

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD**R/CRIMINAL MISC.APPLICATION (FOR SUCCESSIVE REGULAR BAIL -
AFTER CHARGESHEET) NO. 11320 of 2026**

=====

CHIRAGKUMAR GIRISHBHAI PATEL (CHIRAG GIRISHBHAI PATEL)
Versus
STATE OF GUJARAT

=====

Appearance:

A S TIMBALIA(7372) for the petitioner(s) No. 1
MR TRUPESH KATHIRIYA, PUBLIC PROSECUTOR for the Respondent(s)
No. 1

=====

CORAM:HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M. R. MENGDEY

Date : 25/06/2026

ORDER

1. By way of this successive application, filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the petitioner has prayed to release him on regular bail in connection with the offence, being FIR CR No. 11197006250048 of 2025, registered with Bhadarwa Police Station, Vadodara Rural, under Sections 8(C), 21(C), 25 and 29 of the NDPS Act.

2. Learned Advocate, Mr. Timbalia, appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been arrested in connection with the present case on 06.03.2025 and since then, he is in jail and the petitioner has undergone incarceration for more than one year and there has been no progress in the trial after the earlier application for bail filed by the petitioner was withdrawn. It was, further, submitted

that the other co-accused, who are similarly situated to the present petitioner, have been considered for grant of bail by this Court. If, the material collected against the present petitioner, during the course of investigation, is analyzed, it would appear that the present petitioner is better placed, than the other co-accused, whose cases have been considered for grant of bail. It is the case of the prosecution that the present petitioner and the other co-accused had purchased contraband substance. So far as, the other co-accused are concerned, the investigating agency could lay its hands on some financial transactions, which had taken place between other co-accused, *inter se*. However, the investigating agency could not collect any material, as regards financial transaction having taken place between the present petitioner and the other co-accused. He, further, submitted that it is stated in the FIR that one year prior to the alleged incident, the petitioner had tried to prepare Mephedrone at the place of other co-accused. However, said attempt had failed. Thereafter the petitioner, herein, is alleged to have procured the knowledge of preparing Mephedrone and he transmitted that knowledge to the other co-accused in a chit. However, that chit was not sent to the FSL for the purpose of examination. There is nothing on record, in the form of charge-sheet papers, which would indicate that the petitioner ever attempted to prepare Mephedrone and, except the statement of the co-accused, there is no material, connecting the present petitioner with

the offence in question. He, therefore, submitted that the present petitioner be released, on suitable terms and conditions.

2.1 No other submission was made by the learned Advocate for the petitioner.

3. *Per contra*, learned APP strongly opposed this application, contending that the present is a successive application filed by the petitioner, after withdrawal of the earlier application on 08.10.2025 and there is no change in circumstances. He, further, submitted that the material available on record indicate that the petitioner had procured raw-material for preparation of Mephedrone and was involved in the preparation of Mephedrone. He, therefore, submitted that no case is made out and this application may be dismissed.

4. I have heard learned advocates for the parties. The petitioner had earlier preferred Criminal Miscellaneous Application (For Regular Bail – After Chargesheet) No. 20253 of 2025, which was permitted to be withdrawn by this Court vide order dated 08.10.2025, since this Court was not inclined to exercise discretion in favour of the petitioner. Thereafter, the present successive bail application is filed by the petitioner. However, learned Advocate for the petitioner is not in a position to point out any change in

circumstances, after the withdrawal of the earlier application for bail on 08.10.2025. It was contended that after the withdrawal of the earlier application for bail by the present petitioner, the cases of the other co-accused have been considered for grant of bail by this Court. This Court considered the case of the co-accused, namely Bipul @ Suman Vipul Singh Krishnanandan Singh & Another co-accused on 13.10.2025 and while considering their case, this Court observed that, except, the statement of the co-accused and some monetary transactions, which were for some negligent amount, there is nothing available on the record to connect those accused with the offence in question.

4.1 From the material available on record, it appears that the present petitioner had procured raw material, which could be used for preparing Mephedrone, which is a contraband substance. As stated in the FIR, one year prior to the registration of the present offence, the petitioner had helped other co-accused and had made an attempt to prepare Mephedrone, which would indicate that the present petitioner was desperate to prepare Mephedrone for commercial purpose. It also appears from the material available on the record that the present petitioner had also procured technical knowledge for preparing Mephedrone and he transmitted the same to the other co-accused in a chit. It is argued on behalf of the petitioner that the said

chit is not sent to the FSL for examination, which may have its own ramifications at the stage of trial.

4.2 The material available on record also indicate that with the help of the raw material, which was procured by the present petitioner, the contraband substance, i.e. Mephedrone, was manufactured in a huge quantity and out of that a small part, about 200 gms., was also purchased by the present petitioner. Under the circumstances, no case is made out by the petitioner for exercising discretion in his favour.

5. Resultantly, this application fails and the same is ***dismissed.***

UMESH/-

(M. R. MENGDEY,J)