

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 3679 of 2025

Md. Imran, S/o Late Abdul Gapphar, R/o Near Led Masin House, Jugsalai,
P.O. And P.S. Jugsalai, Town Jamshedpur, District East Singhbhum

...

...

Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand ...

...

Opposite Party

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner:

For the State:

Mr. Dilip Kr. Karmakar, Advocate

Mr. Bhola Nath Ojha, A.P.P.

06/ 10.07.2025

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. appearing for the State.

2. This anticipatory bail application under Sections 482 and 484 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita has been preferred by the petitioner apprehending his arrest in connection with Parsudih P.S. Case No. 04 of 2025 for offences registered under Sections 17(a), 21(a), 22(a) and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, pending in the Court of the Sessions Judge, East Singhbhum at Jamshedpur.

3. As per the First Information Report, it has been alleged that while on patrolling duty, informant received a secret information about persons engaged in sale and purchase of brown sugar. On reaching at the place of occurrence, he found 3-4 people trying to flee. Two of them were apprehended and from their possession packets of brown sugar were recovered. These accused persons stated that they were involved in sale and purchase of brown sugar along with Imran, the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and no incriminating article has been recovered from his possession. Only on the basis of confessional statement of the apprehended accused, the name of the petitioner has been implicated in this case. He submits that the apprehended accused has implicated his name due to enmity.

5. Learned A.P.P. appearing for the state vehemently opposes the prayer of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail and submits that the petitioner used to supply narcotic drugs to the co-accused. The petitioner is also having one criminal antecedent being G.R. No.3815 of 2014 dated 09.12.2014.

6. After hearing the counsel for the parties and going through the records, I find that there is serious allegation against the petitioner. This is a case of dealing in narcotics, i.e., Brown Sugar. Though the name of this petitioner transpired on the basis of statement of co-accused, yet the allegation is that he also is a supplier. The Sessions Judge while rejecting the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner has observed that the material collected during the course of investigation disclose that the petitioner is supplier of narcotic drugs to the co-accused. Involvement of this petitioner needs to be investigated, for which it would be necessary to interrogate the petitioner and his presence in investigation is thus required.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts as also considering that the investigation is still in progress and this is a case where detention of the petitioner and custodial interrogation is required, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The prayer for grant of anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

8. This anticipatory bail application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Ananda Sen, J.)

Kumar/Cp-03