mr. NS Dhakar, PP.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPMAN

Order

27/10/2026

1. By way of this application under Section 483 of BNSS, the applicant-complainant has approached this Court seeking cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent Nos.2 to 6, vide order dated 17.09.2026 passed by learned Sessions Judge, Bharatpur in Bail Application No.410/2026 (CIS No.428/2026).

2. It is contended by learned counsel for the applicant-complainant that the learned Sessions Judge has committed grave error in granting anticipatory bail to the accused-respondents by

the impugned order dated 17.09.2026. Learned counsel submits that there are four injuries on the person of the injured, out of which injury No.3 has been reported to be serious in nature, with a possibility of having been inflicted by a sharp/heavy weapon. Counsel further submits that recovery of the weapon used in the alleged offence is still pending and the investigation is yet to be completed. Hence, the impugned order granting pre-arrest bail to the accused-respondents by learned trial Court deserves to be cancelled.

3. I have considered the contentions and perused the impugned order dated 17.09.2026.

4. From perusal of the impugned order dated 17.09.2026, it appears that while considering the application for interim anticipatory bail, learned trial Court watched the video recording of the alleged incident, in which no injury was appeared to be sustained by the injured. However, the injury report shows that the injured sustained total four injuries, out of which injury No.3 caused on the left hand was found to be grievous in nature. During investigation, the Investigating Officer obtained second opinion from the Medical expert with regard to injury No.3 and it was opined that the possibility of the said injury having been caused by sharp/heavy weapon cannot be ruled out and thus, the Investigating Officer has not found proved the offence under Section 74 of BNSS against the accused-respondents. It was further observed that the accused-respondents had already joined the investigation and investigation qua them had already been completed. Moreover, the grievous injury has been attributed to

co-accused Dhruv @ Asshu. The accused-respondents do not have any criminal antecedents.

5. Thus, having regard to the facts and circumstances of the present case and considering the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the applicant-complainant as well as after going through the impugned order as well as FIR, this Court does not find any justifiable ground so as to cancel the facility of anticipatory bail granted to the accused-respondents by the trial Court vide order dated 17.09.2026. The learned trial Court granted pre-arrest bail to the accused-respondents after appreciating the material available on record and as such, the impugned order does not suffer from any infirmity whatsoever so as to call for interference therein.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Bail Cancellation Application stands dismissed as being devoid of merit.

(ANIL KUMAR UPMAN),J

1/MANOJ SOLANKI