

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.71774 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-55 Year-2025 Thana- JOGBANI District- Araria

Deepak Kumar Yadav @ Deepak Yadav @ Bhalta Son of Haruni Yadav
Resident of Indra Nagar, Ward No.- 09, Police Station - Jogbani, District -
Araria (Bihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Kumar Ravish

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Shahabuddin Azeem @ S. Azeem

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 15-10-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Jogbani P.S. Case No. 55 of 2025 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 21 and 22 of the NDPS Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of nine case and the informant alleges
that from possession of Sudhir, 7 gm brown sugar was
recovered.

4. It is next submitted that from perusal of the FIR, it
would manifest that the same does not include the name of the
petitioner, but subsequently, Sudhir, in his confessional
statement, disclosed the name of the petitioner. It is further
submitted that the petitioner has antecedents of 9 cases, as such



police, during the course of investigation, made Sudhir to confess the name of the petitioner when the petitioner has no concern with Sudhir. It is also submitted that had the petitioner been involved in the occurrence, in that event Sudhir would have disclosed his name when he was apprehended and the name of the petitioner would have been recorded in the FIR, which casts an aspersion on the case of the prosecution.

5. The learned APP opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that the petitioner has antecedents of 9 cases and out of which one case is under the NDPS Act. It is also submitted that no doubt that the name of the petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of apprehended accused in police custody, but then, 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	
---	--	---	--

