



CRM-M-10678 of 2026 (O&M) -1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

224

CRM-M-10678 of 2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 13.03.2026

Rani @ Kaati

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Mayur Karkra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Jindal, AAG, Punjab.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.106 dated 01.05.2025 registered under Section 105 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 29 and 27 of the NDPS Act, at Police Station Tripuri, District Patiala.
2. Brief facts as per the prosecution case are that the son of the complainant died due to overdose of intoxicant allegedly provided by the petitioner along with other co-accused. Hence, the present FIR.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and she has no concern with the said offence. He further submitted that the petitioner was neither present at the spot, nor was named in the FIR. It has also been

**CRM-M-10678 of 2026 (O&M) -2-**

contended that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused only on the basis of the disclosure statement made by the co-accused Ranjot Singh @ Goggi. Apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence to connect the petitioner with the offence in question and it is a trite law that disclosure statement of the co-accused during his custodial interrogation is not admissible. He further argued that if the contents of the FIR are taken to be true, even then no specific role has been attributed to the present petitioner. He further argued that the petitioner has been roped in the present case only on the basis of suspicion without any concrete evidence. He argued that even otherwise, the allegations as entailed in the FIR do not satisfy the ingredients of Section 105 of BNS. No recovery is to be effected from her. The petitioner is in custody since 04.05.2025. The investigation in the case is complete, challan stands presented and charges have also been framed. He further submits that there are total 18 prosecution witnesses and out of which, only 02 have been examined till date and as such, the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping her behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner and status report in the matter, which are taken on record and while referring to the status report, he has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. He has further submitted that the petitioner is involved in multiple other cases meaning thereby she is a habitual offender.

**CRM-M-10678 of 2026 (O&M) -3-**

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 10 months; investigation is complete; challan stands presented; charges framed; out of 18 witnesses, only 02 have been examined till date; the complicity of the petitioner is a matter of trial; which is proceeding at snail's pace, and will take a long time to conclude. Thus, no useful purpose would be served by detaining her in further custody. Her continued detention without the prospect of trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of her rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

6. Reliance is placed upon a judgment in the case of ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, wherein Hon'ble Apex Court has held that keeping somebody behind the bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of her right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle "*bail is a rule*" and "*jail is an exception*".

7. As regards the submission of learned State counsel that petitioner is involved in other/one more criminal case(s), reference is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi Vs. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (2) SCC 382*** in which, it is held that the facts and circumstances of the present case are to be seen while deciding a bail application and the bail application of the petitioner cannot be rejected solely on the ground that the petitioner is involved in other/another case(s). The relevant portion of the said judgment is



CRM-M-10678 of 2026 (O&M) -4-

reproduced herein-below:-

"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."

8. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

13.03.2026

D.Bansal

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

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