

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.2553 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -13 Year- 2014 Thana -GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL COMP. District-
PATNA

=====

Javed Ansari @ Babloo, Son of Nanhe, Resident of Village-and Police
Station-Jahangirpur, Tehsil-Jewar, District-Gautam Buddha Nagar (U.P.)

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The Union of India Through Directorate of Revenue Intelligence, Regional
Unit, Patna

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dr. Brahma Deo Prasad

For the Opposite Party/s : Mrs. Renuka Sharma

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

2 09-03-2017

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in Special
Case No.82/14 arising out of DRI, Patna Unit Case
No.DRI/LZU/PRU/718(ii)/ENQ-13/14 registered under Section 21
© and 29(1) of NDPS Act,1985.

Accusation is that on receipt of secret information
officers of D.R.I., Patna started checking of the bus coming to
Patna from Siliguri about carrying the Narcotic at Agam Kuan
near Mahatma Gandhi Setu in course of which they stopped a Bus
of Raj Travels bearing Registration No.BRO6PB-3184 and its
conductor and the driver were apprised of the information and
thereafter search was made of passengers sitting at Berth No.33



and 15 who disclosed their names as Naim Alvi and Shakil Ahmad respectively. Two brown plastic packets were recovered from Naim Alvi and three brown packets from Shakil Ahmad. Thus, total recovery of 5019 grams of dark brown thick wet substance like opium was recovered. They have also stated in their statement that they were carrying the said recovered opium from one Pandit at New Jalpaiguri and to hand over to the petitioner Javed Ansari @ Babloo.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not been apprehended by the personnel of the D.I.R. Patna, rather his name has come in the voluntary statement of co-accused Naim Alvi and Shakil Ahmad recorded under Section 67 of the N.D.P.S. Act. But the statements were not made before the court of Sessions at the time of submitting remand of the co-accused.

Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and the nature of the offence, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The prayer for anticipatory bail is, accordingly, rejected.

(Rajendra Kumar Mishra, J)

AnilKrSinha/-

U			
---	--	--	--

