

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.16436 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-134 Year-2020 Thana- AHYAPUR District- Muzaffarpur

SUNIL KUMAR Son of Kedar Prasad Yadav Resident of Village - Shivraha
Basudeo, P.S.- Ahiyapur, District - Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjay Parasmani

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Uday Pratap Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 13-04-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

Learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes to remove the defects, as pointed out by the office, within four weeks. In the eventuality of non-removal of defects within undertaken period, the office will place the matter before the Bench.

The petitioner seeks bail in Muzaffarpur N.D.P.S. Case No.6/2020, arising out of Ahiyapur P.S. Case No. 134 of 2020 registered for the offences punishable under Section 22/22 of the N.D.P.S. Act pending in the Court of learned 8th Additional Sessions Judge, Muzaffarpur.

500 gm of charas and one mobile phone is said to have been recovered from the possession of the petitioner.



It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that no such occurrence as alleged ever took place. He has been falsely implicated in this case by the police due to previous grudge. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. The charge has been framed on 15.12.2020. Petitioner has no criminal antecedent and has been languishing in custody since 05.02.2020.

Learned APP for the State vehemently opposing the bail petition submitted that the considering the quantity of seized contraband, petitioner does not deserve for bail.

Considering the facts and circumstances of case and particularly considering the criminal antecedents, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The prayer for bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

However, the learned Trial Court is directed to conclude the trial as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of nine months. If the trial is not concluded within the stipulated period as aforesaid, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

Trivedi/-

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

