

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Application No. 292/2026

In

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Interim Bail Application
No.1660/2026

Sunil Vishnoi S/o Shri Babu Lal Vishnoi, Aged about 30 years,
R/o Jambeshwar Colony, Saran Nagar, Jodhpur City East, District
Jodhpur (Raj.)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State of Rajasthan through PP.

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Ms. Vimla Jain (through V.C.)
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Lalit Kishore Sen, PP. (through V.C.)

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANEESH SHARMA

Order

05/05/2026

1. The criminal miscellaneous application has been preferred by the applicant/petitioner seeking extension of the interim bail granted by this Court at the Principal Seat, Jodhpur vide order dated 15.04.2026, in Criminal Miscellaneous Interim Bail Application No. 1660/2026, arising out of FIR No. 102/2025, registered at Police Station Mandore, District Jodhpur East, for the offences under Section 8/21 of the Narcotic Drugs And Psychotropic Substances, Act, 1985.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present application for extension of interim bail has been filed on account of postponement of surgery of the petitioner's wife due to high Creatinine levels and low Hemoglobin levels; he accordingly prays

that the interim bail may kindly be extended by a period of 60 days.

3. Learned Public Prosecutor strongly opposes the present extension application and raises serious doubt over the genuineness and authenticity of the medical report so produced, in view of the report No.1808/05-05-2026 received from SHO P.S. Mandore and prays that the present application for extension of interim bail may kindly be dismissed.

4. Heard and considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

5. Looking to the objection raised by the learned Public Prosecutor, without going into the issue of authenticity, or genuineness of alleged prescription, even if for the sake of arguments, the medical prescription is assumed to be correct, it is revealed that the surgery of the petitioner's wife was postponed due to higher Creatinine levels and low Hemoglobin levels, and the patient has been further referred to a General Physician and Nephrologist, therefore, there is no immediate need for surgery.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, more particularly that there is no immediate need for surgery as discussed above. No good ground for extension of the interim bail has been made out, thus, this Court is not inclined to extend the interim bail granted to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present criminal miscellaneous application for extension of interim bail is dismissed.

8. However, the petitioner shall always be at liberty to move a fresh interim bail application in future, if any date is fixed for the surgery of the petitioner's wife or other exigency arise.

(MANEESH SHARMA),J

Seema/1