

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.40082 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-355 Year-2020 Thana- UCHKAGAON District- Gopalganj

Abbas Ansari S/O Allauddin Ansari R/O Village- Kararia Thakurai, P.S.
Fulwaria, District-Gopalganj

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Dhramveer

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 04-10-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Uchkkagaon P.S. Case No. 355 of 2020 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 8(c) and 21(a) of the N.D.P.S. Act.

3. This is the third attempt of the petitioner to seek bail.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that
petitioner had filed Cr. Misc No. 19415 of 2021 and the same came
to be rejected by an order dated 7-12-2021, thereafter Cr. Misc No.
43422 of 2023 was filed and the same was also rejected by an order
dated 12-7-2023, however, the learned trial court was directed to
ensure that the trial is expedited and is completed preferably within a
period of nine months from the date of receipt/production of a copy
of the order.



5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that when the case was taken up on 12-7-2023, inadvertently a submission was made that charges have been framed as such the order dated 12-7-2023 recorded that the trial be completed within a specified time. It is next submitted that charge till date has not been framed, on which learned APP, Shri. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, submits that it absolutely does not stand to reason that on what basis the said submission was made in Cr. Misc No. 43422 of 2023 on 12-7-2023 that charges have been framed.

6. Learned APP next submits that petitioner has antecedent of sixteen cases and is involved in a case relating to NDPS and charges till date have not been framed and if petitioner is granted the privilege of regular bail, he will abscond.

7. Considering the submission made by learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

SUMIT/-

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

