



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215

CRM-M-19515-2026
Decided on : 27.04.2026

RANO

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Akshat Dalal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, 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(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Sta- tion	District
Rano	35	28.03.2024	21 & 22 of the NDPS Act (Sec- tion 29 NDPS Ac- tand 342, 411, 482, 120-B IPC added subse- quently)	Nakodar Sadar	Jalandhar (Rural)

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that present FIR has been registered on the basis of secret information alleging that petitioner



has been involved in the business of selling drugs for a long time and 10 cases are already registered against her. He argues that the FIR was lodged even prior to the conduct of raid at the premises of the petitioner, which itself casts a serious doubt on the prosecution version.

During the course of investigation, a raid was allegedly conducted at the dairy situated at the residence of the petitioner, from where 310 intoxicant tablets containing Etizolam, weighing 30.69 grams, were recovered. However, the said recovery was effected from the possession of co-accused Karamjit Singh @ Bobby and not from the petitioner. Petitioner is implicated in the present case as accused solely on the basis of disclosure statement made by the said co-accused, who stated that he was running a de-addiction centre in the premises allegedly let out to him by the petitioner and her daughter. Accordingly, on the basis of such disclosure, offence under Section 29 of the NDPS Act has been added, which is legally untenable.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further argues that, the prosecution story is inherently improbable as once the police had prior secret information and conducted a raid with a team of eight armed officials, there was no possibility for the petitioner to escape from the spot, as alleged. Therefore, it creates a serious doubt regarding the genuineness of the alleged raid itself.

It is submitted that, although several cases have been registered against petitioner, she has been acquitted in the majority of them and only in one case she has been convicted, wherein she has already undergone the sentence, while in other cases, either she has been acquitted or awarded minor sentences.



It is also contended that, petitioner is in custody since September 2024, and the trial is proceeding at a very slow pace. Out of a total of 61 prosecution witnesses, only two witnesses have been examined so far, and thus, the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a considerable amount of time. Therefore, continued incarceration of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose. He further submits that, the main accused, namely Karamjit Singh @ Bobby, from whose possession the alleged recovery has been effected, has already been granted bail vide order dated 18.03.2025 passed in CRM-M-47365-2025 (Annexure P-2). Another co-accused, namely Baljinder Kaur @ Baby, has also been granted bail vide order dated 18.08.2025 passed in CRM-M-62339-2024 (Annexure P-3). Therefore, on the principle of parity, petitioner is also entitled to the concession of regular bail. Thus, prays for grant of bail.

4. On advance notice and in response to the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned state counsel contends that petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail in view of her criminal antecedents as detailed here below:-

Sr.No.	FIR	Recovery	Status
1	FIR No.182 dated 28.10.1993 u/s 15 NDPS Act PS Sadar Nakodar District Jalandhar	5 Kg poppy husk	Acquitted on 15.03.1996
2	FIR No.111 dated 25.04.2000 u/s 15 NDPS Act PS Sadar Nakodar District Jalandhar	7 Kg Poppy husk	Acquitted on 10.01.2002
3	FIR No.56 dated 02.04.2005 u/s 15 NDPS Act PS Nurmehar District Jalandhar	639 Kg poppy husk	Acquitted on 04.10.2006
4	FIR No.70 dated 29.03.2013 u/s 15,21,29 NDPS Act PS Sadar	52 Kg poppy husk; 6 grams Heroin	Acquitted on 15.03.2016



