

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.46505 of 2018

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -5 Year- 2016 Thana -D.R.I District- PATNA

=====

Sonoo Kumar @ Sonu Son of Sri Mahesh Chandra @ Guddu, Resident of
Village – Vithvara,P.S. Jasrana, District- Firozabad (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. Nachiketa Jha, Advocate

For the Union of India : Mr. Anshuman Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 31-07-2018 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and counsel
appearing on behalf of the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with D.R.I P.S. Case
No.05 of 2016-2017, registered under Section 20/22 of N.D.P.S
Act.

The allegation in brief is that on secret information Revenue
Intelligence Unit intercepted a truck and found carrying 823.820
kg. of ganja in concealed manner in the hood of the drivers cabin
and the truck was carrying toothpaste and the petitioner was
cleaner of the tuck.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner
being Khalasi had no knowledge of the contraband articles being
transported. He had also no knowledge who had loaded the ganja



and where it was to be delivered and the petitioner has been in custody since 25.8.2016 and the charge-sheet has been submitted.

Whereas, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Director, Revenue Intelligence submits that the statement of the petitioner recorded under Section 67 of the NDPS Act categorically indicates that he had the knowledge of loading of the contraband articles and the driver and the cleaner both were knowing the fact of smuggling of the contraband and huge commercial quantity of 800 k.g. ganja was recovered from possession of accused persons.

Having considered the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and the quantity of recovery, the prayer of the bail of the petitioner is rejected. However the trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and preferably conclude the same within one and a half year.

(Arun Kumar, J)

Sanjeev/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

