



S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s). 15974-15975/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 30-04-2024 in SBCRMBA No. 16348/2023 24-02-2025 in SBCRMSBA No. 2138/2025 passed by the High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan at Jaipur]

BALJEET SINGH @ BABBU SINGH

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF RAJASTHAN

Respondent(s)

IA No. 243226/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 243225/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

Date : 07-01-2026 This matter was called for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. MAHADEVAN

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. Madhav Sinhal, Adv.
Ms. Navroop Jawanda, Adv.
Mr. Rahul Khurana, AOR

For Respondent(s) :Mr. S.. Udaya Kumar Sagar, AOR
Mr. Tushar Singh, Adv.

O R D E R

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks Bail in connection with FIR No. 319/2023 registered at Police Station Shahpura, District Jaipur Rural

for the offences under Section 8/15 of the NDPS Act.

3. Petitioner is accused of being the supplier to the co-accused, from whose possession 141.390 kgs of poppy husk was recovered.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the same was from the vehicle and not from the personal possession of the petitioner. Further, it was contended that co-accused, who was the main supplier of the said drug, has been granted bail by this court on 11/11/2024 in SLP (CRL.) No. 13034/2024.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent-State submitted that commercial quantity of poppy husk was recovered and that the petitioner doesn't deserve to be released on bail.
5. At this juncture, when the court put a direct query to learned counsel for the State as to what was the stage of the trial, it was informed that only three witnesses have been examined out of sixteen.
6. On a further query of the court as to why such position is prevailing, the counsel for the State submits that there was a change in court which has led to some delay.
7. Be that as it may, considering the fact that co-accused who is said to be the supplier of the drug which was actually has been seized, who was in custody for one year two months and the petitioner being in custody for two years four months, having no other criminal antecedent, we are inclined to allow the prayer for bail.
8. Accordingly, the petitioner be released on bail, subject to conditions as may be fixed by the trial court. Further, petitioner shall fully cooperate in the trial.
9. The petition stands disposed of in the aforementioned terms.
10. Before parting, we would put on record our strong displeasure at the conduct of the prosecution in dilly-dallying trials,

especially when the accused are behind bars. It is not only the right of an accused to a quick trial but also the duty of the prosecution/State to ensure that the trial is concluded expeditiously, more so when the accused are behind bars.

(SACHIN KUMAR SRIVASTAVA)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(ANJALI PANWAR)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR