

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49473 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-108 Year-2025 Thana- PARBATTa District- Khagaria

Shankar Das S/o Late Ramdeo Das Resident of Village- Naya Tola Kolhara,
P.S.- Parbatta (Maraiya O.P.), District- Khagaria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rahul Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Jagdhar Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 09-10-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 8, 20(B), (ii), C, 25 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a person of clean antecedent and the informant alleges that the Abhishek was dealing in *ganza* and accordingly his house was raided but Abhishek fled and his mother was arrested and from the house 25.605 Kg. of *ganza* was recovered.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the F.I.R. it would



manifest that the thrust of the allegation of dealing in ganja is against Abhishek and petitioner being father of Abhishek also came to be implicated when he was completely unaware that his son has kept ganja in the house.

5. Learned APP for the State vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that even petitioner was not present at the place of occurrence rather only his wife was present, as such, it appear that even petitioner was aware of ganja being concealed in the house. It is further submitted that it does not appear probable that commercial quantity of ganja kept in the house would not have come to the notice of the petitioner. It is further submitted that investigation in the case is still continuing.

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

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Ranjeet/-

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

