

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.19840 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-139 Year-2020 Thana- MITHANPURA District- Muzaffarpur

NAVIN KUMAR @ NAVIN KUMAR SINHA SON OF LATE
LSURENDRA PRASAD RESIDENT OF MOHALLA- BRAHAMPURA,
P.S.- BRAHAMPURA, DISTRICT- MUZAFFARPUR

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Manoj Kumar Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Vinod Shankar Modi

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

6 09-03-2022 The learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to

remove all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within

one month.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest for the

offences alleged under Sections 188, 420, 308 and 34 of the

Indian Penal Code and Section 18(c) read with 27(b)(ii) of Drug

and cosmetic Act as well as Section 3 read with Section 7 of the

Essential Commodities Act, registered in connection with

Mithanpura P.S.Case No.139 of 2020.

The informant of this case is the Drug Inspector. He

has lodged the present case, mentioning therein that illegal



blood collection centre was being run without having any licence by the present petitioner and co-accused Suraj Kumar. On raid, empty blood bags and 350 ml blood each in two blood bags were found.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the name of Dr. Nivin Sinha has figured in the FIR, but the petitioner is Navin Kumar @ Navin Kumar Sinha, who is not Dr. Navin Sinha.

On the other hand, the learned APP has submitted that the witnesses in paragraph nos. 5, 7, 11, 14 and 15 of the case diary have supported the entire occurrence.

Paragraph nos. 15 of the case diary contains the statement of the witness Golu Kumar, who has stated that he is a poor person and he was in need of money. As such, he was enticed away to donate his blood. He has also stated that transaction of blood for money was conducted after giving enticement to the poor persons.

Considering the above facts and circumstances, it is not a fit case for anticipatory bail. The prayer for anticipatory bail on behalf of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

Office shall ensure that all defects are removed by the petitioner within the stipulated time as provided



hereinabove, failing which the matter shall be brought to the
notice of this Court.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

HR/-

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

