RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT
सत्यमेव जयते

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
AT JODHPUR

S.B. Criminal Appeal (Sb) No. 1626/2026
CNR: RJHC010976532026 | URN: CRLAS / 3820U / 2026

Rajasthan High Court
सत्यमेव जयते
Web Copy - Not Official

Naveen Kumar@ Pramod S/o Sh. Ram Singh, Aged About 21 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 8, Mirjawali Mer Police Station Talwara District Hanumangarh Rajasthan. (Presently Lodged In Dist. Jail Hanumagarh)

----Appellant

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp
2. Ashok S/o Chandra Bhan, Delip Nagar, Ps Sirsaa Sadar Haryana.

----Respondents

For Appellant(s) : Mr. Pankaj Kumar Gupta
For Respondent(s) : Ms. Sonu Manawat, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEET PUROHIT

Order

02/11/2026

1. Learned Public Prosecutor submits that service upon the complainant is complete.

2. The report regarding service upon the complainant is taken on record.

3. The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked by way of filing an appeal under Section 14-A of SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, at the instance of accused-appellant. The requisite details of the matter are tabulated herein below:

S.No.	Particulars of the Case	
1.	FIR Number	129/2026
2.	Concerned Police Station	Talwara
3.	District	Hanumangarh
4.	Offences alleged in the FIR	109(1), 115(2), 126(2),

(Uploaded on 03/11/2026 at 02:54:52 PM)
(Downloaded on 04/11/2026 at 11:49:54 AM)

		118(1), 111(3), 111(4), 111(5), 189(2), 324(2) of BNS and 3(1)(s) and 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Act
5.	Date of passing of impugned order	04.08.2026

Rajasthan High Court Web Copy - Not Official

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant has been falsely implicated in the case and that false allegations have been levelled against him. He further submits that the appellant has not been named in the FIR. It is contended that no case for the alleged offences is made out against the appellant and that his further incarceration is not warranted. Learned counsel submits that the allegations against the present appellant are omnibus in nature and no specific role has been assigned to him in the alleged crime. The principal allegation is against co-accused Naresh, who is alleged to have inflicted the grievous injury upon injured Pawan.

4.1 Learned counsel further contends that the co-accused persons have already been enlarged on bail vide order dated 17.07.2026 passed in S.B. Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 1156/2026 (Bhoop vs. State of Rajasthan) and S.B. Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 8265/2026 (Abhishek vs. State of Rajasthan), as well as vide order dated 26.10.2026 passed in S.B. Criminal Appeal (Sb) No. 1366/2026. The appellant is in judicial custody since 23.07.2026 and the trial is likely to take considerable time. Therefore, it is submitted that the appellant deserves to be enlarged on bail.

5. Learned Public Prosecutor vehemently opposes the appeal. However, he is not in a position to refute the fact that none of the

(Uploaded on 03/11/2026 at 02:54:52 PM)
(Downloaded on 04/11/2026 at 11:49:54 AM)

injured witnesses has named the present appellant or assigned any specific role to him.

6. Heard learned counsel for the appellant and learned Public Prosecutor and perused the material available on record.

7. Having considered the rival submissions, the facts and circumstances of the case, and upon perusal of the case diary, this Court finds that, out of the three injured persons, one has sustained a grievous injury, which has specifically been attributed to co-accused Naresh. The allegations against the present appellant are omnibus in nature, and no specific role has been assigned to him. It is also relevant that the co-accused persons have already been enlarged on bail vide order dated 17.07.2026 passed in S.B. Criminal Appeal No. 1156/2026 (Bhoop vs. State of Rajasthan) and S.B. Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 8265/2026 (Abhishek vs. State of Rajasthan), as well as vide order dated 26.10.2026 passed in S.B. Criminal Appeal (Sb) No. 1366/2026. The appellant has remained in custody since 23.07.2026, and the prosecution has not expressed any apprehension that he may flee from justice in the event of his release on bail. Considering the fact that the trial is likely to take considerable time, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the appellant in custody for an indefinite period. Hence, without expressing any opinion on the merits or demerits of the case, this Court is of the opinion that the appeal filed by the appellant deserves to be allowed.

8. Accordingly, instant appeal is **allowed**. The impugned order dated 04.08.2026 passed by learned Special Judge, SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Cases, Hanumangarh, is set aside. It is ordered that the accused-appellant - **Naveen Kumar@ Pramod**

(Uploaded on 03/11/2026 at 02:54:52 PM)
(Downloaded on 04/11/2026 at 11:49:54 AM)

S/o Sh. Ram Singh, shall be enlarged on bail; provided he furnishes a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 50,000/- with two sureties of Rs. 25,000/- each to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court with the stipulation to appear before that Court on all dates of hearing and as and when called upon to do so.

9. It is, however, made clear that findings recorded/ observations made above are for limited purposes of adjudication of bail application. The trial Court shall not get prejudiced by the same.

(SANJEET PUROHIT),J

Crt_22 (2020)
D-A/118
Abdul Raoof Khan

(Uploaded on 03/11/2026 at 02:54:52 PM)
(Downloaded on 04/11/2026 at 11:49:54 AM)