

Roushan Kumar @ Roshan Kumar	Petitioner(s)/Applicant(s)
	Versus		
The State of Jharkhand	Opposite Party

For the Petitioner(s)/Applicant(s) : Mr. Shashi Kant Mishra, Adv.
For the State : Mrs. Shweta Singh, A.P.P.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned counsel for the State.
2. The applicant, who is in custody since 27.10.2023, has approached this Court for grant of regular bail in connection with Mango P.S. Case No.310 of 2023, registered for the offence under Sections 20(B) (II)C, 22, 25 & 29 of the N.D.P.S. Act, pending in the court of learned Special Judge, N.D.P.S., Jamshedpur.
3. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the applicant(s) that complete set of FIR along with its enclosure have been annexed with this bail application and there is no suppression on his/her part.
4. Innocence has been claimed by the learned counsel for the applicant and undertaking has been given for participation in the trial. It has been submitted that the recovery of 'Ganja' is from pointing out by the father of this applicant, who is the owner and controls the house. The applicant is a student having bright future and no concern with the business of his father. On the above basis, prayer for bail has been made.
5. Learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for bail and it has been submitted that the recovery has been made from the house as well as from the vehicle. There is also confession that they were dealing with Narcotics.
6. Considering the mandate of Section 37 of the N.D.P.S. Act, I am not inclined to enlarge the applicant on bail. Accordingly, his prayer for bail is hereby, **rejected** 'at this stage'.

(Rajesh Kumar, J.)

Raja/-
Uploaded