



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

BLAPL No. 3458 of 2026

Murusudu Raita

..... Petitioner(s)

Mr. Suchit Kumar Nayak, Adv.

-Versus-

State of Odisha

..... Opposite Party(s)

Mr. Tej Kumar, ASC

CORAM:

DR. JUSTICE SANJEEB K PANIGRAHI

ORDER

05.05.2026

Order No.

01.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Case No. and Courts' Name	Sections
50	08.09.2025	SI of Inspector of Excise R. Udayagiri Range	2(a)CC Case No.17 of 2025 pending in the court of learned Sessions Judge-cum-Special Judge, Gajapati	Sections 20(b)(ii)(C) of NDPS Act.

1. This matter is taken up through hybrid arrangement.
2. Heard learned counsel for the parties.



3. The Petitioner being in custody in SI of Inspector of Excise R. Udayagiri Range P.R. Case No. 50 of 2025-26, corresponding to 2(a)CC Case No.17 of 2025 pending in the court of learned Sessions Judge-cum-Special Judge, Gajapati, registered for the alleged commission of offences under Sections 20(b)(ii)(C) of the NDPS Act, has filed this petition for his release on bail.
4. The brief fact of the case is that on 08.09.2025 at about 11 A.M. while the Excise Officials of R.Udayagiri Excise Station were conducting excise patrolling duty in and around village Baroi under Serango P.S, found the accused sitting on three jerry bags beside the road. On search of the jerry bags, they recovered and seized 75 kg of contraband article (ganja) from the possession of the accused-petitioner. Hence, this case.
5. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that nothing has been seized from the conscious possession of the present Petitioner. He further submits that the Petitioner is in custody since 8.09.2025. Hence, he submits that, the prayer of the present Petitioner may be allowed.
6. Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail stating that the quantity of ganja seized is clearly





above the commercial quantity prescribed under the Act which bars granting of bail.

7. Considering the nature and gravity of the accusation, character of evidence appearing against the Petitioner and the stringent punishment provided and also the statutory bar to grant bail under Section 37(1) of the NDPS Act in an offence of this nature without recording the satisfaction that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the petitioner is not guilty of the offence alleged or not likely to commit any such offence, which is not possible to record in this case, the Petitioner's prayer for bail is devoid of merit. Hence, their prayer for bail stands rejected.
8. Accordingly, the BLAPL is dismissed.

(Dr. Sanjeeb K Panigrahi)
Judge

Murmu

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
Signed by: LITARAM MURMU
Designation: P.A.
Reason: Authentication
Location: OHC
Date: 08-May-2026 19:36:14

