



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
AT JODHPUR**

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 10761/2026
CNR: RJHC010804382026 | URN: CRLMB / 23575U / 2026

Patel Ajeet Kumar Chhagan Bhai S/o Patel Chhagan Bhai, Aged
About 42 Years, Resident Of 303, Shivalik Co-Housing Society,
Behind Gil Colony, G.i.d.c. Ankleshwar District Bharuch Gujarat.
(At Present Lodged In District Jail Jalore)

-----Petitioner

Versus

Union Of India, Through Cbn

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Rajendra Singh Chouhan
For Respondent(s) : Mr. Hanuman Prajapati, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BALJINDER SINGH SANDHU

Order

26/10/2026

Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

The petitioner has been arrested in connection with FIR No. 21/2025 registered at Police Station CBN, Kota, for the offences punishable under Sections 8/22(c) and 29 of the NDPS Act. He has preferred the present bail application under Section 483 of the BNSS.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that 2.021 kg of MD was recovered from co-accused Shankara Ram, who stated that the contraband had been procured from Valaram @ Baldev. Thereafter, the premises of Valaram @ Baldev were raided, and certain apparatus and chemicals were recovered. In connection with the recovery of the contraband, the present FIR was



registered, whereas a separate FIR bearing No. VIII/(10)/12/NCB/JZU/2025 was registered in relation to the recovery of the apparatus and chemicals from the premises of Valaram alias Baldev.

Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has been implicated in the case on the basis of the disclosure made by Valaram alias Baldev during interrogation, alleging that the aforesaid apparatus and chemicals had been purchased from the petitioner. It is contended that the petitioner is a genuine businessman running an establishment under the name and style of *Pawan Scientific Glass Works*, engaged in supplying scientific apparatus. The petitioner also procures and supplies chemicals on demand and supplies such articles to various laboratories, particularly school laboratories.

Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner has been implicated merely on the allegation that the aforesaid apparatus and chemicals were sold without bills. It is contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated solely on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused. The investigation has been completed, and the charge-sheet has been filed against the petitioner. He has remained behind bars since 24.11.2025.

Learned counsel further submits that, in the connected FIR arising out of the same incident, bearing No. VIII/(10)/12/NCB/JZU/2025, the petitioner has already been enlarged on bail by this Court vide order dated 14.09.2026, after consideration of the case on merits. It is contended that no



contraband has been recovered from the petitioner and that the recovery in question was effected from co-accused Shankara Ram. Learned counsel, therefore, submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated and that the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude.

Learned Public Prosecutor vehemently opposes the bail application. However, he is not in a position to dispute that the alleged involvement of the petitioner is limited to the procurement and supply of the apparatus and that nothing has been recovered from him.

This Court has considered the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record. It emerges that 2.021 kg of MD was recovered from co-accused Shankara Ram, who stated that the contraband belonged to Valaram alias Baldev. The petitioner has been implicated on the allegation that certain apparatus had been purchased by Valaram alias Baldev from him.

The petitioner is stated to be running a business under the name and style of *Pawan Scientific Glass Works*, engaged in the supply of scientific apparatus. The documents relating to the registration of the petitioner's firm form part of the charge-sheet. Further, the inspection report of the petitioner's firm also indicates that he was carrying on business and that scientific apparatus was found at the premises.

In these circumstances, this Court finds that, *prima facie*, the petitioner's alleged involvement is confined to the supply of





scientific apparatus in the course of his business, and his bona fides in supplying the same cannot be ruled out at this stage. No contraband has been recovered from the petitioner, nor is there any allegation that he was directly involved in trafficking the contraband. Moreover, in the connected matter, being S.B. Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 10695/2026, the petitioner has already been enlarged on bail by this Court. The investigation has been completed, the charge-sheet has been filed, and the petitioner has remained in custody since 24.11.2025.

Hence, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case; conclusion of the trial of the case is likely to take time; the prosecution has not shown any apprehension of the petitioner fleeing away from justice, in case he is enlarged on bail; but, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I deem it just and proper to grant bail to the petitioner under Section 483 of BNSS. Consequently, for the limited purpose of deciding the present bail application, this Court is satisfied that the twin conditions prescribed under Section 37 of the NDPS Act stand satisfied.

Accordingly, this bail application filed under Section 483 of BNSS is **allowed** and it is directed that petitioner – **Patel Ajeet Kumar Chhagan Bhai S/o Patel Chhagan Bhai**, shall be released on bail in connection with aforesaid FIR, if not wanted in any other case, provided he executes a personal bond in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- with two sound and solvent sureties of Rs.50,000/- each to the satisfaction of learned trial court for his



appearance before that court on each and every date of hearing and whenever called upon to do so till the completion of the trial.

It is, however, made clear that the observations made herein are only for the purpose of deciding the present bail application and shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. The learned trial Court shall decide the matter independently, uninfluenced by any observations contained in this order.

(BALJINDER SINGH SANDHU),J

Crt_21 (2022)
D-A/35
Hanuman Ram