

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

105+209

2025.PHHC.174266



CRM-M-61046-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 12.12.2025.

SEEMA KUMARI

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Fatehjeet Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CRM-50418-2025

Application is allowed as prayed for subject to all just exceptions.

Annexures P-4 and P-5 are taken on record.

The Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

Main case

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.15 dated 02.03.2025, under Section(s) 22(b), 27(a) and 22(c) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances

Act, 1985 and Section 223 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, registered at Police Station Sadiq, District Faridkot, Punjab.

2 Briefly summarized, the prosecution case is that on 02.03.2025, SI/SHO Sukhdarshan Sharma, while on patrolling duty along with the police party near the grain market at Sadiq for checking suspicious persons, intercepted the applicant Seema Kumari and co-accused Suraj Kumar at about 4:30 p.m. on grounds of suspicion. Upon conducting a search, 03 strips of intoxicant tablets marked NRX Etizolam & Propranolol Hydrochloride, each strip containing 10 tablets (total 30 tablets) and 10 strips of Pregabalin Capsules IP 300 mg (Ambanyl), each strip containing 10 capsules (total 100 capsules), were recovered from Seema Kumari. During the search of co-accused Suraj Kumar, an amount of ₹10,000/–, stated to be drug money, was recovered, comprising 02 notes of ₹500, 17 notes of ₹200, 40 notes of ₹100, and 32 notes of ₹50.

3 Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that only 30 tablets of Etizolam were recovered from the petitioner, while the sum of ₹10,000/– stated to be drug money was recovered from the co-accused, who happens to be the petitioner's husband. Counsel further submits that although 100 capsules of Pregabalin had also been recovered from the petitioner, however, such capsules do not fall within the ambit of the NDPS Act. It is further submitted that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case and has been in custody since 02.03.2025, having thus undergone an actual custody of nearly nine months. The trial has not yet commenced and 14 prosecution witnesses are still to be examined.

4 State counsel, on the other hand contends, that 30 tablets of

Etizolam have been recovered from the petitioner. He however does not dispute the period of custody undergone by the petitioner, her clean antecedents as well as the stage of the trial.

5 Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the undisputed circumstances including the period of actual custody already undergone by the petitioner, the stage of the trial which is yet to commence, the petitioner s clean antecedents, her young age and the fact that she is a woman, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

6 It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

7 The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

December 12, 2025.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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