CGHC010425272026 2026:CGHC:46024

RAVI SHANKAR MANDAVI Digitally signed by RAVI SHANKAR MANDAVI

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1806 of 2026

Saleem Ansari S/o Abdul Aziz Aged About 37 Years R/o House No. M. N. 612 Gajara Side, Bankimongara, Tehsil Katghora Distt Korba (C. G.)

... Applicant

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Bankimongra, Distt Korba (C. G.)

... Respondent

(Cause title is taken from CIS)

For Applicant	:	Mr. Sanjay Patel, Advocate
For State/Respondent	:	Mr. Varunendra Mishra, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Parth Prateem Sahu

Order on Board

30/10/2026

1. Applicant has preferred Second bail application under Section 482 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail as he apprehends his arrest in connection with

Crime No. 72/2025 registered at Police Station- Bankimongra, District Korba (C.G.) for offence punishable under Section 20(B) of NDPS Act.

2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that while patrolling the police got an information with regard to transportation of contraband (Ganja) by Rajesh Chouhan. On search, the police found 1.268 Kg of contraband ganja from exclusive possession of co-accused/Rajesh Chouhan. Rajesh Chouhan on his memorandum statement stated that it was present applicant who supplied the ganja to him.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant has not committed any offence as alleged. Only on the basis of the memorandum statement of the co-accused Rajesh Chouhan from whose exclusive possession contraband ganja measuring 1.268 Kg was seized, the applicant was falsely implicated in the crime in question. Hence, the benefit of anticipatory bail may be extended to him.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the submission of learned counsel for applicant and would submits that allegation against the applicant is that the co-accused used to sell the contraband ganja for the applicant. There are 2 criminal antecedents of similar nature against the applicant out of 4, therefore, there is prima facie active involvement of applicant in commission of crime and is not entitled for the benefit of the anticipatory bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the respective parties and also perused the documents enclosed along with bail application.

6. Considering the entirety of the facts and circumstances of the case, submission of learned counsel for the respective parties, nature of allegation, allegation levelled against the applicant, further considering the fact that the applicant is involved in similar offence earlier also, I do not find present to be a fit case to allow this anticipatory bail application.

7. Accordingly, this application filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 stands **dismissed**.

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
JUDGE

Ravi Mandavi