



1

MCRC-25990-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH  
AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE DEVNARAYAN MISHRA

ON THE 13<sup>th</sup> OF AUGUST, 2025

MISC. CRIMINAL CASE No. 25990 of 2025

*NARAYAN LODHI*

*Versus*

*THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH*

.....  
Appearance:

*Shri Sandeep Kumar Jain - Advocate and Shri Chandrashekhar Patel -  
Advocate for the applicant.*

*Shri Santosh Yadav - Government Advocate for the respondent/State.*  
.....

ORDER

This is the second application filed by the applicant under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail relating to FIR/Crime No.91/2024 registered at Police Station Chanbila, District Sagar, for the offence punishable under Section 8 read with Section 20 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985. The applicant is in jail since 23.11.2024.

2. The applicant's earlier bail application was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 06.03.2025 passed in M.Cr.C. No.7536 of 2025.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant has submitted that provisions of Section 37 of the NDPS Act are not applicable in the present case. It is alleged that 92 plants of so called cannabis were found from the land of the applicant, but according to him, the land was of a joint ownership property of



the family. No evidence has been brought on record that the applicant is having sole possession over the land in question. Recovery of 92 plants of cannabis was made on 23.11.2024, but proceeding under Section 52-A of the NDPS Act was conducted on 16.12.2024 and after that, samples of seized articles were sent to the FSL. According to him, under such circumstances, the report of FSL is highly doubtful and in support of his stand, he has relied upon the orders passed by this Court on 05.02.2025 in **M.Cr.C. No.3314 of 2025 [Rajol Singh Vs. The State of Madhya Pradesh]** and on 06.08.2025 in **M.Cr.C. No.19995 of 2025 [Lallu Dheemar Vs. The State of Madhya Pradesh]** and submitted that the applicant be enlarged on bail.

4. Learned Government Advocate has opposed the bail application and submitted that the applicant was cultivating the cannabis on his land and hence, he is not entitled for bail.

5. Heard the parties and perused the case diary.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances brought on record and the orders passed by this Court in the cases of **Rajol Singh** (supra) and **Lallu Dheemar** (supra), this Court deems it fit to enlarge the applicant on bail. Hence, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the application is **allowed**.

7. It is directed that **applicant - Narayan Lodhi** shall be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of **Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand Only)** with one solvent surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial Court concerned for his appearance before the said Court on all such dates as may be fixed by that Court in this regard during the pendency



of trial.

8. It is further directed that the applicant shall comply with the provisions of Section 480(3) of BNSS.

9. Accordingly, Misc. Criminal Case stands disposed of.

Certified copy as per rules.

**(DEVNARAYAN MISHRA)**  
**JUDGE**

dm