

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.25331 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-471 Year-2025 Thana- JAHANABAD District- Jehanabad

Daulti Devi w/o Late Ashok Chaudhary @ Ashok Kumar Chaudhary Resident
of Village- Panchmohalla, P.S.- Jehanabad, District- Jehanabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rishabh Gupta, Advocate Mr. Kanishk Kaustubh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Md. Mushtaque Alam, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 13-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned APP for the State.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Jehanabad P.S. Case No. 471 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 8(c), 21(b) and 29 of the NDPS Act.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of two cases and is in custody since 11.03.2026 and the informant alleges that house of Upendra on information was raided and 57.53 grams of smack was recovered and Priya Devi was arrested who disclosed that Upendra supplies smack in the locality and co-accused Mohit, Rita, petitioner and Santosh were also involved in the supply of smack, further the house of petitioner was also raided and from



her house 3.97 grams of smack was recovered.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that house of the petitioner was raided behind her back. It is also submitted that even presuming what has been alleged is true without admitting then from house of the petitioner, the smack recovered was less than small quantity. It is further submitted that Priya Devi, in whose confession the name of the petitioner transpired, had approached this Court seeking regular bail by filing Criminal Miscellaneous No. 53421 of 2025 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 11.08.2025 passed by a learned Co-ordinate Bench. It is further submitted that since Priya Devi has been granted the privilege of regular bail, as such, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the regular bail application of the petitioner and submits that though name of the petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of Priya, but then her house was raided and from her house 3.97 grams of smack was recovered, but then fairly submits that the recovered smack was less than small quantity. It is further submitted that based on disclosure made by Priya, the house of petitioner was raided and smack was recovered. It is



also submitted that petitioner has antecedent of two cases, out of which one case is under the NDPS Act, as such, if privilege of regular bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

7. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew her prayer for bail after framing of charge.

8. Accordingly, the instant regular bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

