

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.29784 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-80 Year-2024 Thana- MAHISHI District- Saharsa

Sunil Kumar Mandal S/o Badri Narayan Mandal R/o Village - Bhaptiyahi,
Ward no. 06, P.S. - Bhaptiyahi, District - Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pramod Mishra, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Umesh Lal Verma, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 10-07-2026 Heard the learned Advocate for the petitioner and the
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail, who is in custody in connection with Special (NDPS) Case No. 15 of 2024, arising out of Mahishi P.S. Case No. 80 of 2024, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 8, 20(b)(ii)(c), 25 & 29 of NDPS Act.

3. This is the third attempt made on behalf of the petitioner as earlier the prayer for bail of the petitioner was turned down by this court on 18.09.2024 in Cr.Misc. No. 48103 of 2024. Subsequently, on 23.07.2025 in Cr.Misc. No. 23831 of 2025, wherein the petitioner sought permission to withdraw the present application. While rejecting the prayer for bail of the petitioner, this Court has taken note of the fact that the 23.6 kgs



Ganja was recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner and others. On the last occasion when the matter was taken up, the status report was called for pursuant thereto. This Court is informed that the charge has been framed on 24.09.2024 and the prosecution has altogether examined, seven prosecution witnesses in this case including the informant and I.O. Only one seizure list witness remained to be examined.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submitted that till date the trial has not been concluded and now the petitioner has been incarcerated since 29.03.2024 more than two years have been lapsed. He further submits that the petitioner also having fair antecedent and he will fully co-operate in the proceeding of the Court and keeping him behind the bar for such a long period would cause prejudice to the petitioner, in case he would be finally acquitted.

5. On the other hand, learned APP for the State vehemently opposes the bail application and submits that the prayer for bail has already been turned down earlier and now the trial is at the fag end and there is every likelihood that the same shall be concluded within a period of four months.

6. Considering the submissions advanced by learned Advocate for the respective parties and taking note of the fact



that the alleged narcotic substance has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner, this Court is not acceded to the prayer of the petitioner for grant of regular bail . Accordingly, the same stands rejected.

7. However, it is expected that the learned trial Court shall take all endeavor to conclude the trial preferably within a period of four months from the date of the receipt/production of a copy of this order.

8. It is made clear that, in case, the trial is not concluded within the period stipulated, the petitioner shall be at liberty to approach before this Court by filing a fresh application.

(Harish Kumar, J)

sumit/-

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

