

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.21235 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-501 Year-2025 Thana- PHULPARAS District- Madhubani

Md. Mainuddin @ Mustakim Son of Late Bhola @ Bhola Mian Resident of
Village - Siswar, P.S.- Phulparas, District - Madhuabani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajeev Ranjan No. Ii, Adv

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Umeshanand Pandit, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 08-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Phulparas P.S. Case No. 501 of 2025, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 8, 20(B)(ii) C/25/29 of NDPS Act.

3. The case of the prosecution, in short, is that the informant received secret information that Md. Mainuddin and his two sons had brought ganja to sell in Delhi. He informed the SDO, made a station entry, and went with a police team to verify the information. When they reached the house in village Siswar, four persons tried to run away. The police chased them and caught two, who identified themselves as sons of Md. Mainuddin, while the others escaped. During the search of the house, the police recovered about 29 kg of ganja packed in



different packets, one electric weighing machine, one TECNO SPARK mobile and one Real Me mobile.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. The petitioner is not the absolute owner of the house in question and he was not present in house at the time of occurrence and he was staying in Hariyana in connection with his wages. He further submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the fact that the seizure of 29 kgs of Ganza, two mobile phones and one electric weighing machine alleged to have been recovered from the house of the petitioner and that it is of commercial quantity, therefore, the bar under Section 37 of the NDPS Act comes into play. Under these circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

kiran/-

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

