

CRM-M-54885-2025
CRM-M-60694-2025
CRM-M-66801-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-8122-2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

133

CRM-M-54885-2025

KULDEEP SINGH ALIAS KEEPA
.....Petitioner
Versus
STATE OF PUNJAB
.....Respondent

CRM-M- 60694-2025

BALVEER KUMAR ALIAS BEERA
.....Petitioner
Versus
STATE OF PUNJAB
.....Respondent

CRM-M-66801-2025 (O&M)

AMARJIT KAUR @ JEETA
.....Petitioner
Versus
STATE OF PUNJAB
.....Respondent

CRM-M-8122-2026

PARAMJIT KAUR@PAMMI
.....Petitioner
Versus
STATE OF PUNJAB
.....Respondent

Decided on : 26.02.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. C.S. Rana, Advocate, and
Mr. A.S. Mann, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-66801-2025),

CRM-M-54885-2025
CRM-M-60694-2025
CRM-M-66801-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-8122-2026

2

2026:PHHC:031891



Mr. Vishavjeet Singh Rishi, Advocate, and
Ms. Divya Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-60694-2025),
Mr. Sandeep Saini, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-8122-2026), and
Mr. Dipanshu Kapur, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-54885-2025).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. By this common order, all the aforementioned four petitions, i.e. CRM-M-54885-2025, CRM-M-60694-2025, CRM-M-66801-2025 and CRM-M-8122-2026 shall stand disposed of.

2. Petition, i.e. CRM-M-54885-2025 has filed by the petitioner namely Kuldeep Singh alias Keepa, seeking grant of regular bail, in case, FIR No.19, dated 01.03.2025, under Section 22 of NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Ladhuwal, District Ludhiana.

Petition, i.e. CRM-M-60694-2025 has filed by the petitioner namely Balveer Kumar alias Beera, seeking grant of regular bail, in case, FIR No.19, dated 01.03.2025, under Section 22 of NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Ladhuwal, District Ludhiana.

Petition, i.e. CRM-M-66801-2025 has filed by the petitioner namely Amarjit Kaur alias Jeeta, seeking grant of regular bail, in case, FIR No.19, dated 01.03.2025, under Section 22 of NDPS Act and section 29 of NDPS Act added later on, registered at Police Station Ladhuwal, District Ludhiana.

CRM-M-54885-2025
CRM-M-60694-2025
CRM-M-66801-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-8122-2026

3

2026:PHHC:031891



Petition, i.e. CRM-M-8122-2026 has filed by the petitioner namely Paramjit Kaur alias Pammi, seeking grant of regular bail, in case, FIR No.19, dated 01.03.2025, under Section 22 of NDPS Act and section 29 of NDPS Act added later on, registered at Police Station Ladhuwal, District Ludhiana.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners contend that approximately one year prior to the present date, i.e. on 01.03.2025, two accused persons, namely Kuldeep Singh alias Keepa (petitioner in CRM-M-54885-2025) and Balvir Singh alias Bira (petitioner in CRM-M-60694-2025), were intercepted by a police party. Upon noticing the police, both the accused persons allegedly threw away the polythene bags, they were carrying. On suspicion, they were apprehended, and upon search, 60 tablets of etizolam were recovered from the polythene bag thrown by Kuldeep Singh alias Keepa, while 30 tablets of etizolam were recovered from the polythene bag thrown by Balvir Singh alias Bira.

It is further submitted that after their arrest, and on the basis of disclosure statements allegedly made by the said accused, other persons, namely Amarjit Kaur alias Jeeta (petitioner in CRM-M-66801-2025), Paramjit Kaur alias Pammi (petitioner in CRM-M-8122-2026), Kulwinder Kaur, and Manjit Singh alias Rodu, were nominated as accused in the present case as suppliers of the intoxicant tablets. However, no recovery was effected from the possession of the accused who were named solely on the basis of the disclosure statements of Kuldeep Singh alias Keepa and Balvir Singh alias Bira.



4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners - Amarjit Kaur alias Jeeta and Paramjit Kaur alias Pammi submit that since no recovery has been effected from their possession, they have been falsely implicated only on the basis of disclosure statements. It is contended that apart from the said disclosure statements, there is no other incriminating or connecting evidence available with the prosecution, and thus, the burden would lie heavily upon the prosecution to establish their guilt or involvement in the alleged offence.

5. Counsel for the respective petitioners jointly submit that petitioner-Kuldeep Singh alias Keepa is in custody since 01.03.2025; petitioner-Balvir Singh alias Bira is in custody since 01.03.2025; petitioner-Amarjit Kaur alias Jeeta is in custody since 13.08.2025; and petitioner-Paramjit Kaur alias Pammi is in custody since 04.08.2025. Additionally, it is pointed out that co-accused, namely Kulwinder Kaur, who was also implicated on the basis of disclosure statement, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court, vide order dated 05.09.2025 passed in CRM-M-48681-2025 (Annexure P-4).

On these grounds, learned counsel jointly pray for grant of regular bail to the petitioners in the present case.

6. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioners, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificates of the petitioners, in Court today, which are taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.



As per the custody certificates, in the present case, petitioner – Balvir Kumar alias Beera has already undergone 11 months and 21 days period inside jail, petitioner – Paramjit Kaur alias Pammi has already undergone 06 months and 20 days period inside jail, petitioner – Amarjit Kaur alias Jeeta has already undergone 06 months and 12 days period inside jail.

7. Learned State counsel has also filed status report dated 19.02.2026 in the Court today and the same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place on the file.

8. Learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners, submits that apart the present case, petitioners are involved in many other criminal cases, and in this regard, he refers to paragraph No.18(5) of the status report.

9. Thus, learned State counsel submits that keeping in view the criminal antecedents of the petitioners, who are involved in many other criminal cases, they are not entitled for the concession of regular bail in the present case.

10. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has carefully perused the record, including the status report placed before it.

11. Admittedly, total 90 intoxicant tablets weighing 7.2 grams, containing the salt of Etizolam, were recovered from the possession of the petitioners, namely Kuldeep Singh alias Keepa and Balveer Kumar



alias Beera. However, no recovery of any narcotic contraband or psychotropic substance was effected from the petitioners, namely Amarjit Kaur alias Jeeta and Paramjit Kaur alias Pammi.

The sole contention advanced by the prosecution against Amarjit Kaur alias Jeeta and Paramjit Kaur alias Pammi is their alleged involvement in other criminal cases. However, it is not disputed that their names surfaced primarily on the basis of disclosure statements made by co-accused persons. The evidentiary value and admissibility of such disclosure statements, particularly those made by a co-accused, and whether in the absence of any independent corroborative material, petitioners can be held liable to face punishment, are matters yet to be adjudicated at trial.

12. Until such issues are conclusively determined, continued detention of the petitioners-Amarjit Kaur alias Jeeta and Paramjit Kaur alias Pammi would amount to an unnecessary curtailment of their personal liberty. In these circumstances, this Court deems it appropriate to grant them the concession of regular bail to the petitioners namely Amarjit Kaur alias Jeeta and Paramjit Kaur alias Pammi in the present case. **Accordingly, petitions, i.e. CRM-M-66801-2025 and CRM-M-8122-2026 are allowed.**

13. With regard to the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioners, namely Kuldeep Singh @ Keepa, from whom 60 tablets of Etizolam were allegedly recovered, and Balveer Singh @ Beera, from whom 30 tablets of Etizolam were allegedly recovered, it is pertinent to note that



this Court, vide order dated 10.12.2025, passed in CRM-M-22148-2025 titled as “Amit Kumar vs. State of Punjab”, while granting bail to the accused therein, considered the issue relating to different salts, namely etizolam and alprazolam.

The relevant portion of paragraph No.6 of the said order is reproduced here below:—

“Concerning the salt of Etizolam, this Court has also dealt with the matter in CRM-M-12950-2025 (order dated 16.07.2025), wherein it was noticed as under:

“3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that although the quantity of Etizolam recovered from the petitioner falls under the category of commercial quantity, the recovered quantity of Heroin falls under the category of small quantity.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has produced a copy of the order dated 09.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-24404-2025 and submits that the co-ordinate Bench of this Court concluded that the salts Alprazolam and Etizolam are prescribed for similar ailments and differ only slightly in potency. It was further observed that the commercial quantity notified by the Central Government for Etizolam (2.5 grams) is, in fact, less than the small quantity prescribed for Alprazolam (5 grams), and there is no data suggesting that Etizolam is 40 times more potent than Alprazolam. Copy of order dated 09.07.2025 is taken on record. The relevant excerpt of the said order is reproduced herebelow:

