



ITEM NO.5

COURT NO.14

SECTION II-D

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

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s).
10073/2026

[Arising out of impugned judgment and order dated 17-04-2026 in SB.CRLMSBA No. 4910/2026 passed by the High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan at Jaipur]

RAHUL KASOTIYA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF RAJASTHAN

Respondent(s)

IA No. 163967/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

Date : 03-08-2026 This matter was called on for hearing
today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.V. VISWANATHAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Vaibhav Pancholy, Adv.
Mr. Pankaj Kumar Singh, Adv.
Mr. Krishan Chander Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Ashok Kumar Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Kunal Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Pawan Kumar Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Raj Singh Rana, AOR

For Respondent(s) Mrs. Sansriti Pathak, A.A.G.
Mr. Saurabh Rajpal, AOR
Ms. Shagufa Khan, Adv.
Mr. Chhatresh Kumar Sahu, Adv.
Ms. Shagufa Khan, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the State.
2. The present petition calls in question the correctness of the order dated 17-04-2026 in

S.B.Criminal Miscellaneous Second Bail Application No.4910/2026 passed by the High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan at Jaipur. By the said order, the petitioner has been denied the benefit of bail in connection with FIR No.133/2025 registered with Arain Police Station, District Ajmer, Rajasthan, for the offences punishable under Sections 8/15 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short, 'NDPS').

3. When the matter came up on 01.06.2026, this Court sought for a series of particulars from the State's counsel. The State has also filed the counter affidavit, which we have perused.

4. The allegation against the petitioner is that he was the owner of the vehicle from which the contraband was seized. Admittedly, the petitioner was not in the vehicle at the time of the seizure. The case of the petitioner is that the vehicle had been taken on hire and that he has not involved in the offence.

5. In any event, these are matters for trial. The petitioner has already undergone about 11 months in custody. Out of 24 witnesses which are listed, as at present 03 witnesses have been examined; the trial is likely to take some time to conclude.

6. Keeping the nature of allegation against the petitioner; the period already undergone by the petitioner; the time that the trial is likely to take and keeping in mind the twin condition of Section 37 of

the NDPS Act, we are inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

7. Accordingly, we direct that petitioner shall be enlarged on bail subject to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court in connection with the aforesaid FIR and for the offences mentioned hereinabove.

8. The Special Leave Petition is disposed of in the above terms.

9. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(NIRMALA NEGI)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(MANOJ KUMAR)
COURT MASTER (NSH)