



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

116

CRM-M-55720-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 24.02.2026

Ramandeep Kaur @ Raman

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Yashpal Thakur, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Saurav Verma, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. This first petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.32 dated 01.03.2025, registered under Section(s) 22-C of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Amloh, District Fatehgarh Sahib, Punjab.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that as per the version of the prosecution, on 01.03.2025, three persons were intercepted while travelling on an unregistered black-blue motorcycle (CT 100). He contends that the driver of the said motorcycle disclosed his name as Paramvir Singh, while the person sitting in the middle disclosed his name as Varinder Singh and the petitioner was pillion-rider of the said motorcycle. He contends that one black colour plastic bag was found tied to the handle bar on the left side, from which 15 injections of Buprenorphine IP Leegesic 2 ml and 15 vials of Pheniramine Maleate Injections IP Avil 10 ml. were



recovered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is a female aged 38 years and has been in custody since 01.03.2025 and has undergone an actual custody of nearly 11 months. He submits that only 02 out of the total 15 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far and the trial is likely to take a long time in its conclusion. He further submits that there would debatable issues as regard the petitioner being in conscious possession of the contraband. He also contends that the petitioner has a young child aged 03 years and that even though she was earlier involved in cases under the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, however, she is no more involved in commission of any such offences.

4. Learned counsel for respondent-State, on the other hand, contends that the petitioner has criminal antecedents and is stated to be involved in a large number of cases. However, the period of custody, role of the petitioner and the stage of the trial are not disputed.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration that arguable issues arise with respect to conscious possession of the contraband by the petitioner and the same is to be determined by the trial Court during the course of trial coupled with the period of actual custody already undergone by her, the stage of the trial and bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to her furnishing bail/surety



bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

24.02.2026
Mangal Singh

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