



CRM-M-59591-2025 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
235

CRM-M-59591-2025
Decided on: November 04, 2025

Paramjit Kaur
.....Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Harpreet S. Rakhra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner	FIR No.	Date	Section	Police Station	District
Paramjit Kaur, aged about 31 years	96	07.07.2025	21 of the NDPS Act, 1985	Chattiwind	Amritsar Rural

2. As per the prosecution version, the allegations are that on the basis of secret information, directly FIR (supra) was registered, and on the basis of information raid was conducted at the house of the co-accused Billa. But on coming to know of reaching of police, boy who was talking to the woman, on seeing the police party, managed to flee



from the spot on his Activa scooter. The woman who also wanted to flee from the spot after throwing the polythene bag, was apprehended by the police party and on questioning about her identity, she disclosed her name as Paramjit Kaur wife of Nirmal Singh (petitioner herein).

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that a false case has been planted against the petitioner and even if the story put forth is taken to be correct, she directly cannot be attributed of having any knowledge of the substance which was there in the polythene bag because as per case of the prosecution she was already in the company of one more person who was first in running away from the spot on seeing the police party. Had there been any notice to the petitioner of lying of 15 grams of Heroin in the polythene bag, she would have also joined her co-accused on the scooter for the purpose of running away from the spot. Thus, argues that the issue of conscious possession is yet to be examined. Moreover, quantity of Heroin recovered is marginally more than the small quantity, i.e. 5 grams, and petitioner is inside jail for the last 04 months and 25 days. After completion of investigation, the challan is yet to be presented in the present case. Therefore, conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time.

4. Learned State counsel, produces the status report and custody certificate, both dated 03.12.2025, in Court today, which are taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

As per the custody certificate, petitioner has already undergone 04 months and 25 days period inside jail and she is not found indulged in any other similar activity.



5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the relevant material on record with their able assistance, this Court finds substance in the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner by observing that the petitioner who is aged about 31 years, having no other instance in the past career would be subjected to the issue of knowledge having conscious possession of the contraband in the polythene bag, and the same would be determined by the trial court after scanning of the entire evidence. As already noticed above, the challan is yet to be presented. In all likelihood, conclusion of trial would take considerable time and liberty of the petitioner in such like case cannot be curtailed for indefinite period.

6. In view of totality of circumstances, and the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed hereinabove, I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

7. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, Trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an



CRM-M-59591-2025 4

independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

10. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

11. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

November 04, 2025
Pkapoor

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/~~NO~~
Whether Reportable: YES/NO