



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



S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 16457/2025

Manoj Kumar Tanwar S/o Shri Brahamprakash Tanwar, R/o WX-568B, WZ-Block Narayana Gaon Delhi- 110028 (At present confined in Central Jail Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

DRI through Special PP

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. O.P. Solanki with Mr. Vivek Goyal, Mr. Umesh Singh & Mr. Rahul Sharma
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Kinshuk Jain, Senior Standing Counsel

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPMAN

Order

16/01/2026

1. This bail application under Section 483 of BNSS has been filed on behalf of the petitioner, who has been arrested in connection with Complaint No. DRI-DZU/JRU/19/INT-12/2025-26 registered by the Intelligence Officer, Directorate of Revenue Intelligence, Regional Unit, Jaipur (Raj.) for offences punishable under Sections 20, 23, 27A, 28 & 29 of NDPS Act. Investigation is being conducted against the petitioner for offences punishable under Sections 8, 20, 23, 27A, 28 & 29 of NDPS Act.
2. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the accused-petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. Counsel submits that no contraband has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner and he has been made accused solely



on the basis of police interrogation of co-accused who was found in possession of contraband i.e. 15.740 kgs of Hydroponic Weed (Ganja). Counsel submits that contraband, which is allegedly recovery from the possession of the co-accused, is below commercial quantity, therefore rigour of Section 37 of NDPS Act does not attract in this matter. Counsel submits that charge-sheet has been filed in this matter. It is submitted that there are no criminal antecedents of the petitioner and trial will take considerable time in its conclusion. Petitioner is in custody since 17.10.2025. Further custody of the petitioner would not serve any fruitful purpose.

3. Learned counsel appearing for Directorate of Revenue Intelligence, Jaipur opposes the bail application. He submits that it appears from the analysis of WhatsApp messages that petitioner was in constant touch with the co-accused who was found in possession of contraband and stayed in the same hotel in Bangkok as well as tickets were also booked by the petitioner. Counsel submits that conduct of the petitioner is also suspicious as he deleted the entire chats. He further submits that co-accused who was found in possession of contraband has been denied benefit of bail by co-ordinate Bench of this Court.

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 petitioner, especially considering the fact that no contraband has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner; charge-sheet has been filed in this matter; there are no



criminal antecedents of the petitioner and trial will take considerable time in its conclusion as well as looking to the period of custody, but without commenting anything on the merits/demerits of the case, I deem it proper to allow the bail application.

6. This bail application is accordingly allowed and it is directed that accused-petitioner- **Manoj Kumar Tanwar S/o Shri Brahmaprakash Tanwar** shall be released on bail provided, he furnishes a personal bond in the sum of Rs.5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakh Only) together with two sureties in the sum of Rs.2,50,000/- (Rupees Two Lakh Fifty Thousand Only), each to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court with the stipulation that he 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.

7. However, it is made clear that the accused-petitioner shall not involve in any other offence(s) during currency of the bail and he shall mark his presence in first week of every month in Directorate of Revenue Intelligence, Regional Unit, Jaipur, till conclusion of the trial.

8. Concerned Officer shall enter the attendance of the petitioner in the Roznamcha. In case the petitioner fails to mark his presence in the concerned Directorate of Revenue Intelligence Unit, the concerned Officer is directed to immediately report the matter to the concerned Court in this regard.

9. If any breach of these conditions is reported or come to the notice of the Court, the same shall alone be a reason for the trial



Court to cancel the bail granted to him by this Court.

10. Office is directed to send a copy of this order to the concerned Officer for necessary compliance.

11. The observations made hereinabove are only for decision of the bail application and would not have any impact on the trial of the case in any manner.

(ANIL KUMAR UPMAN),J

LALIT MOHAN /159