

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11593 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-516 Year-2024 Thana- DUMRA District- Sitamarhi

Ravi Ranjan Kumar Son of Kamal Rai Resident of Village- Bhagwatipur
Amghatta, PS- Sitamarhi, Distt.- Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. N.K. Agarwal, Sr. Advocate
	Mr. Ritesh Kumar Narain Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Ajit Kumar, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 19-06-2025 Heard Mr. N.K. Agarwal, the learned senior counsel
appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Mr. Ajit Kumar, the
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 25(1-B)(a), 26, 35 of Arms Act and Section 8, 20(b)(ii)B of N.D.P.S Act. Petitioner has two criminal antecedents.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant on secret information conducted a raid and apprehended two persons who disclosed their name as Ravi Ranjan Kumar (petitioner) and Kishan Kumar. On search, a country-made loaded pistol and live cartridges were recovered from the co-accused Kishan Kumar and 35 gram smack like substance was recovered from the possession of the petitioner.



4. The learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case and no such recovery as alleged have been made from his conscious possession. It has further been submitted that even taking the allegations on its face value, the recovery is within the commercial quantity and hence the rigours of Section 37 of N.D.P.S. Act would not be attracted. It has further been submitted that the petitioner though has two criminal cases against his name, however, not of similar offence. It has lastly been submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 16.11.2024.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and taking into account the period of custody, I am inclined to grant the petitioner privilege of regular bail.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail is allowed.

8. Let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection Dumra P.S. Case No. 516 of 2024, subject to the



following conditions:-

(i) One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be his close relative and the other shall be local resident.

(ii) The petitioner shall remain physically present in Court on each date of the trial.

(iii) If the petitioner is found involved in similar nature of offence in future, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move for cancellation of his bail bond.

(iv) In case of absence on two consecutive dates or in violation of the terms of the bail, the bail bond of the petitioner will be liable to be cancelled by the court concerned.

(v) The learned Court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Siwani/-

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

