



2026:CGHC:21393



2026:CGHC:21393

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**MCRC No. 4271 of 2026**

Kunal Yadav S/o Khilawan Prasad Yadav Aged About 22 Years R/o Shankar Nagar, Durg District Durg (C.G.), Present Residence, Om Sai Nagar, Street Number 3- B, Chikhili, Durg Tahsil And District Durg (C.G.)

... Applicant**versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through- Station House Officer, Police Station- Padmanabhpur, District – Durg (C.G.)

---- Non-applicant

For Applicant	:	Mr. Tarendra Kumar Jha, Advocate.
For Non-Applicant/State	:	Ms. Vaishali Mahilong, Dy. Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice**Order on Board****07.05.2026**

1. The applicant has preferred this **Second Bail Application** under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Crime No.326/2025 registered at Police Station Padmanabhpur, District Durg (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 8, 22 (ग), 27 (क), 29 of NDPS Act and Section 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 111 of BNS.
2. Earlier the first bail application of the applicant was rejected by this Court vide order dated 15.01.2026 passed in MCRC No. 550/2026, on merits.
3. The prosecution story in brief, is that on account of receiving a secret information police of concerned police station conducted a raid at the premises of Vaibhav Khandelwal, seized the contraband article from the possession of him. Hence, the case was registered and after



arresting the co-accused Vaibhav Khandelwal and during the investigation relying upon the memorandum of the co-accused Vaibhav Khandelwal various were implicated later in the same offence including the present applicant. 10 Alprazolam 0.5mg tablets were found from the possession of the present applicant and he was arrested on 21.09.2025, hence, this bail application.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in crime question. It has been argued by learned counsel for the applicant that the contraband article, which is said to have been recovered from the possession of the applicant is less than the commercial quantity and further submitted that contraband article is recovered from the main accused is more than commercial quantity along with co-accused persons. Charge sheet has been filed and applicant is in jail since 21.09.2025 and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take quite long time. Therefore, he prays for releasing the applicant on regular bail.
5. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of bail and submits that charge sheet has been filed. Moreover, the contraband article, which is said to have been recovered from joint possession of a total 3 persons including the present applicant was above the commercial quantity. It is further submitted that main accused along with co-accused have been involved in an organized crime and offences, for which, FIR has been registered under NDPS Act as well as the BNS. Hence, the present applicant is not entitled for grant of bail.
6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material



available on record.

7. Taking into consideration the fact that the contraband article, which is said to have been recovered from joint possession of a total 3 persons including the present applicant was above the commercial quantity. Moreover, the main accused along with co-accused including the applicant are said to have been involved in an organized crime and offences for which FIR has been registered under NDPS Act as well as the BNS, and on the same ground the first bail application of the applicant already rejected by this Court and no new ground has been raised by counsel for the applicant in the instant case, therefore, this Court is of the view that it is not a fit case to release the applicant on bail.
8. Accordingly, this Second bail application of applicant – **Kunal Yadav** involved in Crime No.326/2025 registered at Police Station Padmanabhpur, District Durg (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 8, 22 (π), 27 (κ), 29 of NDPS Act and Section 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 111 of BNS, is **rejected** at this stage.
9. Needless to say that the learned trial Court is at liberty to proceed with the trial and conclude the same, expeditiously.
10. The Office is directed to provide a certified copy of this order to the trial Court for necessary information and compliance forthwith.

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice