

[2026:JHHC:12672]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No.3547 of 2026

Jaypal Paswan, aged about 47 years, S/o Late Parmeshwar Paswan,
R/o Vill-Ghar-Masiyan Dih, P.O. & P.S. Bind, District—Nalanda,
Bihar. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand Opposite Party

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Vishal Srivastava, Advocate
Mr. Navneet Anand, Advocate.

For the State : Mr. Prabir Kumar Chatterjee, Spl.P.P

Order No.02 Dated- 29-04-2026

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has been made accused in connection with Jaldega
(Bansjore O.P.) P.S. Case No. 52 of 2024, N.D.P.S. Case No. 06 of 2025
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 20(b)(i)(C), 22 of the
NDPS Act.

This is the second journey of the petitioner with the prayer for
regular bail, earlier the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner was
rejected on merits by the co-ordinate Bench of this court vide order dated
20.08.2025 in B.A. No. 3578 of 2025.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the fresh ground is
that the during the trial three witnesses have been examined out of
whom P.W.3 has supported the case of the prosecution and has
categorically stated that 26.91 Kg of Ganja like substance was recovered
from the petitioner and the same has not been challenged in his cross-
examination. It is next submitted that the petitioner undertakes that he
will co-operate with the trial of the case and will not annoy or disturb the
informant or witnesses of the case. It is lastly submitted that the
petitioner has been in custody for a considerable period of time. Hence it
is submitted that the petitioner be admitted to bail.

Learned A.P.P. appearing for the State vehemently opposes the
prayer for bail of the petitioner and submitted that there is recovery of

Ganja in commercial quantity, hence, the rigors of Section 37 of the N.D.P.S. Act, 1985 is attracted in this case and in the absence of any material suggest and there are reasonable grounds of believing that the petitioner is not guilty of the offence and that he will not indulge in any offence if released on bail, as also keeping in view the serious nature of direct allegation against the petitioner, there is every chance of the petitioner absconding or tampering with evidence, if released on bail; the petitioner ought not be released on bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner and the evidence that has already come during the trial against the petitioner as well as absence of any material suggest that there is reasonable ground of believing that the petitioner has not committed the offence, hence, this Court is not inclined to admit the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the above-named petitioner is rejected for same reasons for which is earlier bail petition was rejected.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

29/04/2026

Amar/