

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.16159 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-168 Year-2025 Thana- Chitragupta Nagar District- Khagaria

Jangla Yadav @ Jangali Yadav @ Prasant Kumar Son of Chandrashekhar
Yadav Resident Of Village - Baisa, P.S. - Parbatta, Dist. - Khagaria.
... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sadanand Prasad Deo, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Humayou Ahmad Khan, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

3 06-05-2026 Heard Learned Counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable in connection with Chitraguptnagar P.S. Case No.168 of 2025 corresponding to Special Case No.01 of 2026 under Sections 8(c), 20(b)(ii)(c) and 29 of the NDPS Act, pending before the court of Sessions Judge, Khagaria.

3. As per the prosecution, the recovery of 27 kg ganja has been alleged to be made from a trolley bag, which is subject matter of the present case.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He submits that no offence of NDPS has been made as nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner rather at the instance of disclosure made by the apprehended person from



whose possession, the recovery has been made.

5. Learned Counsel also submits that antecedent of the petitioner is not clean and there are eight criminal antecedents of the petitioner in which he has been acquitted in one case and in rest cases, he is on bail. He further submits that the case of **Tofan Singh Vs The State of Tamil Nadu** passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the matter of NDPS, is absolutely in favour of the petitioner as no recovery has been made from the conscious possession of the petitioner.

6. Counsel further submits that the petitioner is ready to fulfill all the conditions whatsoever shall be imposed upon him.

7. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that it is a case of recovery of commercial quantity of NDPS material and the person from whom recovery has been made, has directly made allegation against the petitioner about his involvement in the present case.

8. In the present facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, therefore the bail application of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Prakashmani/-

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

