

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.28363 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-151 Year-2020 Thana- JAKKANPUR District- Patna

1. Radha Devi @ Bhabhi W/o- Guddu Kumar @ Guddu Bhaiya R/v- Vishnupuri, Chitkohra, PS- Gardanibagh, District- Patna
2. Guddu Kumar @ Guddu Bhaiya S/o- Suraj Narayan Paswan @ Suraj Bahadur R/v- Vishnupuri, Ambedkar Chowk Purani Bhatti Ps- Gardanibagh Dist- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Sriram Krishna, Advocate
		Mr.Madhukar Anand, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Shyam Kumar Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 07-05-2026

Heard the parties.

2. This application has been filed by the petitioner for grant of regular bail in connection with Jakkanpur P.S. Case No. 151 of 2020 registered for the offence under Sections 8(c), 21(c), 25 and 29 of N.D.P.S. Act and Section 120 B of Indian Penal Code.

3. Earlier the bail application of the petitioner was rejected by this Court vide order dated 17.09.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 63424 of 2025 which reads as under:-

*Heard the learned Senior Counsel for the
petitioners and learned APP for the State.*

*2. The petitioners seek regular bail in
connection with Jakkanpur P.S. Case No. 151 of 2020*



registered for the offence under Sections 8(c), 21(c), 25 and 29 of the NDPS Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, 1511 grams of brown sugar was recovered from the co-accused Sudama Kumar. On interrogation, he disclosed that the seized brown sugar was supplied to him by one Abhimanyu Kumar @ Mannu, one Radha Devi @ Bhabhi and by one Guddu Kumar who are in custody.

4. The petitioners are in custody since 02.07.2025 and have four criminal antecedents of similar and serious nature.

5. Considering the nature of accusation levelled against the petitioner and also considering the recovery of brown sugar, this Court is not inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioners.

6. Accordingly, this application for regular bail stands rejected.

4. Thereafter the petitioner moved before the Hon'ble Supreme Court for regular bail, but it was also rejected vide order dated 24.11.2025 passed in Special Leave to Appeal (Crl) No. 18603 of 2025, whereby the order of this Court has been affirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

5. Hence, once the prayer for bail was rejected by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, this Court cannot consider the bail application of the petitioner after a short gap, when it was earlier rejected on 24.11.2025.

6. Accordingly, this application is dismissed with a



direction to the concerned court below to expedite the trial.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

tusharika/-

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

