

13.08.2025
29
Bd.
Ct.29

C.R.M. (NDPS) 929 of 2025

In Re:- An application for Bail under section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure 1973 and/or an application under section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 filed in connection with T.R. Case no. 01 of 2024 arising out of Sankrail Police Station case no. 38 of 2024 dated 13.01.2024 under Sections 20(b)(ii)(c) of the NDPS Act, 1985.

And

In the matter of : **Satdeo Sahani @ Satyadeo Sahani @ Sahyadhou Sahani Petitioner.**

Sk. Taslim Ali	
Ms. Rituparna Bhadra	...for the Petitioner
Mr. Subhomoy Bhattacharya	
Mr. Subhasis Dutta	...for the State

Prosecution case is that 41.5 Kgs. of ganja was recovered from the joint possession of the three persons out of which petitioner is one of them. He further submits that petitioner is in custody for about one year seven months and charge-sheet has been submitted on 19th June, 2024 and charge was framed on 13th August, 2024. He further submits that according to charge-sheet prosecution is required to examine 20 witnesses out of which they could examine so far only one witness in part. He further submits that the delay is not attributable to the petitioner and as such it is not ascertainable as to when the trial would be concluded.

In view of the above, the petitioner may be released on bail on any terms and conditions.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposed the bail prayer contending that commercial quantity of narcotic substance was recovered from the joint possession of the present petitioner and that trial is continuing and it is expected that it would come to a logical conclusion within a short period of time.

Having heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and the State and that rigour of section 37 of the NDPS Act, clearly attracts in respect of the present petitioner, the prayer for bail is considered and rejected.

However, the trial court is requested to expedite the trial and to conclude the trial preferably within a period of six months from the next date of hearing. If the petitioner finds no substantial progress in trial during the said period, for which the delay would not be attributable to the petitioner, he will be at liberty to renew his bail prayer.

Both the parties are directed to communicate the order to Court below.

Accordingly, CRM (NDPS) 929 of 2025 is disposed of.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance of all requisite formalities.

(Dr. Ajoy Kumar Mukherjee, J.)