

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.76749 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-390 Year-2024 Thana- MAJORGANJ District- Sitamarhi

LAKHINDRA RAI @ LAKHAN Son of Sonelal Rai Resident of village -  
Sangrampur, Ward No.- 3, P.S.- Sonebarsa, District - Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Pushpendra Kumar Singh, Adv

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      26-02-2026              1.    Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and  
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2.    The petitioner seeks bail in connection with  
Majorganj P.S. Case No.390/2024, registered for the offences  
punishable under Section 317(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita  
and Sections 8, 20(b)(ii)(c) of the N.D.P.S. Act.

3.    Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the  
petitioner is in custody since 19-11-2024 and is a person with  
clean antecedent and allegation is of recovery of 52 KG of ganja  
from a car and the petitioner was apprehend from the car and  
disclosed the name of Tamish Kumar stating that Tamish Kumar  
and others worked as route liner.

4.    Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that  
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the



informant. It is next submitted that petitioner is not the owner of the seized vehicle and was merely driving the car as such he was not even aware that what was kept in the car.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that petitioner after his arrest disclosed the name of certain other accused persons, who were involved in the occurrence, as such it cannot be said at this stage that petitioner was not involved in the occurrence. It is next submitted that allegation is of recovery of commercial quantity of narcotics.

6. Considering the submission made by learned APP, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

Sumit/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

