



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRA No. 275 of 2026

Tarun Bajaj S/o Naresh Bajaj Aged About 29 Years R/o Walfort Garden H. No. 47, Police Station D.D. Nagar Dist- Raipur (C.G.)

... Appellant

versus

State of Chhattisgarh Through- Police Station D.D. Nagar District- Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondent

Order Sheet

08/04/2026	Mr. Niraj Baghel, Advocate for the Appellant. Mr. Aman Tamrakar, P.L. for the State/Respondent. Heard on admission. Admit. Also heard on IA No.1/2026 for suspension of
------------	--



sentence and grant of bail to the Appellant.

By the impugned judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 06.1.2026 passed in Special Criminal Case No.86/2025, by the learned Special Judge (NDPS Act), Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.), the appellant stands convicted and sentenced as under:-

Conviction	Sentence	In Default
U/s 21(B) of NDPS Act	RI for 5 years and fine of Rs. 50,000/-	RI for 6 months

The Learned Counsel appearing for the appellant submits that the appellant has been wrongly convicted by the Trial Court without there being any clinching evidence available on record. He further submits that in the Court statement of I.O. Mahendra Mishra (PW-8), he has not mentioned at what time or through which medium he received the information from the informant. Secondly, the electric scale used in weighing the contraband was not capable of weighing the contraband as it was scale from 0.00 Kg to 10 Kg. Thirdly, the mandatory provisions of Section 50 of the NDPS Act have not been complied with. The appellant is in jail and he has already served about 6 ½ months of jail sentence and the appeal is likely to take some time to be finalized, therefore, it is prayed that the bail



Shubham	application may be allowed. In support of his argument, he relies upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of Arif Khan @ Agha Khan Vs. State of Uttarakhand reported in AIR 2018 SC 2123. On the other hand, learned Counsel appearing for the State opposes the bail application and supported the impugned judgment. He submits that the appellant has a history of two cases. Considering the totality of the evidence and circumstances of the case, without commenting on merits of the case, this Court is of the opinion that it will not be proper to release the appellant on bail. Accordingly, the application (IA No. 01/2026) is rejected. List this case for final hearing in week commencing 20.04.2026. Certified copy as per rules. Sd/- (Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal) JUDGE
---------	---