



2026:AHC:127653

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 19995 of 2026

Neeraj Rawat @ Tiger

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Satyam Maurya, Vishal Agarwal
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 45

HON'BLE VIVEK KUMAR SINGH, J.

1. Heard Sri Vishal Agarwal, learned counsel for the applicant and the learned A.G.A. for the State of State of U.P.

2. The instant bail application has been filed seeking release of the applicant on bail in Case Crime No. 62 of 2026 under Section 8/20 and 29/60 NDPS Act, Police Station- Iglas, District- Aligarh.

3. Submission of learned counsel for the applicant is that nothing incriminating has been recovered from the possession of applicant and name of the applicant has surfaced in the confessional statement of co-accused Pushpendra. As per the FIR, 490.745 Kg of *Ganja* is said to have been recovered from a tractor which was stationed outside the house of co-accused Pushpendra. Learned counsel for the applicant next contends that the similarly situated co-accused, namely, Satyapal Singh and Aman Chaudhari @ Chotu have been granted bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 21.05.2026 and 07.05.2026 passed in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 17569 of 2026 and 14603 of 2026, respectively.

Further contention is that the statutory provisions of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 have not been complied with in true letter and spirit, and therefore, the legal sanctity of the alleged recovery stands vitiated. The counsel has also tried to demonstrate the circumstances indicating the false implication of the applicant. Malice behind the prosecution has also been pleaded during the course of the arguments placed on behalf of the accused. Learned counsel for the applicant further submits

that the applicant is in jail since 01.04.2026 and criminal history has been well explained in paragraph no. 20 of bail application.

4. Per contra, learned A.G.A. has opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the applicant and submitted that there is ample evidence against the applicant regarding his involvement in the offence, however, he could not dispute the fact that similarly situated co-accused Satyapal Singh and Aman Chaudhari @ Chotu have been granted bail by this Court.

5. Considering the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the view that the applicant has made out a case for grant of bail on the ground of parity.

6. Accordingly, the bail application is **allowed**.

7. Let the applicant- **Neeraj Rawat @ Tiger** who is involved in the aforementioned case crime be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned subject to following conditions. Further, before issuing the release order, the sureties be verified.

(i) The applicant shall file an undertaking to the effect that he shall not seek any adjournment on the date fixed for evidence when the witnesses are present in Court. In case of default of this condition, it shall be open for the Trial Court to treat it as abuse of liberty of bail and pass orders in accordance with law.

(ii) The applicant shall remain present before the Trial Court on each date fixed, either personally or through his counsel. In case of his absence, without sufficient cause, the Trial Court may proceed against him under Section 229-A IPC/ 269 B.N.S.

(iii) In case, the applicant misuses the liberty of bail during trial and in order to secure his presence proclamation under Section 82 Cr.P.C./ 84 B.N.S.S., may be issued and if applicant fails to appear before the Court on the date fixed in such proclamation, then, the Trial Court shall initiate proceedings against him, in accordance with law, under Section 174-A IPC/ 209 B.N.S.

(iv) The applicant shall remain present, in person, before the Trial Court on

dates fixed for (1) opening of the case, (2) framing of charge and (3) recording of statement under Section 313 Cr.P.C. If in the opinion of the Trial Court absence of the applicant is deliberate or without sufficient cause, then it shall be open for the Trial Court to treat such default as abuse of liberty of bail and proceed against him in accordance with law.

8. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, it shall be a ground for cancellation of bail.

9. It is made clear that observations made in granting bail to the applicant shall not in any way affect the learned trial Judge in forming his independent opinion based on the testimony of the witnesses.

(Vivek Kumar Singh,J.)

June 16, 2026

Kirti