

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.7431 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-338 Year-2021 Thana- CHHATAUNI District- East Champaran

PAPPU KUMAR @ PAPPU KUMAR SAH Son of Bhikhari Sah Resident of
Village - Amar Chhatauni, P.S.- Muffasil Motihari, Distt.- East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nafisuzzoha, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Bhanu Pratap Singh, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 16-08-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for
the offence under Sections 25(1-b)a, 26 and 35 of the Arms
Act and Sections 8, 20(B)(C)(ii) of the NDPS Act.

Recovery is of 2.2 Kgs. of Charas along with 9 Kgs.
of silver jewellery.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence. In
fact, according to the F.I.R., 2.2 Kgs. of Charas is said to have
been recovered from the car on which the petitioner was
riding. He further submits that nothing incriminating has
been recovered from the conscious possession of the



petitioner and he has no concern with the alleged recovery of 2.2 Kgs. of Charas. He also submits that the petitioner is not involved in illegal dealing of Charas. He further submits that the petitioner, who is of no fault, is rotting in judicial custody since 04.09.2021.

Learned A.P.P. for the State has, vehemently, opposed the prayer for bail of this petitioner and submits that a huge quantity to the extent of 2.2 Kgs. of Charas falling within the purview of commercial quantity has been recovered from the vehicle which was in the possession of the petitioner and others. He also submits that since the recovered quantity comes under the purview of commercial quantity, the petitioner seems to be engaged in dealing with the contraband substance like charas. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve to be enlarged on bail.

Result of examination of Forensic Science Laboratory is as under;

“The dark brown coloured semi solid substances contained in tin dibba as described above was found to be “CHARAS” containing THC (Tetra Hydro Cannabinol) as their chief intoxicating ingredient.



Charas is also known as ‘HASHISH’ which is the resinous excaudate of the flowering and fruiting tops of the female plant of cannabis sativa.”

Since the quantum of recovery of Charas in this case falls within the purview of commercial quantity, which is defined as 1 Kg., this Court intends to refer Section 37 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, which clearly depicts that the grant of bail in N.D.P.S. cases, where the recovery of commercial quantity of narcotic is alleged, is circumscribed. Section 37 says that for granting bail, the Court must, on the basis of the record produced before it, be satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is not guilty of the offences for which he has been charged, and further he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail.

This issue has also been considered by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of ***State of Kerala and Ors. Vs. Rajesh & Ors.*** reported in ***2020 (12) SCC 122*** as also in the case of ***Narcotics Control Bureau Vs. Mohit Aggarwal*** passed in *Cr. Appeal Nos. 1001-1002 of 2022*.

In view of the aforesaid reference and the facts of



the case, this court is of the view that the recovery of more than commercial quantity of Charas from the vehicle in question belongs to the petitioner and others, confirming the same by the F.S.L. report, would not justify that the petitioner had no knowledge of Charas kept in the vehicle or he was not involved in commission of such offence and also there is no material available to substantiate that the petitioner would not commit such offence in the event of release. Therefore, considering the quantum of recovery of Charas as well as the mandate of Section 37, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner is rejected.

However, learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

brajesh/-

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

