NIRMALA
RAO

CGHC010355932026 2026:CGHC:44527

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 8720 of 2026

1 - Lokesh Awasthi S/o Rajesh Awasthi Aged About 21 Years R/o K L C Dewar Mohalla, Zone-02 Khursipar, District- Durg (C.G.) (Description Of Application Mentioned As Per Charge Sheet)

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station Jamul, District- Durg (C.G.)

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant/s	**:**	Mr. Hemant Kumar Sahu, Advocate
For Non-Applicant	**:**	Mr. Keshav Gupta, G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

14/10/2026

1. This is the first bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) for grant of regular bail to the applicant in connection with the Crime No.3/2026, registered at Police Station Jamul, District Durg, Chhattisgarh for the offences punishable

under Sections 8, 21(b) & 27(a) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short, NDPS Act).

2. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the police of Police Station Jamul, District Durg, received secret information, conducted a raid, and seized 33.36 gm of heroin, 281.85 gm of doda, cash amounting to Rs.8,90,400/- and three mobile phones from the possession of the applicant and other co-accused persons. Thereafter, the aforesaid offence was registered against the applicant.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the case. He would further submit that the applicant has been in jail since 24.02.2026 and the charge-sheet has been filed. He would, therefore, pray that the applicant be enlarged on regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel would oppose the bail application and submit that 33.36 gm of heroin, 281.85 gm of doda, cash amounting to Rs.8,90,400/- and three mobile phones were seized from the possession of the applicant and other co-accused persons. It is further submitted that the applicant has five criminal antecedents. He would contend that two cases under the NDPS Act and one case under IPC are pending before the competent court, whereas the remaining two cases have been disposed of. This, according to learned State counsel, indicates that the applicant is a habitual offender. He would, therefore, submit that the instant bail application deserves to be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary.

6. Having considered the fact that two cases under the NDPS Act and one case under IPC are pending against the applicant before the competent court, whereas two other cases under IPC have been disposed of, which indicates that the applicant is a habitual offender, I am not inclined to allow the instant bail application. Accordingly, the bail application is rejected.

7. Accordingly, the first bail application filed by the applicant is hereby **rejected**.

Sd/-
Rakesh Mohan Pandey
JUDGE

Nimmi