



225

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-3968-2024

Date of decision:-05.02.2025

**DEEPAK SINGH MUNDA**

... Petitioner

**Versus****STATE OF PUNJAB**

... Respondent

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY.**

Present:- Mr. P.S.Sekhon, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.Ankit Grewal, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SANJIV BERRY, J.(ORAL)**

The instant petition has been preferred by the petitioner under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, for grant of regular bail in the following case:-

<b>FIR No.</b>	<b>Dated</b>	<b>Sections</b>	<b>Police Station</b>
112	30.05.2023	18-C of NDPS Act	Sadar Ludhiana, District Ludhiana

2. Arguments heard.

3. It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case by the police. He submits that the story put forth by the police is not probable, according to which 2 kgs 600 gram of opium was recovered from the petitioner. He contends that the police had not completed the requisite legal requirements while effecting the alleged recovery, as such the version of the



police becomes doubtful. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since 30.05.2023 and challan has already been presented in Court wherein prosecution has cited 16 witnesses and till date none of them have been examined. He submits that the recovery has been intentionally shown marginally higher just to proclaim the same as commercial quantity. He submits the petitioner is not having any criminal antecedents and is in custody since 30.05.2023, the conclusion of trial will take sufficient long time to conclude. Hence prayed for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel referring to the reply submitted by the State, has assailed these arguments by submitting that 2 kg 600 grams of opium was recovered from the possession of the petitioner and as such, petitioner does not deserve concession of bail. However, he has not denied the fact that after completion of investigation, challan has been presented in Court wherein, 16 witnesses have been cited by the prosecution and till date none of them have been examined.

5. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that the petitioner is in custody since 30.05.2023 and after completion of investigation, challan has already been presented in Court wherein prosecution has cited 16 witnesses and till date none of them have been examined in the learned trial Court. Therefore, keeping in view the assertion made by learned counsel for the petitioner (*supra*) and also the fact that the conclusion of trial to ascertain criminal liability, if any will take sufficient long time, no purpose would be served by detaining petitioner any



longer.

6. Therefore, in these circumstances, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court concerned, if not required in any other case; undertaking to regularly appear on each and every date; not to leave the country without prior permission of the Court; and not to tamper with evidence of prosecution in any manner.

7. It is further made clear that in case the petitioner is found involved in any case under NDPS Act, after his release on bail, it will be open for the prosecution to move an application for cancellation of his bail in accordance with law.

8. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

9. Pending application(s) if any shall also stand disposed of.

**(SANJIV BERRY)**  
**JUDGE**

**05.02.2025**

Gyan

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No