

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.71113 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-236 Year-2025 Thana- ATHMALGOLA District- Patna

Dinesh Ray @ Dinesh Kumar Ray S/o Vindeshwar Prasad R/o Village- Naya
Tola Raghopur, P.S.- Bakhtiyarpur, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Mahendra Pratap

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Akshay Lal Pandit

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 14-10-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Athmalgola P.S. Case No. 236 of 2025 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 20 and 22 of the N.D.P.S.
Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of two cases and the informant alleges
that 8.250 kgs of ganja was recovered from Chandrama Devi,
who disclosed that Pappu Singh was involved in the business
and gave Rs. 2000 for every trip, further she was bringing the
ganja after purchasing from the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner was not arrested from the spot as such nothing was



recovered from his conscious possession and he came to be implicated based on the confessional statement of Chandrama Devi in police custody, which does not have any evidentiary value.

5. Learned APP vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that it is a case where ganja is alleged to have been recovered and the apprehended accused disclosed that the ganja was purchased from the petitioner and she gets 2000 rupees per trip by an accused namely Pappu and investigation of the case is continuing. Learned APP also submits that petitioner has antecedent of two cases and in the event if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.

6. Considering the submission made by learned 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	
---	--	---	--

