SIDDHANT TAMRAKAR
Digitally signed by SIDDHANT TAMRAKAR
Date: 2026.10.06 10:15:51 +0530

CGHC010374012026 2026:CGHC:42914

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9337 of 2026

- Mahavir Sen S/o Satyanarayan Sen Aged About 35 Years R/o Kunj Bihar Colony Bera, P.S. Bara, District Bara, Rajasthan

... Applicant

versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station Singhoda, District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant : Ms. Kiran Jain, Advocate
For State : Ms. Ritika Verma, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey
Order on Board

05.10.2026

1. This is the second bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicant who has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 73/2025 registered at Police Station Singhoda, District Mahasamund (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Section 20(b) of NDPS Act.

2. Earlier, first bail application i.e. MCRC No. 9584 of 2025 was rejected on merits vide order dated 05.02.2026.

3. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that police of Police Station Singhoda, District Mahasamund has received a secret information from the informant and on the basis of said information, raid was conducted and seized 11 kg of Ganja from joint possession of the present applicant and co-accused persons.

Thereafter, the aforesaid case was registered against the present applicant.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the present applicant has been falsely implicated in this case. She also submits that from joint possession of the applicant intermediate quantity of Ganja was seized. It is further argued that the applicant has only two criminal antecedents of year 2017 and 2021, which are pending consideration. She would contend that applicant is in jail since 01.09.2025 and conclusion of the trial is likely to take some time. Therefore, she prays for grant of regular bail to the applicant.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State would oppose the bail application. Ms. Verma would contend that earlier first bail application was rejected on the ground that the applicant has two criminal antecedents, which are still pending consideration. She would further submit that there is no change in circumstance, therefore, the applicant is not entitled for grant of bail.

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

7. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, and the fact that this is the second bail application; First bail application of the present applicant was rejected on merits vide order dated 05.02.2026 and further no new ground has been raised in this second bail application. There is no change in circumstance and further considering the allegations leveled against the present applicant, I am not inclined to allow this application.

8. Accordingly, instant bail application is hereby **rejected**.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

$iddhant