

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No.100 of 2026

Md. Nasim Alam age about 59 years, son of Abdul Hussain, R/O
village Bari Aliganj, P.O.- Pakur, P.S. Pakur(T), District- Pakur
(Jharkhand)

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Md. Yasir Arafat, Advocate
Mr. Gautam Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Vishwanath Roy, Spl.P.P

Order No.03 Dated-08-04-2026

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has been made accused in connection with Pakur
Town P.S. Case No. 155 of 2025 corresponding to NDPS Case No. 03
of 2025 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 20 of
NDPS Act.

This is the second journey of the petitioner with the prayer for
regular bail. Earlier, the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner was
rejected vide order dated 11.09.2025 passed in B.A. No. 7798 of 2025.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the fresh
ground is that one (1) witness has been examined in this case and he
has supported the case of the prosecution and in the meanwhile, the
petitioner has been in custody for some more time. It is next
submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false. It is then
submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 27.05.2025 as is
evident from para-15 of the instant bail application. It is further
submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to co-operate with
the trial of the case. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be
released on bail.

Learned counsel appearing for the State on the other hand
opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that there is

no fresh ground to admit the petitioner on bail and since overwhelming evidence has come against the petitioner during the trial of the case hence, there is every chance of the petitioner absconding and tampering with the evidence, if released on bail. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner ought not to be released on bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner as well as chance of his absconding and tampering with the evidence, if released on bail, this Court is of the considered view that the fact that one witness has been examined during the trial of the case, who has supported the case of the prosecution and that the petitioner has been in custody for some more time after rejection of his bail application, are not sufficient grounds to admit the petitioner to bail considering the fact that his prayer for bail was earlier rejected on merit.

Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the above named petitioner is rejected for the same reason as mentioned in the order dated 11.09.2025 passed in B.A. No. 7798 of 2025.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

Dated:- 08.04.2026
Saroj/