



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

223

CRM-M-28957-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 26th May, 2026

Veer Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Hitesh Verma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

CRM-22617-2026

Allowed as prayed for.

CRM-M-28957-2026

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 446 dated 09.10.2024 registered under Sections 22 and 29 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short, '*NDPS Act*') at Police Station City Barnala,, District Barnala.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the disposal of the present petition are that on 09.10.2024, on the basis of a secret information, the petitioner along with co-accused Sonu, Gurmail Singh @ Gola, Satnam Singh



@ Satti and Baljinder Singh @ Kaka was apprehended by a police party and recovery of 900 loose intoxicant tablets was effected from their joint conscious possession. Since they could not produce any valid license or permit to keep in their possession the recovered drugs, they were formally arrested at the spot. As per FSL report, the recovered tablets were found to be containing Alprazolam. After completion of necessary investigation and usual formalities, challan was presented in the Court and presently, the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that she has been falsely implicated in this case. A false recovery was planted upon her and co-accused. She is in custody since 10.10.2024. Investigation has since been completed and challan has been filed. Conclusion of trial is likely to take time as only 01 out of total 12 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. Co-accused Sonu, Satnam Singh and Ramandeep Kaur have been extended benefit of regular bail. On parity, she too deserves to be released on bail. No useful purpose would be served by keeping her in custody anymore. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be granted benefit of regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned State counsel has advance notice of the petition and is ready to argue the matter. She has placed on record custody certificate of the petitioner. It is argued by her that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations



levelled against the petitioner as well as the fact that commercial quantity of the contraband had been recovered from her, she is not entitled to get benefit of bail as rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act would be attracted against her. The petitioner may abscond or involve in committing similar offences again, if extended benefit of bail. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. As per the allegations, the petitioner along with the co-accused was found in conscious possession of commercial quantity of contraband on 09.10.2024. Though, the allegations *prima facie* make out a case for commission of subject offences against the petitioner, however, on a perusal of the record, it is apparent that there are no chances of conclusion of the trial in near future and it will take considerable time as a substantive number of the prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. The petitioner has remained in custody since long. It is well settled proposition of law that grant of bail on account of delay in trial and long period of incarceration is to be considered in the light of Section 37 of the NDPS Act. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the observations made by Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Mohd. Muslim @ Hussain v. State (NCT of Delhi), 2023 SCC OnLine SC 352***, wherein it was held that grant of bail on account of undue delay in trial cannot be said to be fettered under Section 37 of the NDPS Act, given the imperative of Section 436-A of Cr.P.C. which is applicable to offence under the Act. It was also



observed that jails are overcrowded and their living conditions are, more often than not, appalling. The danger of unjustified imprisonment is that inmates are more likely to be hardened rather than reformed. Reliance can also be placed upon *Manmandal and Another v. State of West Bengal, Special Leave Petition (Criminal) No.8656 of 2023 decided on 14.09.2023 and Rabi Prakash v. State of Odisha, 2023 SCC Online SC 110*, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court had extended benefit of bail to the accused who had been incarcerated for a long period by observing that prolonged incarceration militated against the most precious fundamental right guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and in such a situation, the constitutional principles must override the statutory embargo contained under Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

8. Reliance can also be placed upon judgment dated 14.11.2025 passed in **Criminal Appeal No.4883/2025** titled as **Santosh Pawar Vs. State of Chhattishgarh & another**, in which the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed that rigors of Section 37 of NDPS Act will not be a bar for considering the case of an accused for bail as it comes with a condition that the prosecution would press for an early completion of trial. In the abovementioned case, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that appellant who was being prosecuted for being in possession of commercial quantity of narcotic substance, was entitled for bail in view of her incarceration for a period of 19 months.

9. Similarly in *Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of*



Investigation, (2022) 10 SCC 51 prolonged incarceration and inordinate delay engaged the attention of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, which considered the correct approach towards bail, with respect to several enactments, including Section 37 NDPS Act. The court expressed the opinion that Section 436A (which requires inter alia the accused to be enlarged on bail if the trial is not concluded within specified periods) of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 would apply.

10. In the case of ***Ismail Khan @ Pathan vs. State of Rajasthan Criminal Appeal No.4911 of 2025*** with regard to recovery of commercial quantity of narcotic substance the Hon'ble Supreme Court accorded the benefit of bail to the accused in view of prolonged incarceration for a period of 02 years and 08 months of the accused.

11. The similar benefit has been extended in another appeal i.e. ***SLP No.15699-2025 titled as Ebrahim @ Ibrahim SK vs. The State of West Bengal*** and in the case of ***Pamesh Arora vs. UT Chandigarh Criminal Appeal No.4872 of 2025***.

12. On analyzing the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case in the light of the aforementioned principles of law, it transpires that the petitioner has suffered prolonged incarceration for a period of about 01 year, 07 months and 16 days. The trial is not likely to be concluded in near future. Similarly situated co-accused have been extended benefit of bail. In view thereof, this Court is of the considered opinion that the continued detention of the petitioner is not likely to serve any fruitful purpose. There is nothing on



record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner will not participate in the trial or will abscond or indulge in similar offences. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court, but subject to the condition that she shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case. She shall appear before the learned trial Court on each and every date of hearing except when her presence has been exempted by the trial Court. She shall surrender her passport, if any, furnish details of her cell phone and Aadhar card, and shall not change her mobile number(s) during the pendency of the trial.

13. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

14. Since the main petition has already been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

26th May, 2026
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |