



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

209

CRM-M-50864-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 16.09.2025

Munawar Ali @ Manawar Ali @ Manavvar Ali

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Monty Goyal, Advocate and
Mr. Harjot Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in FIR bearing No.96 dated 24.10.2024, registered under Section 22 (Section 29 added later on) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station PAU, District Ludhiana, Punjab.

2. Briefly summarized, the facts of the present case are that co-accused Deepak Sharma and Kuldeep Singh were jointly found in possession of 2000 intoxicant tablets make Tramadol Prolonged Release IP on 24-10-2024 and during the course of investigation, on the disclosure statement of co-accused Kuldeep Singh, 900 ampoules make Pentazocine Lactate, 7200 capsules make Acetaminophen Tramadol and 750 ampoules make Tramadol Hydrochloride were recovered. The petitioner has been nominated as an accused under section 29 NDPS Act on 30-10-2024. It has



been specifically alleged that the petitioner used to sell narcotics to co-accused and received money from them through his bank account.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the case of the prosecution co-accused Deepak Sharma and Kuldeep Singh were jointly found in possession of 2000 intoxicant tablets make Tramadol Prolonged Release IP on 24-10-2024. During the course of further investigation 900 ampoules make Pentazocine Lactate, 7200 capsules make Acetaminophen Tramadol and 750 ampoules make Tramadol Hydrochloride were recovered pursuant to the disclosure statement of co-accused Kuldeep Singh. On the basis thereof the FIR had been registered. On the disclosure statement of co-accused/Kuldeep Singh on 30.10.2024, the petitioner has been nominated as an accused under section 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, alleging therein that the contraband had been purchased by the co-accused from the petitioner and money was paid through account. He contends that despite the investigation having been completed, no evidence has been collected by the Investigating Agency in relation to any financial transaction/dealings between the petitioner as well as the co-accused. He contends that no recovery of any nature whatsoever has been effected from the petitioner and that his incarceration is solely on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. He contends the petitioner has undergone an actual custody of 10 months and 11 days and he is not involved in any other criminal case. It is further argued that out of the total 22 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far.

4. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the



209

CRM-M-50864-2025 (O&M)

aforesaid factual aspects and he is not in a position to refer to any evidence as would dispel the claim of the petitioner at this stage. It is also not in dispute that the petitioner does not suffer from any other criminal antecedents and that no evidence has been recorded so far.

5. Taking into consideration that the petitioner has been nominated in the present case solely on the disclosure statement of co-accused, no recovery of any nature whatsoever has been effected from the petitioner, the period of actual custody undergone by the petitioner, the stage of the trial, the petitioner not being involved in any other criminal case and bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

16.09.2025

Mangal Singh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No