



CRM-M-71654-2025 (O&M)

-1-

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

106

CRM-M-71654-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision : 22.05.2026

KARAMJIT KAUR

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Vipul Jindal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Pandher, AAG, Punjab.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)**CRM-13219-2026**

1. This application has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 (erstwhile Section 482 Cr.P.C) for placing on record additional documents as Annexures P-5 & P-6.

2. Heard.

3. For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed and Annexures P-5 & P-6 are taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

CRM-M-71654-2025

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (erstwhile Section 439 Cr.P.C.) seeking grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.166 dated 30.08.2025, registered under Sections 21 and 29 of the NDPS Act at Police Station City Sangrur, District Sangrur.

**CRM-M-71654-2025 (O&M)****-2-**

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 30.08.2025, the police party, while on patrol duty, apprehended co-accused Yadwinder Singh @ Sunny and Bara Singh, who were allegedly found in possession of 51 grams of heroin. During investigation, co-accused(s) suffered disclosure statement and named the present petitioner in the alleged offence. In consequence thereto, a raid was conducted and recovery of 500 grams of heroin along with cash amount of Rs.11 lakhs was allegedly effected from the house of the petitioner at Amritsar on 01.09.2025.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and was arraigned as an accused only on the basis of disclosure statement(s) of co-accused(s). Besides the disclosure statement(s), there is no incriminating material against the petitioner which would connect her with the alleged offence and no recovery of contraband has been effected from her. It is further submitted that the amount allegedly recovered from the petitioner formed part of the sale consideration received from the sale of her land and, therefore, could not be treated as drug money. It is also submitted that the disclosure statements allegedly suffered by the co-accused during police custody are not admissible in evidence unless duly corroborated by independent material.

4. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner was not apprehended by the local police but by the Police from Sangrur. It is further submitted that there is non-compliance of mandatory provisions of the NDPS Act as the grounds of arrest were neither explained to the petitioner nor her family members were informed prior to her arrest. Moreover, the petitioner was

**CRM-M-71654-2025 (O&M)****-3-**

not produced before the Magistrate at Amritsar and she was brought to Sangrur where she was produced before the Illaqa Magistrate. Learned counsel also submits that the petitioner, who is 38 years old lady and the mother of two minor children, is in custody for the last more than 08 months and 19 days and is not involved in any other case. He, therefore, prays for release of the petitioner on regular bail as the trial is likely to take a long time as none of the cited 19 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

5. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner in Court, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 08 months and 19 days. He, upon instructions, submits that none of the cited 19 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts that the petitioner, who is 38 years old lady and the mother of two minor children, is in custody for the last more than 08 months and 19 days, she is not involved in any other case and that the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude as none of the cited 19 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial as the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice.



CRM-M-71654-2025 (O&M)

-4-

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on her furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

May 22, 2026
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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