



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

105

CRM-M-50486-2025(O&M)

Date of decision: 13.10.2025

Paramjeet Kaur

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

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

Present :- Mr. Ranjit Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Davinder Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurav Verma, Addl. AG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant second 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.36 dated 21.03.2024, registered under Section 22(c) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Lambi, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. Briefly summarized the case of the prosecution is that when the police party reached near the bridge of village Channu, a woman (petitioner herein) had been seen approaching from the front while she was in possession of a transparent envelope. However, she dropped the said envelope on seeing the vehicle of the police party. The petitioner was thereafter arrested and made to collect the leaves of scattered tablets from the envelope that had been dropped by her and she was found to be in possession of four leaves of 10 tablets each of Etizolam mouth dissolving tablets (0.5 mg). The FIR No.36 dated 21.03.2024 thus came to be registered against the petitioner under Section 22(c) of the Narcotic Drugs and



105 CRM-M-50486-2024(O&M)

Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Lambi, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner/accused is innocent and has not committed any type of offence as alleged in the FIR, and nothing was recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner/accused. He also submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case due to party faction in the village and she is in custody since 21.03.2024.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner also contends that as per the case of the prosecution, on seeing the police party, the petitioner had thrown the polythene bag held by her. A total of 40 tablets of Etizolam weighing 59.6 grams has been recovered from the same. He submits that the investigation in the case is already complete. The petitioner was arrested on 21.03.2024 and despite having undergone an actual custody of more than 01 and half years, only 01 witness out of 14 witnesses has been examined so far.

5. Learned State counsel on the other hand submits that there are total 14 witnesses out of which 06 witnesses have been given up and only 01 witness has been examined so far, hence, only 07 witnesses remain to be examined. He however does not dispute the actual custody of the petitioner w.e.f. 21.03.2024 and her clean antecedents.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and noticing the facts as aforesaid, the period of custody, clean antecedents of the petitioner and bearing in mind the stage of trial, I deem it appropriate to allow the instant petition.

2025.PHHC.140789



105 CRM-M-50486-2024(O&M)

7. 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/Illaq Magistrate concerned.

8. 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.

9. 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.

13.10.2025

Sumit Gusain

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

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE