CGHC010380822026 2026:CGHC:44222

NAFR

NIRMALA RAO

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9100 of 2026

1 - Abdul Jafar @ Pinku S/o Abdul Kadar Aged About 32 Years R/o Near Charnal Chowk, Nehru Nagar, P.S. Kotwali Distt- Raipur (C.G.)

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through S H O P.S. City Kotwali Distt- Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant/s	**:**	Mr. Lukesh Kumar Mishra, Advocate
For Non-Applicant	**:**	Ms. Monika Thakur, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

13/10/2026

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.76/2026, registered at Police Station City Kotwali, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh for the offences punishable under Sections 20(b)(ii)B & 29 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 City Kotwali, District Raipur, received secret information, conducted a raid, and seized 8.023 kilograms of Ganja from the possession of the applicant and another co-accused. Thereafter, the aforesaid offence was registered against the applicant.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case. He would further submit that the applicant has been in jail since 23.02.2026 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 8.023 kilograms of Ganja was seized from the possession of the applicant and another co-accused. It is further submitted that the applicant has ten criminal antecedents. He would contend that one case under the NDPS Act and one case under the Arms Act are pending before the competent criminal court, whereas the remaining eight criminal 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 one case under the NDPS Act and one case under the Arms Act are pending against the applicant before the competent criminal court, whereas eight other criminal cases 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