

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 7116/2023

1. Krishna Soni Son Of Shri Vinod Kumar Soni, Aged About 24 Years, R/o D-390, Vidyadhar Nagar, Jaipur. (Accused Petitioner Is Presently Confined In Central Jail, Jaipur).
2. Vikas Soni @ Vikky Son Of Shri Ganpatram Soni, Aged About 38 Years, R/o House No. 105, Shriram Nagar, Chandoliya Garden, Jhotwara, Jaipur. (Accused Petitioner Is Presently Confined In Central Jail, Jaipur).

----Petitioners

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through P.P.

----Respondent

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Anirudh Tyagi, Advocate

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Mangal Singh Saini, Public
Prosecutor
Mr. Udit Purohit, Advocate for
complainant

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPMAN (V. J.)

Order

30/06/2023

1. Petitioners have filed this bail application under Section 439 of Cr.P.C.
2. F.I.R. No. 101/2023 was registered at Police Station Vidyadhar Nagar, District Jaipur City (South) for the offences under Sections 420 and 406 of IPC.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits that the petitioner No.1-Krishna Soni is an employee of the complainant and there occurred a dispute between them with regard to salary. He further submits that so far as petitioner No.2-



Vikas Soni @ Vikky is concerned, an FIR was lodged by the same complainant in the year 2022 while levelling similar type of allegations in which he was granted bail. He further submits that on the same day i.e. on 26.04.2023, three other FIRs were lodged by the same complainant against the petitioners. He further submits that the petitioners are in custody since 21.05.2023 and no further recovery or investigation is required from them. He further submits that entire case of the complainant is based on the documents and the alleged documents have already been made available. He also submits that the conclusion of trial will take considerable time. He thus, prays that the instant bail application may be allowed.

4. Learned Public Prosecutor assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the bail application. It is submitted by learned counsel for the complainant that in planned manner, money has been misappropriated by the petitioners. Hence, the instant bail application should not be allowed.

5. I have considered the contentions.

6. Considering the overall facts & circumstances of the case especially the fact that the alleged offences are triable by the First Class Magistrate and custody period of the petitioners, I deem it proper to allow the bail application.

7. This bail application is accordingly allowed and it is directed that accused-petitioners shall be released on bail provided they furnishes a personal bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand Only) together with two sureties in the sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand Only) each to the

satisfaction of the learned Trial Court with the stipulation that they shall appear before that Court and any Court to which the matter is transferred, on all subsequent dates of hearing and as and when called upon to do so.

(ANIL KUMAR UPMAN (V. J.)),J

Ashish Kumar /502