

2025:PHHC:176969



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

245

CRM-M-71277-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 22.12.2025

Bagdi Bai

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Vikas Bishnoi, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Gautam Kaile, DAG, Haryana.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.266 dated 04.06.2024, registered under Section 18(b) of NDPS and during investigation Sections 27-A, 29, 31 of NDPS Act, have been added, at Police Station City Hisar, District Hisar.
2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for 1 year and about 6 months. Her name surfaced based on the disclosure statement of co-accused Raju Bairagi, who has been granted regular bail by this Court after being in custody for 1 year, 5 months, 27 days, vide order dated 08.12.2025, from whom the alleged contraband had been recovered. No recovery has been effected from the petitioner. There is no evidence to connect her with the aforesaid co-accused. Charges have been framed on 04.02.2025 and out of 30 PWs, only 6 have been examined. She is involved in one more case, wherein her sentence stands suspended. Co-accused Tek Singh, Vinod, Pargat Singh and Jai Bhagwan, who were also implicated based on the disclosure statement, have also been granted regular bail vide orders dated 23.04.2025, 19.08.2025, 21.08.2025, 27.09.2025, Annexures P2 to P5, respectively. Reliance is placed on the judgment passed by

Hon'ble The Supreme Court titled as **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. The custody certificate dated 21.12.2025, filed by the learned State counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for 1 year, 5 months & 29 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the petitioner has been specifically named by the co-accused from whom the commercial quantity of contraband has been recovered. However, he is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage, sentence of the petitioner being suspended in another case and co-accused having been enlarged on bail.

5. Heard.

6. Hon'ble The Supreme Court in the case of **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi** (Supra) had held that, "As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc."

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for last 1 year, 5 months and 29 days; sentence stands suspended in another case; co-accused are on bail; charges were framed on 04.02.2025 and only 6, out of 30 PWs, have yet been examined, the trial is likely to take a considerable time, further incarceration of the petitioner would be violative of her right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the present petition is allowed.

8. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate

concerned, if not required in any other case and shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, she is an accused, or for commission of which she is suspected of.
- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse her liberty.
- (vii) The petitioner shall furnish her address and mobile number by way of an affidavit to the trial Court and not change the same till conclusion of trial and if for any reasons, she seeks to change either of the aforesaid, it shall be done only with prior information to the learned trial Court.
- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

9. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

10. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

22.12.2025
ashok

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

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