
(2026) 01 JH CK 1707

In the Jharkhand High Court

Case No : Bail Application No. 10992 Of 2025

Masum Ansari @ Md. Masoom Anasari, S/o Ekbal Ansari

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Jharkhand

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 06-01-2026

Acts Referred:

Narcotic Drugs And Psychotropic Substances, Act, 1985 — Section 17, 18

Citation : (2026) 01 JH CK 1707

Hon'ble Judges : Gautam Kumar Choudhary, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Abhishek Kumar Dubey, Atif Anwar, Harsh Utsav, Bhola Nath Ojha

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Gautam Kumar Choudhary, J

Heard both the sides.

This bail application has been filed on behalf of Masum Ansari @ Md. Masoom Anasari who is in custody since 14.02.2025 in connection with Tamar P.S. Case No. 29 of 2025(N) corresponding o NDPS Case No. 108 of 2025 for the offence registered under Sections 17 and 18 of the NDPS Act, 1985 pending in the Court of learned Special Judge (NDPS) Ranchi is pressed into motion

As per the FIR, 3.1 Kilogram of Opium was seized from a Car bearing Registration No. JH05BB 7957 which was being driven by this petitioner. Two of the co-accused persons managed to escape from the place of occurrence on being signaled by the police to stop at the barricade.

It is submitted by the learned counsel on behalf of petitioner that he was simply a driver in car and has no concern with the seized contraband. Furthermore, as per the format of the seizure list, the signature of the accused persons should have been taken, but no signature finds place of this petitioner which casts serious doubt on recovery of the contraband in the presence of this petitioner.

Learned A.P.P. opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that matter involves seizure of commercial quantity of opium which was transported by a car and on secret information the raid was conducted. Two of the co-accused persons managed to escape from the place of occurrence and this petitioner arrested on the spot.

I find force in the argument advanced by the learned A.P.P that so far as the signature part on form of the seizure list format is concerned, there is no requirement of law that signature of the accused person in whose presence the contraband is seized should be taken. It is only to ensure that the copy of the seizure list is furnished to the accused person. Omission to take the signature does not go to the root of the matter to cast suspicion on the seizure of the contraband.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the prayer for bail of the petitioner, is hereby, rejected.

Learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial.