

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

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 10884/2026
CNR: RJHC020648702026 | URN: CRLMB / 20138U / 2026

Abhijeet Soni Son Of Sunil Soni, Aged About 24 Years, Resident
Of House No. 4/159, Vidhyut Abhiyanta Colony, Near Satkar
Shopping Center, Malviya Nagar, Police Station Malviya Nagar,
Jaipur (At Present In Central Jail Jaipur)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through P.p.

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Bhanu Kumar Bawta, Adv. with Mr. Ashish Chauhan, Adv.
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. NS Dhakar, PP
For Complainant	:	Mr. Vaibhav Shara, Adv. with Mr. Vivek Sharma, Adv.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPMAN

Order

12/10/2026

1. The instant bail application has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS on behalf of the petitioner, who has been arrested in connection with FIR No.101/2026 registered at Police Station Nahargarh, Jaipur City (North) for the offences punishable under Section 64(2)(m) of BNS, 2023 and Section 5(l)(n)/6 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (as amended in 2019). After completion of investigation, police filed charge-sheet in this matter before the concerned Court.

2. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Learned counsel submits that the family of the petitioner and that of the



प्रतिनिधि
अधिकारी न्यायिक
सर्व न्यायालय पीठ
जयपुर

3

victim are closely related, and the petitioner and the victim are cousins. It is further submitted that a property dispute is subsisting between the family members of the petitioner and the victim, and the present FIR has been lodged as a consequence thereof, with the ulterior motive of exerting pressure upon the petitioner in connection with the said dispute. Learned counsel further submits that although the alleged Incident is stated to have occurred in December, 2025, the present FIR came to be lodged only in April, 2026, and no plausible explanation has been furnished by the prosecution for the inordinate delay in lodging the FIR. It is also contended that no medical evidence is available on record to corroborate the allegations levelled against the petitioner. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents; the charge-sheet has already been filed; and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time. Counsel argues that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 01.05.2026 and further custody of the petitioner would not serve any fruitful purpose.

3. Learned Public Prosecutor, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, vehemently opposes the submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioner and submits that the case at hand is not merely one of rape or sexual exploitation, but also involves the alleged grooming of the victim. It is contended that the petitioner had been sexually exploiting the victim since her childhood. He further submits that owing to the alleged continuous sexual exploitation, the victim is suffering from depression and is undergoing treatment for the same. It is further submitted that In her statements recorded under Sections 180 and 183 of BNSS, the



१-प्रतिलिपि
नेक अधिकारी न्यायिक
न उच्च न्यायालय पीठ
जयपुर

(Handwritten signature)

victim has specifically levelled allegations against the petitioner. Thus, looking to the age of the victim, the nature and gravity of the allegations and the specific allegations levelled by the victim, benefit of bail may not be extended to the petitioner.

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 learned counsel for the parties and the material available on record; especially the statements of the victim recorded under Section 180 & 183 of BNSS in which she has specifically levelled allegation against the petitioner as well as the fact that it is a case of grooming and the petitioner has been sexually exploiting the victim since her childhood, as also considering the age of the victim as well as gravity and seriousness of offence, but without commenting anything on the merits/demerits of the case, I do not find it a fit case for grant of bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the instant bail application is dismissed.

7. The observation made hereinabove is only for decision of the instant bail application and would not have any impact on the trial of the case in any manner.

3/Manoj Solanki



सही-प्रतिलिपि
15/10/26
प्रशासनिक अधिकारी न्यायिक
राजस्थान उच्च न्यायालय पीठ
जयपुर

(ANIL KUMAR UPMAN), J