



IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-55630-2025 (O&M)

Gurudayal Singh Munda ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	23.02.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	24.02.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	24.02.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Prateek Pandit, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

- Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 25 dated 20.02.2024, registered under Sections 18, 27 and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (*for short 'NDPS Act'*) at Police Station GRP, District Ludhiana.
- Brief facts of the case relevant for the disposal of the present petition are that on 20.02.2024, co-accused Satyadev Teeru was apprehended by a police party headed by Inspector Palwinder Singh and recovery of 15 kgs.

2026:PHHC:028806



of opium was effected from a bag which he was carrying. Since he could not produce any valid license or permit to keep in his possession the recovered contraband, he was formally arrested at the spot. He suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the subject offences and disclosed that petitioner Gurudayal Singh Munda and Kuldeep Singh @ Deepa were also involved with him in sale/purchase of opium in the area of Phagwara. He further disclosed that on 04.02.2024, he had supplied 12 kgs. of opium to an unknown person at Railway Station, Phagwara at the instance of the petitioner and on 05.02.2024, the petitioner himself had supplied 12 kgs. of opium to the said unknown person for a sale consideration of Rs.16 Lakhs, out of which, he had received an amount of Rs. 2 Lakhs in cash and an amount of Rs.1,10,000/- was deposited in his bank account by the petitioner. He also disclosed that the recovered contraband was given to him by the petitioner to deliver the same to the said unknown person at Railway Station, Phagwara. On the basis of the same, the petitioner was nominated in this case as an accused. Initially, he could not be arrested and was declared a proclaimed offender by the learned trial Court, vide order dated 30.09.2024. Subsequently, he was arrested on 15.04.2024. Some other persons were also nominated in this case. During investigation, it was found that he had received several amounts of money in his bank account from co-accused Kuldeep Singh @ Deepa. Investigation now stands completed and the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of the disclosure statement of the above named co-accused, which cannot be considered to be admissible in

2026:PHHC:028806



evidence. The amounts of money received from co-accused Kuldeep Singh @ Deepa was with regard to cattle trade. There is nothing on record to connect the petitioner with the subject offences. Even otherwise, investigation has since been completed and challan/supplementary challan has been filed. Conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time as no prosecution witness has been examined so far. He has been in custody since 15.04.2024. His involvement in one more case of similar nature cannot be made a ground for denying him the benefit of bail in the given circumstances. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. Co-accused Harjinder Singh @ Jinder has been granted concession of bail by this Court. On parity, the petitioner too deserves to be given the same benefit. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be released on regular bail.

4. Status report along with the custody certificate of the petitioner has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner as well as his criminal antecedents, he is not entitled to get benefit of bail as Section 37 of the NDPS Act would be attracted in this case. The petitioner had received several amounts of money into his bank account from co-accused Kuldeep Singh @ Deepa, which shows his complicity in the subject crime. It is, thus, argued that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions.

6. The well settled proposition of law is that the Court while considering an application for grant of bail has to keep certain factors in mind, such as, whether there is a prima facie case or reasonable ground to believe that

2026:PHHC:028806



the accused has committed the offence; circumstances which are peculiar to the accused; likelihood of the offence being repeated; the nature and gravity of the accusation; severity of the punishment in the event of conviction; the danger of accused absconding or fleeing, if released on bail and reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being threatened. The period of incarceration is also relevant fact that is to be considered. It is also unequivocally established that, to be granted bail, the accused charged with offence under the provisions of NDPS Act must fulfill the conditions stipulated in Section 37 of the Act. A contention has been raised that the rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act are attracted in the present case as there is recovery of commercial quantity of contraband.

7. The case of the prosecution is that the name of the petitioner was disclosed by the above named co-accused, from whom recovery of commercial quantity of the contraband was effected. As per his disclosure statement, he had sourced the contraband from the petitioner. In ***Tofan Singh Vs. State of Tamil Nadu, (2021) 4 SCC 1***, it was observed by Hon'ble Apex Court that the disclosure statements made under Section 67 of NDPS Act, are inadmissible in evidence unless corroborated by independent material. The petitioner was neither named in the FIR nor any recovery of contraband has been effected from him. His implication is based on the alleged monetary transactions, the evidentiary value of which is a matter of trial. Investigation has since been completed and challan/supplementary challan has already been presented. The petitioner has been in custody for a considerable period. The trial is likely to take time as no prosecution witness has been examined so far. Co-accused Harjinder Singh @ Jinder has already been granted concession of bail by this Court. The involvement of the petitioner in one more case cannot be

2026:PHHC:028806



considered as a ground to deny him bail in this case in the given circumstances. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it will be open for the prosecution to apply for cancellation of bail in case the petitioner is found involved in any other subsequent case.

8. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

24.02.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No