CRM-M-19515-2026

	Nakodar District Jalandhar		
5	FIR No.206 dated 26.05.2014 u/s 15,18,22 NDPS Act PS Sadar Nakodar District Jalandhar	15 grams Heroin and 50 grams intoxicant substance	Acquitted on 01.12.2019
6	FIR No.25 dated 18.03.2015 u/s 21 NDPS Act PS Goraya District Jalandhar	85 grams Heroin	Acquitted on 16.12.2017
7	FIR No.85 dated 20.08.2014 u/s 21,25,29 NDPS Act PS Sadar SBS Nagar	80 grams Heroin	Acquitted on 07.12.2017
8	FIR No.103 dated 08.09.2016 u/s 323,324,326,506,148,149 IPC PS Kartarpur District Jalandhar	--	Acquitted on 16.12.2019
9	FIR No. 20 dated 26.02.2015 u/s 21, 25, 29 NDPS Act, PS Sadar Banga, District SBS Nagar	280 grams Heroin	Acquitted on 08.12.2017
10	FIR No. 49 dated 18.02.2008 u/s 15 NDPS Act, PS Sadar Nakodar, District Jalandhar	7 Kg Poppy Husk	Convicted on 03.12.2009; undergone 1½ months
11	FIR No. 259 dated 02.09.2008 u/s 15 NDPS Act, PS Sadar Nakodar, District Jalandhar	10 Kg Poppy Husk	Convicted on 14.01.2010; undergone 3½ months
12	FIR No. 178 dated 27.08.2009 u/s 15 NDPS Act, PS Sadar Nakodar, District Jalandhar	111 Kg Poppy Husk	Convicted RI 10 years on 19.08.2010; sentence suspended by High Court
13	FIR No. 189 dated 02.07.2013 u/s 420, 193, 120-B IPC, PS Sadar Nakodar, District Jalandhar	—	Convicted on 07.03.2019; Fine Rs. 4000
14	FIR No. 73 dated 24.03.2007 u/s 15 NDPS Act, PS Sadar Nakodar, District Jalandhar	500 grams Heroin	Convicted on 20.11.2009; undergone 3 months
15	FIR No. 79 dated 15.11.2022 u/s 8, 21 NDPS Act, PS NCB Chandigarh	—	Under Trial



16	FIR No. 34 dated 28.03.2024 u/s 21, 22 NDPS Act, PS Sadar Nakodar, District Jalandhar	09 grams Heroin (named in disclosure)	Under Trial
----	---	---------------------------------------	-------------

He submits that petitioner is a habitual offender and has been involved in a large number of cases, particularly under the provisions of the NDPS Act. It is further argued that although petitioner claims acquittal in several cases, the sheer number of cases registered against her clearly establishes her continuous involvement in the illegal activities. It is submitted that the acquittals in earlier cases do not wipe out her antecedents, especially when multiple prosecutions under the NDPS Act have been initiated against her over a long period of time. Therefore, there is every likelihood that if petitioner is released on bail, she may again indulge in similar offences. Thus, prays for dismissal of concession of bail.

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 advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner by observing that the alleged recovery in the present case has not been effected from the conscious possession of the petitioner, but rather from the co-accused. The implication of the petitioner is primarily based upon the disclosure statement of the co-accused, which by itself carries limited evidentiary value at this stage.

It is further noticed that petitioner is in custody since September 2024 and has undergone incarceration for a considerable period. The trial is progressing at a slow pace, as only 2 prosecution witnesses have been exam-



CRM-M-19515-2026

ined of total 61 prosecution witnesses so far and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take substantial time.

6. This Court also takes into consideration the fact that the main co-accused Karamjit Singh @Bobby, from whose possession the contraband was allegedly recovered, has already been granted the concession of bail (Supra). Another co-accused Baljinder Kaur @Baby has also been enlarged on bail. Therefore, the case of the petitioner stands on a similar footing, and the principle of parity is attracted.

With regard to the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, although multiple cases have been registered against her, it is evident that she has been acquitted in the majority of such cases. The remaining cases either resulted in minor sentences or are pending trial. Thus, at this stage, the antecedents alone cannot be a ground to deny bail, particularly in view of the facts and circumstances of the present case.

Without commenting on the merits of the case and keeping in view the totality of the circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of regular bail.

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

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his 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.



CRM-M-19515-2026

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

10. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

27.04.2026

Jyoti-V

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO

Whether Reportable: YES/NO.