



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

251

CRM-M-16476-2025

Date of decision: 07.07.2025

Anjana Devi @ Anju

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Anmol Puri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Shiva Khurmi, AAG, Punjab
assisted by ASI Rajesh Kumar.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.166 dated 21.09.2023 under Sections 22, 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short, 'the NDPS Act') registered at Police Station Garshankar, District Hoshiarpur.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of a disclosure statement of co-accused from whom a recovery of 260 grams of Alprazolam was purportedly effected. Learned counsel submits that the disclosure statement, on the basis of which the petitioner has been nominated as an accused, holds little evidentiary value and, therefore, the petitioner deserves the concession of bail moreso when the trial has not concluded yet despite the challan having



CRM-M-16476-2025

been presented way back on 29.03.2024. It has also been submitted that when the petitioner was arrested on 24.09.2023, no recovery of any contraband much less Alprazolam was effected from her which further lends credence to her false implication in the present case.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner. It has been submitted by the learned State counsel that no doubt no recovery of any contraband was made from the petitioner after she was named as an accused in the disclosure statement suffered by the co-accused and no recovery of any contraband was also effected from her, however, a perusal of the custody certificate clearly reveals that the petitioner is involved in a number of cases under the NDPS Act; she stands convicted in two cases under the NDPS Act. Still further, on instructions, learned State counsel has submitted that the trial is nearing conclusion with only two prosecution witnesses remaining to be examined, who in all likelihood would be examined on the next date of hearing i.e. 24.07.2025.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

5. *Prima facie*, the petitioner does come across as a habitual offender as is evident from a bare perusal of her custody certificate which has been placed on record today. It also transpires that despite being having been extended the concession of bail in the other cases registered against her under the NDPS Act, the petitioner had *prima*

**CRM-M-16476-2025**

facie misused the concession of bail by getting involved in another case under the NDPS Act. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court does not deem it fit to admit the petitioner to bail *moreso* when the trial is at its fag end. The instant petition stands dismissed accordingly.

6. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

07.07.2025

Vinay

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

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