



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



S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 8863/2026

CNR: RJHC010629682026

URN: CRLMB / 19256U / 2026

Dinesh Vishnoi S/o Pukhraj, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Alai,
Police Station Sri Balaji, district Nagour, Rajasthan, at Present R/o
Gali No 9, rampura Basti, Police Station Mukta Prasad Nagar,
District Bikaner, Rajasthan (Lodged In District Jail, Bikaner)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through PP

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Bhagirath Ray Bishnoi
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Surendra Bishnoi, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP SHAH

Order

09/07/2026

1. The applicant has filed the present bail application under Section 483 of BNSS being aggrieved against the order dated 15.06.2026 passed by the learned Special Judge NDPS Act, and Additional Session Judge, Nokha, District Bikaner, in Criminal Misc. Case No.197/2026, whereby the bail application filed by the accused-applicant under Section 483 B.N.S.S. was rejected. The accused-applicant is behind the bars, pursuant to the F.I.R. No.512/2025 registered at Police Station Nokha, District Bikaner against the accused-applicant for offences punishable under Sections 8/22 and 25 of NDPS Act 1985.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the recovered contraband is below the demarcated commercial quantity. He



submits that the similarly situated co-accused, Suresh, has already been enlarged on bail by Coordinate Bench of this Court, vide order dated 24.03.2026 passed in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No.3028/2026 (Suresh v. State of Rajasthan). He also submits that the accused-applicant is in judicial custody since 02.03.2026. He further submits that the charge-sheet has already been filed and the trial is likely to take sufficiently long time to conclude. He further submits that simply because one other criminal case under the NDPS Act, 1985 is pending against the accused-applicant, his bail application has been dismissed. He, therefore, implores this Court to allow the present bail application.

3. *Per contra*, learned Public Prosecutor opposes the bail application and submits that the co-accused Suresh was implicated only on the basis of the confessional statement of the present accused-applicant. He, therefore, contends that the accused-applicant cannot claim parity with the said co-accused.

4. Heard learned counsel for the applicant as well as the learned Public Prosecutor and perused the material available on record.

5. Having considered the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, more particularly the facts that the recovered contraband is below the demarcated commercial quantity, the accused-applicant is in judicial custody since 02.03.2026, the charge-sheet has already been filed and the trial is likely to take sufficiently long time to conclude, and considering that the pendency of another criminal case by itself cannot be a ground to deny bail in the present case, more particularly the



charge-sheet has already been filed, this Court *prima facie* finds it a fit case to enlarge the accused-applicant on bail.

6. Thus, without expressing any opinion on merits/demerits of the case, this Court is inclined to enlarge the accused-applicant on bail.

7. Consequently, the bail application under Section 483 B.N.S.S. is **allowed**. It is ordered that the accused-applicant; ***Dinesh Vishnoi S/o Pukhraj***, arrested in connection with F.I.R. No.512/2025, registered at Police Station Nokha, District Bikaner, shall be released on bail, if not wanted in any other case, provided he furnishes a personal bond of Rs.50,000/- and two sureties of Rs.25,000/- each, to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court, for his appearance before that Court on each & every date of hearing and whenever called upon to do so till completion of the trial.

8. It is further, made clear that findings recorded/observations made herein-above are for limited purposes of adjudication of bail application and the same shall not prejudice the trial of the case in any manner.

(SANDEEP SHAH),J