

GAHC010280902025



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

Case No. : Bail Appln./4078/2025

INJAMUL HAQUE
SON OF IBRAHIM ALI LASKAR, RESIDENT OF KABUGANJ BAZAR, SONAI,
CACHAR, ASSAM

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM
REPRESENTED BY PP ASSAM

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR A. ALI, MR M AHMED,A. K. KANU,MR Y. BARBHUIYA

Advocate for the Respondent : PP, ASSAM,

Linked Case : Bail Appln./174/2026

HUSSAIN AHMED BARBHUIYA
S/O. MAYUR UDDIN BARBHUIYA

R/O. BAGA
LOKNATHPUR
P.O. SAPTAGRAM P.S. DHOLAI
PIN 788114
CACHAR
ASSAM

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM
REPRESENTED BY THE PP
ASSAM

Advocate for : MR. M R SODIAL
Advocate for : PP
ASSAM appearing for THE STATE OF ASSAM

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHIVJYOTI SAIKIA

ORDER

Date : 27.01.2026

Since both the bail applications arise out of the same FIR, the same are taken up together for disposal by this common order.

2. Heard the learned counsel Mr. M R Sodial and Mr. M Ahmed appearing for the petitioners. Also heard Mr. Bhaskar Sarma, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State of Assam.

3. These two bail applications are filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 whereby the petitioners, namely, Hussain Ahmed Barbhuiya & Injamul Haque Laskar have prayed for releasing them on bail, after they were arrested in connection with Silchar P.S. Case No. 761/2025.

4. Mr. Jodial has submitted that the petitioner Hussain Ahmed Barbhuiya is the driver of the vehicle and the narcotic drugs were seized from beneath the seat of the driver of the vehicle.

5. Mr. Jodial has submitted that the petitioner Injamul Haque Laskar was a passenger in the said vehicle.

6. The learned counsel have submitted that the two petitioners aforementioned have no connection with the existence of the narcotic drugs below the seat of the driver of the vehicle.

7. I have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel of both sides.
8. In this case, police has already filed the charge sheet.
9. This Court is of the opinion that under the given circumstances, the petitioners shall have the opportunity to contest the matter at the time of framing of charge before the trial court.
10. At this stage, this Court is of the opinion that this is not a fit case for releasing the petitioners on bail.
11. Therefore, both the bail applications are dismissed and stand disposed of accordingly.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant