

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.29444 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-2 Year-2025 Thana- Refinery District- Begusarai

1. Prince Kumar, Son of Sanjay Singh, Resident of village - Nayagaon, Ward No.- 02, P.S.- Nayagaon, Distt.- Begusarai
2. Jitendra Kumar, Son of Ram Nandan Singh @ Ramanandan Singh, Resident of village - Nayagaon, Ward No.- 02, P.S.- Nayagaon, Distt.- Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Chandra Sen Prasad Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

8 17-12-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioners have prayed for bail in connection with Begusarai Refinery P.S. Case No.02 of 2025 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 20 and 22 of the N.D.P.S. Act.

3. The case of the prosecution, in short, is that on an e-rickshaw there were three persons. One was driving the e-rickshaw and two were on back seat and from their possession, altogether 30. 535 Kg. of ganja was recovered.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that petitioners are innocent and have committed no offence. They have been falsely implicated in the present case. It has further been



submitted that one another person who was also riding on the e-rickshaw has been granted bail by learned trial Court as he claimed to be the owner and driver of the e-rickshaw. From perusal of the entire F.I.R., it is not clear as to where these petitioners were sitting on the e-rickshaw. It has also been submitted that the seizure list does not show as to what amount of ganja was recovered from each one of the petitioners rather a collective seizure list has been made. It has also been submitted that petitioners are languishing in judicial custody since 18.01.2025. and the investigation is still under progress.

5. Learned APP appearing for the state has vehemently opposed the prayer of regular bail.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature of allegation, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail at this stage and, as such, their prayer for bail stands rejected.

7. However, the petitioners may renew their prayer for bail after six months or after framing of charge, whichever is earlier.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

lata/-

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

