



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

955 BAIL APPLICATION NO. 107 OF 2026

Shaikh Nadeem Shaikh NaimApplicant

VERSUS

The State of MaharashtraRespondent

Mr. A. C. Deshpande, Advocate for Applicant
Mr. P. P. Davalkar, APP for the State.

CORAM : SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.
DATE : 20th FEBRUARY, 2026.

PER COURT :

1. Applicant seeks regular bail in connection with Crime No. 265/2023 registered with Begampura Police Station, Dist. Chhatrapati Sambhajanagar (Urban), for the offences punishable under Sections 18A, 18(c), 27(kh)(2), 27(B)(ii) of Drugs and Cosmetics Act, Sections 276, 328, 34 of Indian Penal Code and Sections 22(B), 29, 8(c) of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act.

2. Learned APP has pointed out that this is a successive bail application.

3. When confronted with any change in circumstances, learned Counsel for the Applicant is unable to demonstrate the same.

4. Perusal of the record indicates that the bail application of the Applicant came to be rejected by the Additional Sessions Judge, Aurangabad vide order dated 09.02.2024. Thereafter, this Court, vide order dated 10.07.2025 disposed of the bail application of the Applicant by granting liberty to file a fresh application, in case the trial does not conclude within the period of six months. As such, the Applicant is before this Court.

5. Having heard the submissions of both sides, except delay in trial, no other fresh grounds are raised by the Applicant. Recently, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of Union of India vs. Vigin K. Varghese, **2025 LiveLaw (SC) 1101**, has observed that mere delay in trial is not the sole ground for bail in case of offences under the NDPS Act.

6. In view of the aforesaid precedent and coupled with the fact that the trial is under progress and in absence of demonstrable change in circumstances, I am not inclined to exercise discretion in favour of the Applicant.

7. Hence, application is rejected.

(SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.)