

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.69849 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-471 Year-2025 Thana- JAHANABAD District- Jehanabad

Upendra Chaudhary @ Phatta @ Upendra Kumar Chaudhary S/o Late Rama
Chaudhary R/o Village- Panch Mahallah, P.S. and Dist.- Jehanabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nityanand Neeraj, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Navin Kumar Pandey, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 01-11-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Jehanabad P.S. Case No. 471 of 2025 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 8(c), 21(b) and 29 of the
NDPS Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of two cases under the NDPS Act and
the informant alleges that on information, the house of Priya
Devi was raided and 57.53 grams of smack was recovered and
Priya Devi was arrested who disclosed that petitioner who is her
brother-in-law used to supply smack in the locality and Mohit,
Rita, Daulti Devi and Santosh were also involved in the
occurrence.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant, it is next submitted that smack was recovered from the house of Priya Devi who is his sister-in-law and they reside separately. It is next submitted that since petitioner has antecedent of two cases under the NDPS Act, as such, he came to be implicated in the instant case by the police.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that petitioner has antecedent of two cases under the NDPS Act and based on confessional statement of Priya, the name of the petitioner transpired and the case is in its nascent stages of investigation and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.

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

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

