

2026:PHHC:018361



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

214

CRM-M No.34274 of 2025
Date of Decision: 06.02.2026

Manjeet Kaur ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Satnam Singh Gill, Advocate and
Ms. Manjot Kaur, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
59	01.03.2025	Tripuri Patiala, District Patiala	22 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short ‘NDPS Act’) (27 and 29 of NDPS Act added later on)

2. As per the allegations, on 01.03.2025, the accused Jagwinder Singh @ Nan and Jafar Khan were apprehended on the basis of suspicion while they were found present along with one Splendor make bike in the area of PUDA Ground, Market, Tripuri Town, Patiala. On seeing the

2026:PHHC:018361



police officials, they had taken out two polythene envelopes from the pockets of their jeans and had thrown the same on the ground and then tried to flee. On checking, 100 grams of intoxicating powder was found to be kept in each of the polythene which was taken into possession by the police. The above named accused were formally arrested. They suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the crime. As per the disclosure made by accused Jagwinder Singh @ Nan and Jafar Khan, they had purchased the powder from the accused Jasvir Singh and his wife Manjeet Kaur i.e. the petitioner. Both of them were nominated as additional accused and were arrested on 08.03.2025. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that she has been falsely implicated in this case. She is in custody since 08.03.2025. No recovery has been effected from her. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. She was not even named in the FIR and has been nominated on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. No useful purpose would be served by keeping her in custody any more. Her involvement in other cases cannot be considered to be a reason for denying benefit of bail to her. As such, it is urged that she deserves to be released on bail.

4. Per contra, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab has argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner who was an active participant in the crime being supplier of commercial quantity of contraband to the co-accused. She is a habitual offender being

involved in several other cases of similar nature as well as under the



provisions of IPC. She has even been convicted in seven cases under the provisions of NDPS Act and is a habitual offender. The possibility that she may indulge again in commission of similar offences cannot be ruled out. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner along with her husband is alleged to have supplied commercial quantity of intoxicating capsules/tablets to the co-accused. The investigation stands concluded and trial has commenced. There is nothing on record to show that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the trial. The petitioner is a habitual offender as she had been convicted in seven cases under the different provisions of NDPS Act. At present, apart from this case, she is facing trial in three more cases. Taking into consideration the antecedents of the petitioner, the role allegedly played by her in this crime, this Court is of the considered opinion that the apprehension that she may commit similar offences again if extended benefit of bail cannot be stated to be unfounded at this stage. Accordingly, finding no compelling ground to allow the petition, the same is dismissed.

7. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

06.02.2026
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No