

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND, RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 4997 of 2026

Bintesh Kumar Singh @ Bintesh Singh, aged 32 years, son of
Shiv Bihari Singh, resident of Pradhan Tola Bagbera, near
Chhota Shiv Mandir, PO and PS – Bagbera, Jamshedpur, District
– East Singhbhum **.... Petitioner**

-- Versus --

The State of Jharkhand **.... Opposite Party**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner :- Mr. Nilesh Kumar, Advocate

For the State :- Mr. Prabhu Dayal Agrawal, Advocate

02/13.07.2026 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as well
as the learned counsel appearing for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with
Jugsalai P.S. Case No.28 of 2026, registered for the offence under
Sections 21(c) and 22(c) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic
Substances Act, 1985 and Section 27(b)(ii) of Drugs and Cosmetics
Act, 1940, pending in the Court of the learned Additional Sessions
Judge-II-cum-Special Judge, NDPS Act, Jamshedpur.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case and Codeine
Phosphate and Triprolidine Hydrochloride Syrup have been
recovered from the godown of the transporting company namely,
Bol Bam Transport Company. He further submits that it has been
alleged that the said consignment was booked by the petitioner. He

then submits that name of the petitioner has come only on the confessional statement. On these grounds, he submits that anticipatory bail may kindly be granted.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the prayer and submits that commercial quantity syrup of 4796 bottle having Codeine Phosphate have been recovered and this petitioner has paid the transportation cost to the transport company for transporting the said syrup. He submits that in identical situation anticipatory bail of three of the co-accused persons have been rejected by this Court in ABA Nos.4744 of 2026, 4787 of 2026 and 4982 of 2026.

5. Considering that 4796 bottle cough syrup having Codeine Phosphate alleged to be transported on the payment of this petitioner and the said is having commercial quantity and in identical situation anticipatory bail of three of the co-accused persons have been rejected in the aforesaid ABAs and further there are parameters of granting anticipatory bail or regular bail in the matter arising out of the NDPS Act.

6. In the attending facts and circumstances of this case, I am not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

*Dated 03.09.2026
Sangam/*