

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.85257 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-319 Year-2025 Thana- JANKINAGAR District- Purnia

Dilip Kumar Yadav, Son of Late Satyanarayan Yadav, Resident of Village-
Charapatti, Ward no. 12, Ps- Jankinagar, Dist- Purnea

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Deepak Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Pushpa Sinha, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 06-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. Petitioner, who is in custody, seeks bail in connection with Jankinagar P.S. Case No. 319 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 8(c) and 21(c) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985.

3. As per the prosecution case, the police, on secret information that one Chetan Yadav @ Monu Yadav has brought illegal Codeine syrup by a car and has kept the same in the garage of his house, conducted a raid, however, the said accused Chetan Yadav @ Monu Yadav managed to flee and one Dilip Kumar Yadav (petitioner), who happens to be the father of the



accused Chetan Yadav @ Monu Yadav, was apprehended and on search total 215.8 liters of Codeine syrup was recovered.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that from the very tenor of the FIR, it would be evident that the police had an input with regard to the co-accused Chetan Yadav @ Monu Yadav that he was dealing in the Codeine syrup business. It has further been submitted that the petitioner happens to be the father of the said co-accused Chetan Yadav @ Monu Yadav and was present in his house and was not even aware as to what was kept in the garage of the house which is accessible from outside. It has next been submitted that the petitioner has clean antecedent and merely because he was present at the relevant time in his house, he was arrested without any specific attribution. He is in custody since 10.10.2025.

5. The learned A.P.P. has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid submissions made by the parties, let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection Jankinagar P.S. Case No. 319 of 2025, subject to the



following conditions:-

(i) One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be his close relative and the other shall be local resident.

(ii) The petitioner shall remain physically present in Court on each date of the trial.

(iii) In case of absence on two consecutive dates or in violation of the terms of the bail, the bail bond of the petitioner will be liable to be cancelled by the court concerned.

(iv) If the petitioner is found involved in similar nature of offence in future, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move for cancellation of his bail bond.

(v) The learned Court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail is allowed.

8. It is made clear that the observation, if any, made in this order, shall be of no bearing during the trial.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

manoj/-

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

