



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

233

CRM-M-12156 of 2025

Date of decision: 24.07.2025

Paramjit Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL**

Present: Mr. Sahil Chaudhary, Advocate, for  
Mr. Yavneet Dhakla, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. H. S. Sullar, Special P.P. for respondent-NCB.

\*\*\*\*

**H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 in case FIR No.33 dated 12.06.2020, under Sections 8, 21, 22, 29 and 60 of NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station NCB, Chandigarh.
2. The case of the prosecution is that the consignment of 57,000 tablets (Clovidol-100 SR) containing Tramadol Hydrochloride was found in possession of petitioner-Paramjit Kaur and co-accused Bhavnish, which was booked by one Rakesh Singla at the address of company of the petitioner i.e Bhrioshine Pharma.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case because as per her knowledge, only supply of the protein powder was done in the company and she had no knowledge regarding illegal work being done by the co-accused. The petitioner is stated to be suffering from HIV and has undergone a period of 2 years 11 months and 12 days, and out of total 21 prosecution witness, only 19 have been examined so far, therefore, petitioner be released on regular bail.



4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. H. S. Sullar, Special P.P. for respondent-NCB, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate in the Court today, which is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for 02 years, 11 months and 12 days.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and considering the custody period undergone by the petitioner and the fact that she is not enjoying the good health; the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on her furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of her bail.

**(H.S. GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**24.07.2025**

anil

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