



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

CRM-M-21320-2026

Date of decision: 14.05.2026

KARAMJIT KAUR

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Armaan Dahiya, AAG Haryana.

.....

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.104 dated 01.04.2024 registered under Sections 22(c), 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Kalanwali, District Dabwali.

2. Brief facts of the present case as per the prosecution are that on 01.04.2024, police party acting upon a secret information raided at the house of one Charanjeet Singh @ Charna. During raid of the house, one Simranjeet Kaur wife of Charanjeet Singh @ Charna was present and total 1785 intoxicant tablets were recovered from the house. Initially, the FIR in question was registered against the said co-accused persons.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and she has no concern with the said offence. He argued that the petitioner was neither present at the spot nor was named in the FIR. It has also been contended that the petitioner was nominated as an accused only on the basis of the disclosure statement made



by co-accused. Apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence to connect the petitioner with the offence in question and it is a trite law that disclosure statement of co-accused during her custodial interrogation is not admissible in evidence. He further submits that the only role attributed to the petitioner is that she in collusion with co-accused purchased the recovered contraband and in order to falsely implicate Simranjit Kaur, kept the contraband in her house. He further submits that however, there is no quality evidence to connect the petitioner with the said allegations. No recovery is to be effected from her. The petitioner is in custody since 04.04.2024. He further contends that co-accused namely Sewa Singh has already been granted concession of bail by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 28.08.2025 in *CRM-M-12945-2025*. The investigation in the case is complete; challan stands presented; however, charges are yet to be framed, as such trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping her behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Learned State counsel has filed the status report and custody certificate in the matter, which is taken on record. He has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. He submits that the recovered contraband which falls under commercial quantity was actually purchased by the petitioner and the same was planted by the petitioner in the house of Simranjit Kaur in order to get rid of her as during investigation it has been found that the petitioner was having an affair with Gurcharan Singh @ Charna i.e. husband of Simranjit Kaur. He has further submitted that the



petitioner is involved in multiple other cases meaning thereby she is a habitual offender.

5. As far as the argument of learned counsel for the petitioner regarding nomination of accused on the basis of disclosure statement is concerned, it would be apposite to refer herein to a judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court titled as '**Tofan Singh vs. State of Tamil Nadu, AIR 2020 Supreme Court 5592**', relevant whereof reads as under:

"155. We answer the reference by stating: (i) That the officers who are invested with powers under section 53 of the NDPS Act are "police officers within the meaning of section 25 of the Evidence Act, as a result of which any confessional statement made to them would be barred under the provisions of section 25 of the Evidence Act, and cannot be taken into account in order to convict an accused under the NDPS Act (ii) That a statement recorded under section 67 of the NDPS Act cannot be used as a confessional statement in the trial of an offence under the NDPS ACT".

6. More recently, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in a judgment titled as '**Smt. Najmunisha, Abdul Hamid Chandmiya @ Ladoo Babu Vs. State of Gujrat, Narcotics Control Bureau' 2024 INSC 290**', has reiterated the ratio decidendi of the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Tofan Singh (supra).

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court while dealing with a plea for grant of anticipatory bail in a case under NDPS Act, 1985; in a judgment titled as '**Vijay Singh vs. The State of Haryana, bearing Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No.(s)1266/2023 decided on 17.05.2023**' has held as under:

"The petitioner is alleged to have committed offences under Sections 15 and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereinafter called the NDPS Act". His



application for anticipatory bail was rejected by the High Court. The allegations in the FIR are that 1.7 Kg of Poppy Straw (Doda Post) was recovered from the co-accused. The petitioner concededly was not present at the spot but was named by the co-accused. That apart there is no other material to implicate the petitioner. The prosecution urges that another case with allegations of commission of offence under the NDPS Act are pending against the petitioner. It is not denied that in those proceedings he was granted bail. Having regard to these circumstances, the petitioner is directed to the enlarged on anticipatory bail, subject to such terms and conditions as the trial Court may impose. The petition is allowed. All pending applications are disposed of."

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody since 04.04.2024; investigation is complete; challan stands filed; however, charges are yet to be framed; co-accused has already been granted concession of bail by Co-ordinate Bench and the fact that trial may take a long time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by detaining her in further custody. Her continued detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of her rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

9. Reliance is placed upon in ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, wherein Hon'ble Apex Court has held that keeping somebody behind the bars, till her guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of her right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle "*bail is a rule*" and "*jail is an exception*".

10. The foundational concept of the criminal jurisprudence is to ensure speedy trial. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has repeatedly reiterated that right to speedy trial is enshrined in Article 21 of the Constitution of



India. Speedy trial would cover investigation, enquiry, trial, appeal, revision and retrial etc. i.e. everything starting with the accusation against the accused and expiring with the final verdict of the last Court.

11. In this regard, reference is being made to the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the context of right to speedy trial under Article 21 of the Constitution of India on the following decision:- ***Akhtari Bi Vs. State of M.P., (2001) 4 SCC 355, Surinder Singh Alias Shingara Singh Vs. State of Punjab, (2005) SCC (Crl) 1674, P. Ramachandra Rao Vs. State of Karnataka, (2002) 4 SCC 578, Babu Singh and others Vs. State of U.P., (1978) 1 SCC 579, Takht Singh and others Vs. State of M.P., (2001) 10 SCC 463; Special Leave to Appeal (Crl) No.2356 of 2010, Kushal Singh Vs. State of U.P. (2JJ.) and Fazal Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh, (2012) 5 SCC 752.***

12. As regards the submission of learned State counsel that petitioner is involved in other/one more criminal case(s), reference is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi Vs. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (2) SCC 382*** in which, it is held that the facts and circumstances of the present case are to be seen while deciding a bail application and the bail application of the petitioner cannot be rejected solely on the ground that the petitioner is involved in other/another case(s). The relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced herein-below:-

"As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc."



2026:PHHC:076013

2026:PHHC:076013



232

CRM-M-21320-2026

-6-

13. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

14.05.2026

puneet

- i) Whether speaking/reasoned?
- ii) Whether reportable?

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

Yes/No
Yes/No