

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18400 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-114 Year-2025 Thana- MANPUR District- West Champaran

Manoj Kumar Yadav @ Monaj Kumar Yadav, S/O Sri Dinesh Kumar Yadav
R/V- Subhadra Jamuniya,P.S- Sahodara, Dist- West Champaran

... .. Petitioner/S

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Sagar Kumar
		Mr.Harsha Shashwat
		Mr.Sharad Kumar Verma
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr.Ajit Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 01-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in Manpur P. S. Case No.114 of 2025 registered for
the offences punishable under Sections 8/20(b)(ii), 22(b)
and 23(b) of the NDPS Act.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits
that the petitioner has antecedent of three cases and the
informant alleges that he received an information that
accused with narcotic shall be entering Nepal through VTR
Jungle. Accordingly, the informant along with force reached
the place of occurrence and saw an accused coming, the



accused seeing the force, fled throwing a bag. It is next alleged that from the bag, two kilograms ganja was recovered and the petitioner was identified based on the Aadhar card and mobile which fell while fleeing.

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. It is also submitted that petitioner came to be implicated falsely in the instant case for ulterior reason. It is also submitted that even alleged recovery of ganja is of intermediate quantity.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that petitioner has antecedent of three cases and he was identified based on Aadhar card and mobile which fell while he was fleeing on seeing the police force. It is next submitted that investigation in the case is continuing and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond or try to tamper with the evidence.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to extend the



privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail
stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

