

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.24382 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-91 Year-2025 Thana- UDWANTNAGAR District- Bhojpur

Neha Kumari @ Neha Devi W/O Saurav Kumar Singh Resident of Kharauni,
P.S.- Udwanthnagar, Dist.- Bhojpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ravindra Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Ram Bilash Roy Raman, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 13-08-2025 Heard Mr. Ravindra Kumar, learned counsel for the
petitioner and learned APP representing the State.

2. The petitioner is in custody in connection with
Udwanthnagar P.S. Case No. 91 of 2025 for the offence
punishable under Sections 8(c), 20(b)(ii)(c) and 27(a) of the
N.D.P.S. Act, lodged on 18.02.2025 by the informant Madhu
Kumari.

3. As per the prosecution story, the informant alleged
that in course of patrolling and visiting the Banks, as she was
returning got secret information about movement of a white
colour Swift Dzire with Jharkhand number coming from
Narayanpur carrying illegal ganja. It was intercepted in the
presence of Circle Officer, Udwanthnagar in which two men and
and women were present. While one person managed to escape,



a man and a women (petitioner herein) were taken into custody and there is recovery/seizure of 175 Kilogram ganja beside mobiles and cash amount. This led to the F.I.R.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is complete violation of the section 50 of the N.D.P.S. Act and further, despite the petitioner being in custody since last six months, the FSL report has not come to prove that recovered material is ganja. Further submission is that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP on the other hand opposes the prayer for bail submitting that the recovery/seizure is much above the commercial quantity and the petitioner was sitting in the vehicle from the which the recovery/seizure was made.

6. Considering the submissions of the parties as also the recovery/seizure that has come, this Court is not inclined to extend her the privilege of bail.

7. Accordingly, the bail application stands rejected.

8. Though the bail has been rejected, it is to be noted as rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioner that in such cases where the F.I.R. has been lodged on 18.02.2025, it is duty of the Police as also the Forensic Science Laboratory to immediately report on the findings of the seized



material. The Police Officer investigating the present case is duty bound to do so and submit the FSL repot within four weeks to the Trial Court, if still not been submitted.

9. As the petitioner’s bail application stands rejected, she is a lady, the Trial Court is also directed to expedite the Trial.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

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