“4. He further contends that the Central Government vide notification bearing No. S.O.1276(E) dated 23.03.2021, Etizolam was brought under the ambit of the NDPS Act. It was specified that 0.05g would constitute to be small quantity while 2.5g would be the commercial quantity in this regard. However, a perusal of the Pre-Review Report presented on Etizolam by the World Health Organisation’s Expert Committee on Drug Dependence, at its 37th Meeting (16-20 November, 2015), would indicate that Etizolam is comparable to Alprazolam in its nature and effects, both being derivatives of benzodiazepine. Based on its chemical structure, it is also unlikely to convert Etizolam into a different controlled substance. In fact, the report concludes that nature of possible abuse of Etizolam does not warrant international control. Moreover, there is also a scarcity of empirical data concluding overdose of Etizolam can result



in death. While two doses of 0.5mg Etizolam per day would have the same impact as two doses of 0.5mg Alprazolam, the huge difference in the notified commercial quantities for the same is rather curious

<i>Controlled Substance</i>	<i>Small Quantity</i>	<i>Commercial Quantity</i>
<i>Alprazolam</i>	<i>5g</i>	<i>100g</i>
<i>Etizolam</i>	<i>0.05g</i>	<i>2.5g</i>

5. In spite of the fact that both the notified substances are prescribed to cure the same ailments and have a similar effect, with minor difference in potency, the commercial quantity notified by the Central Government for Etizolam (2.5g) is even lesser than small quantity prescribed for Alprazolam (5 g). There is no data to even remotely suggest that the potency of Etizolam is 40 times that of Alprazolam

6. With that in view, a study of Section 22 of the NDPS Act is called for-

22. Punishment for contravention in relation to psychotropic substances.—

Whoever, in contravention of any provision of this Act or any rule or order made or condition of licence granted thereunder, manufactures, possesses, sells, purchases, transports, imports inter-State, exports inter-State or uses any psychotropic substance shall be punishable,--

(a) where the contravention involves small quantity, with rigorous imprisonment for a term which may extend to 2[one year], or with fine which may extend to ten thousand rupees, or with both;

(b) where the contravention involves quantity lesser than commercial quantity but greater than small quantity, with rigorous imprisonment for a term which may extend to ten years, and with fine .

(c) where the contravention involves commercial quantity, with rigorous imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than ten years but which may extend to twenty years, and shall also be liable to fine which shall not be less than one lakh rupees but which may extend to two lakh rupees:

Provided that the court may, for reasons to be recorded in the judgment, impose a fine exceeding two lakh rupees.

The mandatory minimum punishment for cases involving commercial quantities is 10 years, which may be extended to 20 years. In view of the nature of



Etizolam, such stringent punishment does not satisfy the test of proportionality. The impact of Etizolam and the meagre amount of commercial quantity i.e. 2.5g notified by the Central Government does not align with the gravity of the offence alleged.”

Counsel submits that in the cited case, there was a recovery of 2.76 grams of Etizolam, and considering the custody period of 9 months already undergone, the petitioner in that case was granted the concession of bail. Relying on the strength of the aforesaid bail order, Mr. P.S. Sekhon, learned counsel for the petitioner, prays for grant of bail, submitting that the petitioner has been in custody for nearly two years (i.e., one year, eleven months, and sixteen days).”

15. In view of these observations, and considering the substantial period of incarceration already undergone by the petitioners – Kuldeep Singh alias Keepa and Balveer Kumar alias Beera, this Court is of the considered opinion that both the petitioners deserve an opportunity for rehabilitation and reintegration into society. Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, petitioners’ right to personal liberty cannot be curtailed indefinitely.

Consequently, prayer made in the petitions, i.e. CRM-M-54885-2025 and CRM-M-60694-2025 is allowed.

16. **Therefore, all the four petitioners, namely Kuldeep Singh alias Keepa, Balveer Kumar alias Beera, Amarjit Kaur alias Jeeta and Paramjit Kaur alias Pammi are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their 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-54885-2025
CRM-M-60694-2025
CRM-M-66801-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-8122-2026

10

2026:PHHC:031891



17. Needless to observe that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

18. 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.

19. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioners are directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

20. All the four petitions stand disposed of.

21. A photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

26.02.2026
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO