CGHC010398042026 2026:CGHC:43972

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9653 of 2026

1 - Pranab Kumar Naik S/o Kumudchand Naik Aged About 29 Years R/o Tehsil P.S. Kosinga District Kalahandi Orissa.

... Applicant

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Tilda, Nevra, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

... Non-applicant

For Applicant	:	Mr. C.R. Sahu, Advocate
For Non-applicant	:	Mr. Kawaljeet Singh Saini, Dy. GA

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order On Board

12.10.2026

1) This is the Second bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicant arrested in connection with Crime No. 41/2026 registered at Police Station Tilda Nevra, District Raipur (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 20(C), 22B and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 and Section 25 of Arms Act. Earlier first bail application of the applicant bearing MCRC No.6063 of

2026 was rejected on merits vide order dated 13.07.2026.

2) The prosecution case, in brief, is that on 28.01.2026, the police seized 73 kg of ganja, 790 Nitrazepam tablets weighing 553 grams, and three button-operated knives from co-accused Madhu Mishra. During investigation, she allegedly disclosed that she procured ganja from the present applicant, Pranav Kumar Naik, for sale. Thereafter, the applicant was arrested in connection with the afore-stated offence. Hence, the present bail application.

3) Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case on the basis of the memorandum statement of the co-accused. He would contend that, out of nine witnesses, eight have already been examined before the Trial Court, and they have not supported the prosecution case. He would contend that earlier first bail application of the applicant was rejected on merits in MCRC No. 6063 of 2026 vide order dated 13.07.2026. He would contend that the charge-sheet has already been filed, the applicant is in jail since 28.01.2026, therefore, he prays for grant of bail to the present applicant.

4) On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the bail application and submits that, as per the allegations made in the charge-sheet, the applicant was a supplier of prohibited contraband. He would contend that the first bail application of the applicant was rejected on merits and that there is no substantial change in circumstances warranting reconsideration of the prayer for bail. Therefore, the applicant is not entitled to be enlarged on bail.

5) I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case

diary.

6) It is a well-settled principle of law that, while considering a bail application, the High Court cannot conduct a mini-trial or undertake a detailed examination of the evidence. The reliability and credibility of the witnesses are matters to be assessed by the learned Trial Court during the course of trial.

7) Having considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the nature and gravity of the allegations, the seizure of 73 kg of ganja and 790 Nitrazepam tablets weighing 553 grams from the possession of co-accused Madhu Mishra, and the allegation that the present applicant was supplier of prohibited contraband, this Court finds that the allegations against the applicant relate to the alleged supply of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances. Further, the first bail application of the applicant was rejected on merits in MCRC No. 6063 of 2026, and no change in circumstances warranting reconsideration of the prayer for bail has been brought to the notice of this Court. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the present applicant. Accordingly, the bail application is **rejected**. However, the learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial.

Sd/-

(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

Rekha