



**CRM M-590-2025 (O&M) [1]**

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

**CRM M-590-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 15.01.2025**

**Paramjit Kaur @ Pammi** ...Petitioner  
**VERSUS**  
**State of Punjab** ...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA**

Present : Mr. Sandeep Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr. Rohit Bansal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**HARKESH MANUJA, J. (ORAL)**

By way of present second petition filed under Section 483 BNSS, 2023, prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.22 dated 15.05.2023 under Sections 22, 29/61 of the NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Mukundpur, District SBS Nagar; whereby the petitioner has been implicated with the allegation of recovery of 90 intoxicating tablets without label and 04 strips of Etizolam, each containing 15 tablets total 60 tablets along with co-accused Sandeep Kumar.

2. Custody certificate has been filed in Court today. The same is taken on record. Copy thereof has been furnished to counsel opposite. Registry to tag the same at appropriate place.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last about 01 year and 04 months; trial is likely to take some. He further submits that though the petitioner is involved in three more cases under NDPS Act; but is on bail in all of them and thus she deserves the concession of bail.

3. On the other hand, the prayer made on behalf of the petitioner has been opposed by learned State counsel while submitting that the recovery in the present case is of commercial

**CRM M-590-2025 (O&M) [2]**

quantity; she is involved in three more cases under NDPS Act, though on bail, and thus the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper book. I find substance in the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. In the present case, investigation already stands concluded with the filing of challan, followed by framing of charges and out of 14 prosecution witnesses, 08 have been examined. The petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year and 08 months. Undisputedly, petitioner is involved in three more cases under NDPS Act, but those are of non-commercial quantity and in all of them, she is on bail, in such circumstances, considering the fact that the trial is likely to take some time, I do not find any justification to extend the incarceration of the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to her furnishing adequate bail bonds/ surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

7. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

15.01.2025  
sanjay

**( HARKESH MANUJA )**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned ?	Yes/No
Whether Reportable ?	Yes/No