



CGHC010383692026

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9279 of 2026

1 - Dinesh Yadav S/o Trilochan Yadav Aged About 20 Years R/o Siharthar Police Station Lailunga District Raigarh C. G.

--- Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer Police Station Lailunga District Raigarh C. G.

--- Respondent(s)

For Applicant : Shri Dharendra Mishra, Advocate.
For Non-Applicant/State : Ms. Priya Sharma, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey
Order on Board

15.10.2026

1) This is the first bail application filed under under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicant, who has been arrested in connection with Crime No.128 of 2025 registered at Police Station Lailunga, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh for the offence punishable under Sections 20(b) & 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 and Sections 111 & 335(1) of BNS.

- 2) The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the police of Police Station Lailunga, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh, received secret information from an informant and, acting on the said information, conducted a raid. Two cars were seized, and three occupants fled into the forest, whereas co-accused Purandar Yadav was arrested. A total of 61 kg of ganja was recovered, out of which 29 kg was recovered from one car and 32 kg from the other. On the basis of the memorandum statement of co-accused Purandar Yadav, the present applicant and other accused persons were implicated in the case.
- 3) Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that co-accused Purandar Yadav has already been granted bail by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Special Leave Petition (Criminal) Diary No. 34992 of 2026. It is also argued that the applicant has been in jail since 13.5.2025 and that the charge-sheet has already been filed. He would further contend that the applicant has one criminal antecedent of a similar nature, registered in the year 2024. He would submit that, as no article was seized from the possession of the present applicant, the bail application deserves to be allowed.
4. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the State/non-applicant would oppose the bail application. She would submit that the present applicant has one criminal antecedent and is involved in the illegal transportation of a huge quantity of ganja. She would, therefore, submit that the bail application deserves to be dismissed.
5. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary.

6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the fact that co-accused Purandar Yadav, from whose possession 61 kg of ganja was allegedly recovered, has already been granted bail by the Hon'ble Supreme Court; that the present applicant was implicated on the basis of the memorandum statement of co-accused Purandar Yadav; that the charge-sheet has already been filed; that the applicant has been in jail since 13.5.2025; and that the conclusion of the trial may take some time, this Court is of the view that the applicant is entitled to be released on bail in the present case.
7. It is directed that in the event of the applicant executing a personal bond for a sum of **Rs. 50,000/-** with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court, he shall be released on bail on the following conditions:-

- (a) he shall make himself available for interrogation by the police officer as and when required;
- (b) he shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such fact to the Court; and
- (c) he shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to a fair and expeditious trial.

The observation made hereinabove is for the purpose of deciding this bail application only, the learned trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge