

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.25249 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-58 Year-2026 Thana- CHAUSA District- Madhepura

Sanjan Yadav @ Sanjan Kumar Son of Arun Yadav @ Arun Kumar Resident
of Village- Bhatgama, P.S.- Chausa, District- Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Barun Kumar Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar Jha

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 21-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Chausa P.S. Case No.58/2026, registered for the offences
punishable under Section 317(5) of BNS and Section 30(a) of
Bihar Prohibition and Excise (Amendment) Act, 2022, Sections
8, 21(a), 21(c) and 20(b)(ii)A of NDPS Act and Sections 25(1-
B)(a), 26 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and allegation is of
recovery of 3.83 grams of smack, 338 grams of Ganja, 8.5 litres
of Codeine from house of Manish along with 2 country made
pistol, two live cartridges and 3 empty cartridges.

4. Learned counsel submits that petitioner was not



arrested from the spot as such nothing was recovered from his conscious possession and his name transpired based on confessional statement of apprehended accused in police custody, which does not have any evidentiary value.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that the case has been instituted under the NDPS Act and under the Arms Act. It is also submitted that no doubt the name of the petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of apprehended accused in police custody but then in the nature of allegation, the case requires to be investigated and interrogation of the petitioner is required. It is also submitted that investigation of the case is continuing.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

