



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

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 13904/2025  
CNR: RJHC011000932025 | URN: CRLMB / 28986U / 2025

Mahendra S/o Bhagwati Lal, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Of Vajani Rodi, Post Kot Police Station Kurabad, At Present House No. 10, Meera Nagar, Near Old Rto, Pratapnagar, District Udaipur, Rajasthan. (At Present Lodged In Central Jail Udaipur)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

---

|                   |   |                      |
|-------------------|---|----------------------|
| For Petitioner(s) | : | Mr. Naman Mohnot     |
| For Respondent(s) | : | Ms. Sonu Manawat, PP |

---

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BALJINDER SINGH SANDHU**

**Order**

**03/08/2026**

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

The petitioner has been arrested in connection with FIR No.184/2025 of Police Station Hiranmagari, District Udaipur for the offences punishable under Sections 8/21 and 29 of NDPS Act. He has preferred this bail application under Section 483 of BNSS.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the alleged contraband in question has been recovered from Praveen Patel, and the sole allegation against the petitioner is that he had arranged the alleged consignment which was to be delivered to Radhakishan Medico. It is submitted that neither Praveen Patel nor the petitioner, Mahendra, has any connection with

Radhakishan Medicose, to whom the consignment was allegedly destined.

It is further submitted that the petitioner has been implicated solely on the basis of the statement of the co-accused. The prosecution has set up a case under Section 21 of the NDPS Act; however, the petitioner's case does not fall within any of the categories contemplated under the said provision. It is submitted that the petitioner has neither manufactured, possessed, sold, purchased, nor transported the alleged contraband. Apart from this, an offence under Section 420 IPC has also been added.

Learned counsel further submits that the co-accused, Khemraj @ Nirmal and Vinod @ Sabir, have already been enlarged on bail by the co-ordinate bench of this Court vide order dated 13.10.2025 and 11.11.2025, as they too were implicated solely on the basis of the statement of co-accused Praveen Patel. Since the present petitioner has also been implicated on the same basis, his case stands on the same footing as that of the said co-accused. It is further submitted that the licence of Radhakishan Medicose stands in the name of Ramesh Lal Patel, and the petitioner has no connection with either the agency which allegedly dispatched the parcel or the recipient agency. It is also submitted that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a considerable amount of time.

Per contra, learned Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the bail application.

This Court has considered the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner and finds that the alleged contraband in question has been recovered from Praveen Patel,

and the allegation against the petitioner is that he had arranged the alleged consignment which was to be delivered to Radhakishan Medico. The petitioner has been implicated solely on the basis of the statement of the co-accused. The petitioner has an arguable case that the petitioner's case does not fall within any of the categories mentioned under Section 21 further, the licence of Radhakishan Medico stands in the name of Ramesh Lal Patel. Further, the co-accused, Khemraj @ Nirmal and Vinod @ Sabir, have already been enlarged on bail. Hence, his case is similar to that of Khemraj @ Nirmal and Vinod @ Sabir. Further, there are no criminal antecedents against the petitioner.

Having regard to the material presently available on record, the absence of recovery from the conscious possession of the petitioner, the nature of the evidence collected during investigation, and the fact that a co-accused standing on similar footing has already been enlarged on bail, this Court is of the prima facie opinion that reasonable grounds exist for believing that the petitioner may not be guilty of the alleged offence. There is also nothing on record to indicate that, if released on bail, he is likely to commit any offence while on bail. Consequently, for the limited purpose of deciding the present application, the rigours contained in Section 37 of the NDPS Act stand satisfied.

Hence, keeping in view of the fact that conclusion of the trial of the case is likely to take time and the prosecution has not shown any apprehension of the petitioner fleeing away from justice, in case he is enlarged on bail and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court deems it just and proper to grant bail to the petitioner under Section 483 of BNSS.

Accordingly, this bail application filed under Section 483 of BNSS is **allowed** and it is directed that petitioner – **Mahendra S/o Bhagwati Lal**, 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**