

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 6546 of 2021

Anuj Dangi @ Abhishek Kumar Verma ...	Petitioner
Versus	
The State of Jharkhand ...	Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner	: Mr. Md. Sajid Yunus, Advocate
For the State	: Mr. Ravi Prakash, Spl. P.P.

Order No.02 Dated- 10.09.2021

Heard the parties through video conferencing.

Learned counsel for the petitioner personally undertakes to remove the defects as pointed out by the stamp reporter within two weeks after the lockdown period is over.

In view of the personal undertaking of the learned counsel for the petitioner, the defects pointed out by the stamp reporter are ignored for the present.

Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner has moved this Court for grant of privilege of anticipatory bail in connection with Lohsinghna P.S. Case No.183 of 2020 registered under sections 21(b)(c)/22(b) (c) of NDPS Act.

The Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that police seized heroine (brown sugar) from the co-accused-Shiv Shakti Rana and he disclosed that he has got the said brown sugar from the petitioner who is a brown sugar mafia along with Kishore Dangi. It is further submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are all false and he has not committed any offence. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Learned Spl. P.P. on the other hand vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submits that the FSL report shows that the seized article is Di-acetylmorphine which is commonly known as heroine and since, it is submitted that the petitioner is a brown sugar mafia therefore, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required during the investigation

of the case to find out the chain of supply of narcotic drug. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not to be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner as well as the requirement of his custodial interrogation during the investigation of the case, this Court is of the considered view that this is not a fit case where the above named petitioner be given the privilege of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of privilege of anticipatory bail of the above named petitioner is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

Sonu/Gunjan-