



CRM-M-66137-2025 (O&M)

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

124

CRM-M-66137-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 12.03.2026

Amritpal Kaur @ Jyoti

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Anoop Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The present first petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.037 dated 27.05.2025, under Section(s) 15, 22, 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Ajitwal, District Moga.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner contends that as per the case set up by the prosecution, on 27.05.2025, a police party headed by ASI Veerpal Kaur, spotted one lady, who was standing on the seepage bridge and holding one white coloured plastic bag in her hand. On seeing the police party, she threw the plastic bag, whereupon she was apprehended. Upon enquiry, she disclosed her name as Kirandeep Kaur @ Kirna wife of Jagsir Singh. From her search, 3 kg poppy husk was recovered. During investigation, she suffered a disclosure statement, which was recorded on was recorded on 29.05.2025, wherein she named Amritpal Kaur @ Jyoti(present petitioner) and petitioner was nominated as an accused vide rapat No.18,



dated 29.05.2025 and thereupon offence under Section 29 of NDPS Act was added. The petitioner was arrested on 31.05.2025 and 20 loose tablets of peach colour were recovered from her possession. He contends that the said tablets were found to contain etizolam with a total weight of 3.66 grams. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been nominated in the other FIR No.36, dated 25.05.2025, under Sections 22, 29 of NDPS Act after her arrest in the present case. It is submitted that the charges in the present case have been framed on 18.10.2025 and out of 13 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far.

4 On the other hand, learned State counsel does not dispute the aforesaid contentions.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into the consideration the facts and circumstances as noted above, including the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner, young age of the petitioner i.e. 24 years coupled with the stage of trial, wherein out of 13 prosecution witnesses none has been examined so far, hence the trial will take a long time to conclude, 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 his/her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq 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.

12.03.2026
monika

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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