

09.10.2025
SL No.24
Court No.7
S.Gayen/
Rohan

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE**

C.R.M.(NDPS) 520 of 2025

In Re: An application for bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Bhimpur Police Station Case No. 340 of 2023 dated 05.09.2023 under sections 20(c)/29 of the NDPS Act, 1985;

-And-

In the matter of: Sajal Halder

...Petitioner

Mr. Soumyajit Das Mahapatra,
Mr. Md. Golam Nure Imrohi,
Ms. Madhurai Sinha.

...for the Petitioner

Mr. Madhusudan Sur, Ld. APP,
Ms. Sonali Das.

...for the State

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned counsel for the opposite party/State are present.
2. Heard the learned counsel for the parties.
3. Perused the materials in the case diary.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is falsely implicated in the instant case and the petitioner is in custody for two years one month and his prayer for bail be considered.
5. Learned counsel for the opposite party/State submits that the petitioner's prayer for bail was earlier rejected by the Hon'ble Apex

Court on 13th February, 2025 and as there is no development, the petitioner's prayer for bail cannot be considered.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon the evidence of three witnesses being P.W. 3, a Gazetted Officer and P.W.s 8 and 9 being the raid team members of the police authority. Learned counsel further submits that from the depositions, in the examination-in-chief and cross-examination, the involvement of the petitioner is not established and the case will end in an acquittal.
7. Learned counsel for the State submits that 23 witnesses have been examined and six witnesses could be examined within a very short period.
8. Upon considering the fact that pursuant to the order passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court on 13th February, 2025, about seven months have passed and certain depositions of some of the witnesses relied upon by the petitioner does not show the involvement of the petitioner, although all witnesses are required to be examined but in the interest of justice, as depositions of six more witnesses will take some time, the petitioner should be granted an interim bail.
9. Accordingly, the application for bail is, thus, **allowed**.
10. I direct the petitioner will be released on an interim bail for a period of four weeks upon furnishing a bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties of like amount each, one of whom must be a local, to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Krishnagar, Nadia. The petitioner shall appear before the Trial Court on each and every

day of substantive hearing subject to the provisions of Section 317 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973/Section 355 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and shall not intimidate the witnesses and/or tamper with evidence in any manner whatsoever. The petitioner shall not leave the jurisdiction of the Trial Court without prior permission of the Court and shall furnish the mobile number to the Officer-in-Charge of the concerned Police Station. The petitioner, on the completion of four weeks, shall surrender before the learned Trial Court and in the event the learned Trial Court is of the view that the trial cannot be completed within a short period, may extend the interim bail or pass such other order as the learned Trial Court may deem fit.

11. In the event, the petitioner fails to comply with any of the conditions as stated above, the learned Trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel his bail in accordance with law without further reference to this Court.
12. Thus, the application for bail being **C.R.M. (NDPS) 520 of 2025** stands disposed of.

(Biswaroop Chowdhury, J.)