

In the Court of District & Addl. Sessions Judge-I, Gopalganj

A.B.P. No. 571/2026

1- Shrikant Yadav :-----Petitioner

V r s

The State of Bihar :----- Opposite party

Counsel for the petitioner :----- Sri Ranjan Kumar Srivastava, Advocate

Counsel for the Opposite party :----- Sri Deobansh Giri, P.P.

17.04.2026	Order	Remarks
	<p>Anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf of the petitioner namely Shrikant Yadav, who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Kuchaikote P.S. Case No. 42/2021, registered U/s 20, 22, 25, 29 NDPS Act is put up for hearing.</p> <p>The above case was registered on the written application of Md. Sajid Khan that when on patrol duty the informant got secret information that two smugglers are coming from Maruti Van loaded with Ganja. When started checking at NH 28, two persons from Maruti Van bearing reg. no. GJ05CE3849 was seen coming. After seeing the police party, they left the van and tried to flee away, but were apprehended by the police force. The apprehended persons disclosed their identity as Yogendra Sanjay and Pawan Kumar. The police recovered 10 kg Ganja from the Dikki of said vehicle. Hence, the present F.I.R.</p> <p>Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner argued that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. <b>Learned counsel further argued that the petitioner has one criminal antecedent.</b> Learned Counsel further argued that the prosecution story is totally false, fabricated and concocted. With these arguments learned counsel for the petitioner prayed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.</p> <p>Ld. P.P. for the State opposed the bail prayer of the petitioners.</p> <p>Heard both the parties and perused the record. The co-accused persons namely Yogendra Sanjay and Pawan Kumar were caught on the spot with 10kg of Ganja. As mentioned in para 17 of case diary Yogendra Sanjay in his confessional statement disclosed</p>	

**Contd.**  
**17.04.2026**

that the petitioner is supplier of the contraband seized. As mentioned in para 7, 8, 9 & 10 of case diary, the witnesses have supported the prosecution story. This is very serious offence. Moreover, the investigation is still going on.

**Therefore, at this score it is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly anticipatory bail of the petitioner stands rejected.**

(Dictated)

**(Sanjeev Kumar Singh)**  
A.S.J-I