



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

**CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_ OF 2026  
(@ SLP(CRL.) No.20993/2025)**

**SATVEER** **APPELLANT(S)**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF RAJASTHAN** **RESPONDENT(S)**

**with**

**CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_ OF 2026  
(@ SLP (CrI.) No.21003/2025)**

**CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_ OF 2026  
(@ SLP (CrI.) No.20407/2025)**

**CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_ OF 2026  
(@ SLP(CrI) No. 20453/2025)**

**O R D E R**

1. Leave granted.
2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the appellants and the learned counsel appearing for the respondent-State.
3. The appellants have been arrayed as accused in

connection with FIR No.638/2022, registered at Police Station - Nadbai, District - Bharatpur, Rajasthan, for the offences punishable under Sections 323, 341, 324, 325 and 504, read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short, the 'IPC').

4. On 30.08.2023, the appellants were granted bail by the Investigating Officer (for short, 'I.O.') as all the offences were bailable in nature. Subsequently, on the basis of the nature of injury suffered by one of the injured persons, offence under Section 308 of the IPC was added by the I.O. Thereafter, an application under Section 439(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short, the Cr.P.C.) was filed by the State before the Trial Court seeking cancellation of the bail granted to the appellants, which came to be allowed and their bail was cancelled. The same has been confirmed by the High Court vide the impugned order. Aggrieved, the appellants are before us.
5. Upon hearing the learned counsel appearing for the parties, while we do not find any error in the reasoning adopted by the High Court in

confirming the order of the Trial Court, the question for consideration is as to whether the custodial interrogation of the appellants is required or not.

6. Admittedly, the offence that has been subsequently added is the one punishable under Section 308 of the IPC which has been done pursuant to the medical report, and the maximum punishment that can be awarded for the same is imprisonment of seven years. The occurrence is of the year 2022 and it is a case where an FIR has been registered at the instance of the appellants' side as well, pertaining to the very same occurrence. Suffice it is to state that, on a conspectus of the above, custodial interrogation of the appellants is certainly not required.
7. In such view of the matter, the Trial Court is directed to make sure that the appellants execute requisite bail bonds for the purpose of ensuring their cooperation with further proceedings.
8. Accordingly, the impugned order(s) and the order(s) of the Trial Court cancelling bail stand

set aside, and the appeals are allowed with the aforesaid direction.

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

.....J.  
[M.M. SUNDRESH]

.....J.  
[AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH]

NEW DELHI;  
18<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY, 2026



**Ms. Nidhi Jaswal, AOR**

**Mr. Namit Saxena, AOR**

**UPON hearing the counsel the Court made  
the following**

**O R D E R**

**Leave granted.**

**The appeals are allowed in terms of  
the signed order.**

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

**(SWETA BALODI) (POONAM VAID)  
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS ASSISTANT REGISTRAR  
(Signed order is placed on the file)**