

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18186 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-57 Year-2025 Thana- KURLIKOT District- Kishanganj

JAYANNA S/o- Late Nagaraju R/v- Maruthinagar, Solurugoan Po- Soluru Ps-
Magadi Taluk Dist- Ramanagar, Karnataka

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rajendra Narain, Sr. Adv
		Mr.Pawan Kumar Singh, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr.Tapeshwar Sharma, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 06-05-2026 1. Heard learned senior counsel for the petitioner, Sri
Rajendra Narain and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Kurlikot PS Case No. 57 of 2025 registered for the offences
punishable under Section 20(b)(ii)C, 25 and 29 of NDPS Act.

3. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and allegation is of
recovery of 77.370 litres of Ganja from a truck.

4. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that
the 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 fact that he is owner of the seized vehicle. It
is next submitted that no prudent person would use his own vehicle
for committing an occurrence and thus would create evidence against
himself and hence would get implicated, it is further submitted that
petitioner was completely unaware that Venkata Ramu, Pradeep



Kewat and Kirtibes Sarkar would misuse the vehicle in the manner as alleged, who were also apprehended from the spot. It is also submitted that petitioner in good faith had handed over the truck to his driver Venkata Ramu on monthly rent system for transporting goods and thus was not aware that Venkata Ramu would indulge in such an act.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that case has been instituted under the NDPS Act and commercial quantity of ganja is alleged to have been recovered from the vehicle, it is next submitted that investigation in the case is required about the involvement of the petitioner in the occurrence for which interrogation is also necessary, it is further submitted that if petitioner is innocent, in that event, police will act accordingly.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, 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	
---	--	---	--

