HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
AT JODHPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 1499/2026
CNR: RJHC010094992026 | URN: CRLMB / 3483U / 2026

Dilip Nath S/o Narayan Nath, Aged About 37 Years, Resident Of Sisarama, Tehsil Girva, P.s. Nai, Udaipur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

----Respondent

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Abhishek Charan
For Respondent(s) : Mr. Urja Ram Kalbi, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL BENIWAL
Order

07/08/2026

1. This bail application under Section 482 BNSS has been filed by the petitioner apprehending his arrest. The requisite details of the matter are tabulated herein below:

S.No.	Particulars of the Case	
1.	FIR Number	36/2025
2.	Date of lodging FIR	13.03.2025
3.	Concerned Police Station	Nai
4.	District	Udaipur
5.	Offences alleged in the FIR	Sections 3 and 25(6) of Arms Act, 1959.
6.	Offences added, if any	-

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as the I.O., in the present case, is having some personal enmity with the present petitioner. The role of police in the investigation of the present FIR is highly questionable. The petitioner was in judicial custody even when the present FIR was lodged, yet no interrogation was made from him, which further shows that the investigation was being carried out in a mala fide manner just to include the present petitioner for one or the other reason in the present crime and

thus, no fruitful purpose would be served by sending the petitioner behind the bars. It is thus, prayed that the petitioner may be granted benefit of anticipatory bail.

3. Learned Public Prosecutor vehemently opposes the extending benefit of anticipatory bail and submits that the petitioner is having 35 criminal antecedents which include the offences under Sections 302 and 307 IPC and various other offences including numerous offences under the Arms Act. He further submits that the petitioner is a member of organized syndicate, therefore, he may not be granted the benefit of anticipatory bail.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

5. Having considered the rival submissions, facts and circumstances of this case so also considering the FIR, and the fact that there are 35 criminal cases of heinous crime pending against the petitioner; the allegation in the present FIR is with regard to providing arms to other co-accused; previous criminal antecedents also indicate cases under the Arms Act against the present petitioner, prima facie, his involvement cannot be ruled out from the crime in question, this Court is of the opinion that the bail application filed by the petitioner deserves to be dismissed.

6. Accordingly, the bail application is dismissed.

(SUNIL BENIWAL),J

55/Ajay Singh