

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.19210 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-104 Year-2025 Thana- Ratanpur District- Begusarai

Sachin Kumar @ Sachin Kr. Son of Chunchun Singh Resident of Mohalla -
Ballahpur, Ward No.- 3, P.S.- Nayagaon, District - Begusarai

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Union of India through N.C.B. New Delhi

... .. Opposite Parties

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Arbind Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Parties : Mr. Chandra Sen Prasad Singh, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 07-04-2026 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(c), 21(c) and 29 of NDPS Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that he received information that smack was kept in the rented premise of Ram Briksha Kumar and landlady is Sudha Devi, accordingly, the house was raided and 3.340 kg of smack was recovered, thereafter the informant received an information that Ram Briksha, Shivam and Kumar Aryan along with other accused are present near BP High School, accordingly, the



police force reached the place of occurrence when accused fled but two accused were apprehended who disclosed their as Shivam and Kumar Aryan and also disclosed the name of Ram Briksha who fled and further disclosed that Sonu, petitioner, Raja, Nilesh and Abhash are also involved in the racket.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant based on confessional statement of apprehended accused in police custody which does not evidentiary value. It is next submitted that petitioner was not arrested from the spot nor it is the case of the prosecution that informant had any information about the petitioner being involved in the occurrence.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits no doubt name of the petitioner transpired based on confessional statement of apprehend accused in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value but then from perusal of the order impugned it would manifest that call detail records are recorded at paragraph nos. 76 and 210 of the case diary and the same shows that petitioner was in regular contact with the co-accused persons including on the date of occurrence. It is thus submitted that the



case requires to be investigated and interrogation of the petitioner is required.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP and also taking into consideration the fact that it is a case under NDPS, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Gaurav Sinha/-

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

