



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

238

CRM-M-44635-2025

Date of decision: 30th October, 2025

Ram Tirath

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Ms. Ayushka Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Vivek Sharma, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 78 dated 01.07.2023 registered under Sections 328 and 379 of IPC (Sections 411 of IPC and Section 22 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substance Act, 1985 (for short '*NDPS Act*') added later on) at Police Station Fatehgarh Sahib, District Fatehgarh Sahib.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Kawaljit Kaur on 01.07.2023 alleging that she was running a marriage bureau at Saharanpur. About 15 days back, she received *Whatsapp* call on her cell phone and the caller while introducing himself as Tirath told her that he was looking for a match for his cousin Gagandeep Kaur. As per their conversation, they had decided to meet



at Gurudwara, Shri Fatehgarh Sahib on 25.06.2023. She along with her son and nephew reached at the Gurudwara. The said Tirath had asked them to come outside the Gurudwara near a juice cart. The complainant went there along with her son. The said Tirath Singh offered two glasses of juice to her son and herself. They consumed the same and soon thereafter, she started feeling dizziness. On regaining conscious, she found herself to be lying in the house of her brother. She found her gold ornaments, one cell phone and cash amount of Rs. 15,000/- to be missing. By alleging that, she had made inquiries about the above said Tirath and had come to know that his actual name Ram Tirath, resident of village Ghurala, District Ludhiana, she prayed for taking action against him. The petitioner was arrested on 01.07.2023. On interrogation, he suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and got recovered 15 morphine Sulphate injections along with his motor bike and an apple iphone. Offence under Section 22 of NDPS was added. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since 01.07.2023. The trial is likely to take considerable time. The complainant has been examined and has not implicated him in commission of the subject offences. His further incarceration would not serve any fruitful purpose. With these broad submissions, it is urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed by respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that the petitioner had mixed some intoxicating substance in the juice and made the complainant to consume it due to which she had become unconscious and he had removed her gold ornaments, cash



amount of Rs. 15,000/- and her apple i-phone. The phone was recovered from him. Recovery of contraband had also been effected from him. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. He is a habitual offender since as many as 11 more cases many of which are of similar nature have been registered against him. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. It is, thus, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have made the complainant consume juice laced with some intoxicating substance on 25.06.2023, on consuming which, she had become unconscious and then the petitioner had committed theft of her belongings including ornaments. The petitioner also got effected recovery of 15 injections of morphine sulphate. The complainant Kawaljeet Kaur and her son Amanjot Singh have since been examined and have supported the prosecution version. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. He has been involved in eleven more cases out of which six cases are of similar nature. He has been convicted in six of such case. As such, the apprehension expressed by learned State counsel to the effect that he may abscond or commit similar offences cannot be stated to be unfounded at this stage. Taking into consideration, the above discussed facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove



shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

30th October, 2025
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |