

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
AT JODHPUR**

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 8227/2026
CNR: RJHC010594762026 | URN: CRLMB / 17849U / 2026

Roshan Lal S/o Chen Ram, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of
Chipakheda P.s Mangalwad District Chittorgarh Rajasthan
(Presently Lodged At Sub Jail Kapasan)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through PP

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Pranjal Babel
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Surendra Bishnoi, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP SHAH

Order

10/08/2026

1. The applicant has filed the present bail application under Section 483 of BNSS being aggrieved against the order dated 14.05.2026 passed by the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge No.1, Nimbahera, District Chittorgarh, in Criminal Misc. Case No.108/2026, whereby the bail application filed by the accused-applicant under Section 483 B.N.S.S. was rejected. The accused-applicant is behind the bars, pursuant to the F.I.R. No.12/2026 registered at Police Station Mandphiya, District Chittorgarh for the offences punishable under Sections 331(6) and 305(a) of BNS.
2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the offences alleged against the accused-applicant are triable by the Court of Magistrate. He submits that the similarly situated co-accused, namely Radheshyam, Shobhalal, Nathulal and Sharwan have

already been enlarged on bail by this Court, vide orders dated 20.07.2026 passed in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No.9455/2026 (Radheshyam v. State of Rajasthan), dated 08.06.2026 passed in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application Nos.7384/2026 (Shobhalal v. State of Rajasthan) and 7383/2026 (Nathulal v. State of Rajasthan) and dated 23.06.2026 passed in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No.8233/2026 (Sharwan v. State of Rajasthan). He also submits that the accused-applicant has criminal antecedents and, therefore, his bail application was not considered at the relevant point of time. He further submits that no recovery has been effected from the accused-applicant. He submits that the accused-applicant is in judicial custody since 27.04.2026. He further submits that the charge-sheet has already been filed and the trial is likely to take sufficiently long time to conclude. He, therefore, implores this Court to allow the present Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application.

3. *Per contra*, learned Public Prosecutor opposes the bail application and submits that considering the criminal antecedents of the accused-applicant, he does not deserve to be enlarged on bail.

4. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned Public Prosecutor and perused the material available on record.

5. Having considered the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the parties and having regards to the facts and circumstances of the case, more particularly, the facts that the offences alleged against the accused-applicant are triable by the Court of Magistrate, the similarly situated co-accused namely Radheshyam, Shobhalal, Nathulal and Sharwan have already been



enlarged on bail by this Court, no recovery has been effected from the accused-applicant, the accused-applicant is in judicial custody since 27.04.2026, the charge-sheet has already been filed and the trial is likely to take sufficiently long time to conclude, this Court *prima facie* finds it a fit case to enlarge the accused-applicant on bail application.

6. Thus, without expressing any opinion on merits/demerits of the case, this Court is inclined to enlarge the accused-applicant on bail.

7. Consequently, the bail application under Section 483 B.N.S.S. is **allowed**. It is ordered that the accused-applicant; ***Roshan Lal S/o Chen Ram***, arrested in connection with F.I.R. No.12/2026 registered at Police Station Mandphiya, District Chittorgarh, shall be released on bail, if not wanted in any other case, provided he furnishes a personal bond of Rs.50,000/- and two sureties of Rs.25,000/- each, to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court, for his appearance before that court on each & every date of hearing and whenever called upon to do so till completion of the trial.

8. It is further, made clear that findings recorded/observations made herein-above are for limited purposes of adjudication of bail application and the same shall not prejudice the trial of the case in any manner.

(SANDEEP SHAH),J