

254

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-51849-2024
Date of decision:-21.05.2025

CHINDO ALIAS SURINDER KAUR

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY.

Present:- Mr. Rahul Jaiswal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Vipul Sherwal, AAG, Haryana.

SANJIV BERRY, J.(ORAL)

The instant second petition has been preferred by the petitioner under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, for grant of regular bail in the following case:-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
693	27.07.2023	20 of the NDPS Act	Samalkha, District Panipat

2. Arguments heard.
3. It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is a lady aged about 54 years has been falsely implicated in this case on the allegations that she along with co-accused Sarita, Gurdeep alias Deepo and Krishna were carrying 27 kgs of Ganja in their possession. He contends that no independent witnesses has been joined at the time of alleged recovery and the petitioner is in custody since 27.07.2023, after completion of investigation challan has already been presented in Court. He submits that similarly situated co-accused Sarita has already been granted concession of regular bail vide order dated 25.02.2025 passed in CRM-M-



50568-2024 and on the ground of parity seeks grant of bail to the petitioner.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel referring to the reply submitted by the State, has opposed the bail petition by submitting that the petitioner alongwith other co-accused were found keeping in their possession commercial quantity of narcotics, as such petitioner is not entitled to concession of bail, however he has not disputed that fact the case of the petitioner is at par with the co-accused Sarita who had been granted concession of regular bail vide order dated 25.02.2025 passed in CRM-M-50568-2024.

5. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that petitioner was arrested on 27.07.2023, since then she is in custody and after completion of investigation, challan has already been presented in Court, wherein prosecution has cited 14 witnesses and till date none of them have been examined. The conclusion of trial to ascertain criminal liability, if any, of the petitioner, will take sufficient long time. The petitioner is not having any criminal antecedents, moreover, the case of the petitioner is at par with co-accused Sarita who has already been granted concession of regular bail vide order dated 25.02.2025 passed in CRM-M-50568-2024, as such, no purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner any longer in custody.

6. In these circumstances, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court concerned, if not required in any other case; undertaking to regularly appear on each and every date; not to leave the country without prior permission of the Court; and not to tamper with

evidence of prosecution in any manner.

7. It is further made clear that in case the petitioner is again found involved in any case under NDPS Act, after his release on bail, it will be open for the prosecution to move an application for cancellation of his bail in accordance with law.

8. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

9. Pending application(s) if any shall also stand disposed of.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

21.05.2025

Gyan

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |