



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

BLAPL No.12355 of 2025

Ranjan Kumar & Anr.

...

Petitioner(s)

Mr. Rohit Kumar Suna, Adv.

-Versus-

State of Odisha

....

Opposite Parties

Mr. Rajdeep Pradhan, ASC

CORAM:

DR. JUSTICE SANJEEB K PANIGRAHI

ORDER

17.12.2025

Order No.

01.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Case No. and Courts' Name	Sections
140	01.11.2025	Sambalpur GRPS	T.R Case No.148 of 2025, pending in the Court of learned Sessions Judge-cum-Judge (Special Court), Sambalpur	U/S. 20(b)(ii)(B) of N.D.P.S. Act 1985

1. This matter is taken up through hybrid arrangement.
2. The petitioners being in custody in connection with Sambalpur GRPS Case No. 140 of 2025, corresponding to T.R Case No.148 of 2025, pending in the Court of learned Sessions Judge-cum-Judge (Special Court), Sambalpur registered for the alleged commission of



offences under Sections 20(b)(ii)(B) of N.D.P.S. Act 1985, have filed this petition for their release on bail.

3. The brief fact of the case is that on 01.11.2025, at about 12 noon the SI, RPF Post, Sambalpur (Informant) got information from reliable source regarding transportation of ganja in Sambalpur Railway station. Accordingly, he attended the Platform No-3 and noticed that two persons were sitting with one trolley bag from which Ganja like smell was emitting. The Police detained them and after due formalities found 10 Kg 100 gm of ganja from the conscious and exclusive possession of the petitioners. Hence, this case.

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioners submits that the Petitioners being arrested in this case is in custody since 02.11.2025. He further submits that the quantity of Ganja seized from the possession of the Petitioners are below commercial quantity. On the basis of statement of official witnesses, the present Petitioners were implicated in this case. They have no antecedents to their credit. In view of all these above, according to him, the bar contained under Section 37 of the NDPS Act at this stage does not stand on the way of grant of bail to the Petitioners. Therefore, when there is no scope



on the part of the Petitioners to flee from justice and tamper the evidence, he urges for consideration of the prayer for grant of bail to the Petitioners.

5. Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail.

6. Considering the facts and keeping in view the submission of learned counsel for the Petitioners, this Court is of the view that there is no requirement of keeping the Petitioners inside the custody any further. Accordingly, this Court directs that the Petitioners be released on bail by the Court *in seisin* over the matter in the aforesaid case on some stringent terms and conditions with further conditions that:

- i. the petitioners shall appear before the local Police Station on 1st Monday of every month between 10 A.M. to 1.00 P.M. till the conclusion of the trial;
- ii. the Petitioners shall not indulge themselves in any criminal activities in future;
- iii. the Petitioners shall not tamper the evidence of the prosecution evidence in any manner;

Violation of any of the above conditions shall lead to the cancellation of the bail.



7. The BLAPL is, accordingly, disposed of.

(Dr. Sanjeeb K Panigrahi)

Judge

Gitanjali