

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49834 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-2 Year-2024 Thana- GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL COMP.
District- Darbhanga

=====

Amarjeet Kumar Singh S/o Late Ramkripal Singh R/o - Milki Belwara, P.S -
Kamtaul, District - Darbhanga, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vinay Kumar Mishra

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Nagendra Prasad

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 12-08-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with G.R Case No. 02 of 2024 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 18(c), 27(b) and 11 of Drugs and
Cosmetics Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case and the complainant
alleges that 74 types of drugs were seized from a kiosk
belonging to the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the
complainant. It is next submitted that kiosk does not belong to
the petitioner nor petitioner has any license for selling any



medicine; and petitioner has been implicated at the instance of Chowkidar.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that from perusal of the complainant, it would manifest that a person had purchased a tablet, as he was having headache and after consuming the tablet, the same reacted based on which a complaint was made and in pursuance of the complainant, a team was constituted and the kiosk of the petitioner was raided from where 74 types of drugs were recovered. It is next submitted that petitioner was selling the drugs from his kiosk, despite petitioner not having a valid license. It is thus submitted that it appears that petitioner was selling medicine which was having adverse effect on its consumption.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

