

214 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2025.PHHC:170031



CRM-M-67437-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 05.12.2025

SHARANJEET KAUR ALIAS SUMAN KAUR ... PETITIONER
VERSUS
STATE OF PUNJAB ... RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Ritesh Pandey, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Hans, D.A.G., Punjab.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) in FIR No. 156 dated 23.10.2025, under Section 21(C) of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, (Section 29 of NDPS Act added later on), registered at Police Station Kalanaur, District Gurdaspur.

2. The case of the prosecution is that 2 Kg 80 gms of heroin was recovered from the co-accused Navjot Singh and Gurpreet Singh @ Mahajan, while they were riding on a motor-cycle.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioner was nominated on the basis of the disclosure statement made by the co-accused. No recovery has been effected from the present petitioner. She is not involved in any other case. Apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence on record to implicate the petitioner in the alleged recovery of contraband.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rohit Hans, D.A.G., Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the State and vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the

petitioner on the ground of gravity of allegations. He has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner has undergone actual custody for a period of 01 month and 03 days.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Considering the submissions of the learned State Counsel and the fact that petitioner was nominated on the basis of the disclosure statement made by the co-accused; no recovery has been effected from the present petitioner; she is not involved in any other case; the petitioner has undergone actual custody for a period of 01 month and 03 days, therefore, continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on her furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that if on bail so granted through the instant order the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of her bail.

05.12.2025

Janki

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

:

:

Yes/No

Yes/No

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE