



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

228

CRM-M No.20732 of 2024
Date of Decision: 09.05.2024

KRISHNA RANIPetitioner

Vs
STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA*

Present: Mr. P.K. Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Jindal, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

HARKESH MANUJA, J. (Oral)

1. By way of present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C., prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.154 dated 05.12.2023 registered under Sections 21, 23, 29 of NDPS Act, 1985 at Police Station Jalalabad (W), District Fazilka.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been implicated on the basis of disclosure statement made by one of the co-accused namely Pawanjot Singh. In the present case, 4 kg. & 155 grams of heroin was recovered from three persons namely Major Singh, Sandeep Singh @ Sippi and Pawanjot Singh.
3. The prayer made on behalf of the petitioner has been opposed by learned State counsel by referring to the huge recovery involved in the present case besides custody period of the petitioner which is only 05 months.



4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper book. I find substance in the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.
5. In the present case, the petitioner has been implicated merely on the basis of disclosure statement made by one of the co-accused namely Pawanjot Singh, who was arrested on 05.12.2023 and made disclosure statement on 07.12.2023. No recovery has been effected from the petitioner and she is not involved in any other case under the provisions of NDPS Act. Petitioner is behind the bars for a period of 05 months and as per learned State counsel on instructions from the Investigating Officer, the investigation already stands concluded with the preparation of challan which is likely to be presented before the Court concerned at the earliest.
6. Considering the aforesaid facts and the fact that trial is likely to take sometime in its culmination, I do not find any justification to extend the incarceration of the petitioner.
7. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to her furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate.
8. It is made clear that this order may not be construed as expression of an opinion on the merits of the case.

May 09, 2024
Atik

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

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