

occurrence. It is next submitted that the petitioner is neither owner nor driver of the truck in question. Name of the petitioner has transpired in this case on the basis of confessional statement made by co-accused person as the petitioner was receiver of the seized items and the same has got no evidentiary value. The petitioner has got seven criminal antecedents in which he is on bail in five cases. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that similarly situated co-accused has been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 02.04.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 19754 of 2025. There is no compliance of Section 103 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits that name of the petitioner has transpired as receiver of the seized article and the petitioner bears seven criminal antecedents. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and criminal antecedents of the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer is rejected. However, the petitioner is directed to surrender in the Court below and pray for regular



bail. If any such application is filed, the Court below shall consider and dispose of the same on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

