

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRA-D-329-2026

JUDGEMENT RESERVED ON	JUDGEMENT PRONOUNCED ON	OPERATIVE PART PRONOUNCED OR FULL	UPLOADED ON
09.04.2026	27.04.2026	FULL PRONOUNCED	27.04.2026

Dipender Partap Singh @ Dipen Rana ...Appellant

Versus

National Investigation Agency ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

Present: Ms. Rajvinder Kaur Sohal, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Sukhdeep Singh Sandhu, Advocate
For the respondent-NIA.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

RC No.	Dated	Police Station	Section
22/2025/NIA/DLI dated 18.12.2025 arising out of FIR No.57	16.03.2025	Maqsudan, Jalandhar	109, 61(2), 48 BNS and Sections 3/4/5 of Explosive Substance Act 1908, Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act and Sections 13/16/17/18/18B/20 of UAP Act

Criminal Case number before the Sessions Court	CIS No.BA/143/2026 CNR No.PBSA01000574-2026
Date of Decision	02.02.2026

1. Aggrieved by the order dated 2nd February 2026, vide which, the bail application of the appellant under Section 187(3) of BNSS 2023, which corresponds to Section 167(2) of CrPC, was rejected, the appellant had come up before this Court by filing the present appeal.

2. The investigation could not be completed within the statutory time limit and as such vide Annexure A4 (Page 31) a report of the Public Prosecutor was placed before the trial Court in a sealed cover. The some of the contents of the report are mentioned in Annexure

A4, but this Court is not referring to the same. After that an application for extension of period to investigate was filed on behalf of the Assistant Investigating Officer and this application is dated 5th January 2026.

3. Subsequently vide impugned order 6th January 2026, learned Special Judge, NIA Punjab, allowed the application and extended the time to complete investigation by 60 days.

4. After that the applicant filed an application for default bail on the grounds that the investigation was not completed within limited time and the application for extension was filed by Sub Inspector of Police, Assisting Investigating Officer which was not the authorized person, however vide order dated 2nd February 2026, learned trial Judge dismissed the application for default bail. Feeling aggrieved the appellant has come up before this court by filing the present appeal.

5. We have heard counsel for the parties and gone through the pleadings and its analysis would lead to the following outcome.

6. In the present case, the extension of time was not sought by the investigator, but a report was duly submitted by the Public Prosecutor under a sealed cover as Annexure A4. It was this report, based on which, the application was filed by the concerned investigator. Thus, on the face of it, the time was extended not on the basis of the application filed by the Assisting Investigating Officer, but on the report of the Public Prosecutor and such an approach falls within the legal requirements of Section 43D(2) of UAP Act.

7. Given the above there is no illegality in the said order and once the time was extended in accordance with law, there was no occasion to grant default bail under 187(3) of BNSS 2023. Consequently, the present appeal is dismissed. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

27.04.2026
Anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned	YES
Whether reportable	NO