GAHC010187912026

2026:GAU-AS:16161

THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : AB/2096/2026

BIKASH GOWALA
S/O - SITARAM GOWALA, AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS, A PERMANENT RESIDENT OF VILL SONAKIRA, P.O. CHANDKHIRA, P.S. PATHARKANDI, DIST. SRIBHUMI, ASSAM, PIN - 788725

VERSUS

STATE OF ASSAM
REPRESENTED BY THE LEARNED PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, ASSAM

Advocate for the Petitioner : TAWHID LASKAR, MS. S NISHA SULTANA

Advocate for the Respondent : PP, ASSAM,

BEFORE

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRANJAL DAS

O R D E R

04.11.2026

Heard Mr. T. Laskar, learned counsel for the petitioner. Also heard Mr. B. Sharma, learned Addl. P.P. appearing for the State respondent.

2. This is an application under Section 482 of the BNS, 2023, the petitioner,

namely, **Bikash Gowala**, seeking anticipatory bail in connection with Patharkandi P.S. Case No.83/2026, registered under Sections 20(b)(ii)(c)/25/29 of the NDPS Act, 1985.

3. The gist of the allegations in the FIR dated 25.06.2026 lodged by police official of Patharkandi P.S. based on an information, a search operation was conducted in the house of co-accused Monorul Islam and that contraband by way of 1080.52 kilograms of suspected ganja were recovered. The present petitioner is named as one of the accused persons involved in the alleged offences.

4. Mr. T. Laskar, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though admittedly the name of the petitioner has been given in the FIR, but it remains to be seen from the investigation material as to whether there any concrete materials to arrive at the finding that he was involved in the alleged offences.

5. The case diary as called for, has been received.

6. The learned Addl. P.P. submits that the investigation is continuing in this case and considering the quantity of the alleged suspected contraband, it would not be justified to grant anticipatory bail.

7. The case diary has been placed before me.

8. It is revealed from the materials that when police searched the premises of Monorul Islam, co-accused Rana Das was apprehended and several other persons ran away from the spot. In the FIR, the name of the present petitioner is mentioned as an accused person, as already stated above.

9. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances; the nature of the alleged offences and the fact that investigation is going on including efforts to apprehend the escaped persons - I am of the considered view that it would not

be justified to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

10. In such view of the matter, the anticipatory bail petition stands **rejected** at this stage.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant