



**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CRIMINAL APPEAL No.4868/2026
[Arising out of SLP (Crl.) No.16147/2026]

**ANIL KUMAR MEENA @
SHER SINGH MEENA**

APPELLANT

VERSUS

STATE OF RAJASTHAN

RESPONDENT

O R D E R

1. Leave granted.
2. The High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan, Bench at Jaipur, has declined the prayer of the appellant for grant of bail. His application¹ stands dismissed by the impugned judgment and order dated 22nd May, 2026.
3. This appeal take exception to such dismissal.
4. Appellant, figuring as an accused in FIR No.0010 of 2024 dated 03rd March, 2024 registered at Police Station

SOG, District ATS & SOG, Jaipur under Sections 419, 420 & 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860; Sections 4, 5 & 6 of the Rajasthan Public Examination (Prevention of Unfair Means) Act, 1992 and Section 66D of the Information Technology (Amendment) Act, 2008, was arrested on 30th March, 2024 (while already in custody in connection with FIR No.227/2022 at Police Station Bekariya, Udaipur, Rajasthan).

5. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the counter-affidavit of the respondent-State of Rajasthan.

6. It appears that upon completion of investigation, chargesheet² *qua* the appellant and the co-accused has been filed on 01st May, 2024 whereafter the prosecution has also filed 16 supplementary chargesheets against a total of 150 (one hundred and fifty) accused. Prosecution proposes to record the evidence of around 180 (one hundred and eighty) witnesses to drive home the charges against the appellant. The trial court is yet to frame the charges. Thus, it is quite likely that the trial, once it commences, will be a protracted

² Charge-sheet No.07/2024

exercise.

7. Though it further appears from the counter affidavit of the respondent-State of Rajasthan that the appellant is a habitual offender, who is standing trial in various cases, we find that insofar as the present case is concerned, the maximum punishment that could be imposed if at all the appellant is convicted of the charges is three years of imprisonment; and he has been in custody for almost 30 (thirty) months.

8. That apart, it is not in dispute that some of the co-accused have been enlarged on bail; hence, the appellant is justified in claiming parity.

9. Taking an overall view of the matter, we are of the considered opinion that further detention of the appellant in custody pending trial is not necessary; and, since the appeal deserves acceptance, the appellant may be admitted to an order for grant of bail.

10. Accordingly, we set aside the impugned judgment and order.

11. Appellant shall be released on bail, subject to

furnishing of bail bonds to the satisfaction of the trial court and subject to such other terms and conditions as may be imposed by it.

12. Needless to observe, if released on bail, the appellant shall not, directly or indirectly, by making inducement, threat or promise, dissuade any person acquainted with the facts of the case from disclosing such facts to the court.

13. In the event there is any breach of the terms and conditions for grant of bail, the trial court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail of the appellant.

14. It is also ordered that the appellant shall diligently attend proceedings of the trial, unless exempted. If he abstain from attending the proceedings without justifiable cause, that could also be seen as breach of the conditions for grant of bail and the trial court will be free to pass appropriate orders.

15. We clarify that the observations made in this order and grant of bail will not be treated as findings on the merits of the case.

16. The appeal is, accordingly, allowed on the aforesaid terms.

17. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

.....J.
(DIPANKAR DATTA)

.....J.
(SHEEL NAGU)

**New Delhi;
October 12, 2026.**

ITEM NO.3

COURT NO.6

SECTION II-D

**S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Petition for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.)
No.16147/2026**

**[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order
dated 22-05-2026 in SBCRMBA No.3105/2026 passed by
the High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan at
Jaipur]**

**ANIL KUMAR MEENA @
SHER SINGH MEENA**

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF RAJASTHAN

Respondent(s)

FOR ADMISSION

I.A. No.258902/2026-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

I.A. No.269693/2026-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

**I.A. No.269691/2026-PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL
DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES**

**Date : 12-10-2026 This matter was called on for
hearing today.**

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DIPANKAR DATTA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU**

**For Appellant(s) : Mr. K Parmeshwaran, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Pankaj Singhal, Adv.
Ms. Ashima Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Chandan Kashyap, Adv.
Ms. Etti Sharma, Adv.
Mr. M. P. Srivignesh, AOR**

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Saurabh Rajpal- 3577, AOR

Mr. Vinay Kumar Singh, Adv.

**UPON hearing the counsel the Court made
the following
O R D E R**

1. Leave granted.
2. The appeal is allowed in terms of the signed order.
3. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(MANIK KUMAR)	(SUDHIR KUMAR SHARMA)
SENIOR PERSONAL ASSISTANT	COURT MASTER (NSH)
(signed order is placed on the file)	