[2026:JHHC:30199]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No.5631 of 2026

Bhushan Mahto, Aged about 30 years, S/O Marawari Mahto, R/O Village- Ganaloya, P.O. and P.S.- Murhu, District- Khunti

.... …. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand .... Opposite Party

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Ms. Nivedita Kundu, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Naveen Kr. Ganjhu, Addl.P.P.

Order No:-02 Dated:-08-10-2026

Heard the parties.

Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner has moved this Court for grant of privileges of anticipatory bail in connection with N.D.P.S. Case No.26 of 2026 arising out of N.D.P.S. (Khunti) P.S. Case No.13 of 2026 registered under Sections 15(b), 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner was involved in transportation of poppy husk for sell and 18.4 Kg of poppy husk was recovered from the co-accused persons and the petitioner was in regular touch with the co-accused persons and talked on mobile phone of the co-accused persons thirteen (13) times as is evident from para-56 of the case-diary. It is submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false. It is also submitted that the petitioner has been implicated in this case only on the basis of confessional statement of the apprehended co-accused persons. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be given the privileges of anticipatory bail.

Learned Addl. P.P appearing for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that

keeping in view the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner of being involved in transportation of poppy husk in huge quantity, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required during the investigation of the case to find out the details of the sell and purchase made by the petitioner. It is, therefore, submitted that the petitioner ought not to be given the privileges 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 privileges of anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, the prayer for grant of privileges of anticipatory bail of the above-named petitioner is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

Dated-08.10.2026-Animesh/