

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:095063



(102)

CRM-M-19522-2025 (O&M)

Decided on: 14.07.2026

Uploaded on: 14.07.2026

Balbir Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Directorate of Enforcement

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Mr. Tarun Hooda &  
Mr. Mukul Sheoran, Advocates, for the petitioner.

Mr. Lokesh Narang, Sr. Panel Counsel with  
Ms. Shubhleen Dhariwal, Advocate and  
Ms. Nitya Choudhary, Advocate for the respondent-ED.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Sumeet Goel (Oral):**

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case bearing No. ECIR/04/STF/2019 dated 31.05.2019 registered on the basis of NCB Crime No. 18 dated 02.08.2018 under Sections 22, 23 and 29 of the NDPS Act, 1985.

2. On 29.04.2025, the following order was passed:

*“1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case bearing No. ECIR/04/STF/2019 dated 31.05.2019 registered on the basis of NCB Crime No. 18 dated 02.08.2018 under Sections 22, 23 and 29 of the NDPS Act, 1985.*

*2. A reply has been filed by the Directorate of Enforcement-respondent and the same is taken on record.*

*3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that Narcotic Control Bureau (NCB) had filed a complaint under Sections 22, 23, 29 and 38 of the NDPS Act against the eight accused, namely,*

*Amit Kumar, Sanjay Singh, Archana Sharma, M/s Zatak Soft Tech Pvt. Ltd. M/s Farma Glow, M/s Sanjay Enterprises, M/s Archit Biotech and M/s Amit Enterprises before the Court of Special Judge, Patiala Court House, New Delhi. The main allegation against the accused was that Amit Kumar, Director of M/s Zatak Soft Tech Pvt. Ltd. (ZSTPL) was operating an internet based pharmacy and had booked some parcels/couriers, destined to various countries on behalf of his other firm, namely, M/s Farma Glow, which were lying at Foreign Post Office, ITO, New Delhi and were suspected to contain Narcotics Drugs/Psychotropic Substance based medicines. During search, psychotropic substances were found and the complaint was instituted against them. By treating the offence under Sections 22, 23 and 29 of the NDPS Act as scheduled offences, the investigation was initially initiated by the Directorate of Enforcement (ED) and the ECIR was registered on 31.05.2019. Even, the prosecution complaint in the above mentioned ECIR was filed before the Court on 23.02.2022 and vide order dated 29.03.2022, the Court had taken cognizance against 12 accused. Apart from the earlier arrayed accused, 04 more accused Arti Sharma, Ragini Sharma, Pankaj Sharma and Swaraj were also arrayed as accused in the said complaint.*

*4. Learned counsel further contends that three properties were registered in the names of Arti Sharma, Ragini Sharma, Pankaj Sharma and Swaraj and were leased out to Unnativesh India Private Limited and Babita Yadav, Director, runs an NGO Unnati Trust and the petitioner is also associated with the welfare activities being undertaken by the said NGO. Aarti Sharma, Ragini Sharma and Pankaj Sharma offered to sell these properties to Ms. Babita Yadav, who informed the petitioner about the same and the petitioner also expressed his willingness to purchase the said properties. Consequently, Ragni Sharma executed an agreement to sell dated 29.03.2019 (Annexure P-1) in favour of the petitioner for one of such property, i.e., Unit No. 13A, B-3, Spaze-I, Tech Park, Sector 49, Gurugram for a total sale consideration of Rs.75,00,000/-. The petitioner paid a sum of Rs. 30,00,000/- as earnest money to Ragni Sharma. However, Ragni Sharma refused to execute the sale deed in favour of the petitioner and the petitioner had filed a Civil Suit No. CS/734-*

2021 before the Court of Civil Judge, Gurugram.

5. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner had received the summons under Section 50(2) and sub-Section (3) of PMLA and he was directed to appear on 27.09.2024. However, the petitioner could not appear due to some personal difficulty. He was again called on 14.10.2024, but he informed the respondent about his personal difficulty by sending an e-mail on 13.10.2024. However, in compliance of the notice dated 15.10.2024, the petitioner appeared before the respondent on 22.10.2024 and answered the questions and got his statement recorded. He further contends that the petitioner had no concern with the allegations levelled by the NCB in the scheduled offences. The respondent illegally wants to arrest the petitioner. Moreover, there is a civil dispute between Ragini Sharma and the present petitioner and the petitioner has been wrongly summoned by the respondent. He further contends that the petitioner is ready to fully cooperate with the respondent-ED and the entire incriminating evidence is already with the respondent.

6. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-ED has vehemently opposed the submissions made by the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is involved in a serious crime of money laundering and does not deserve the concession of bail.

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

8. At this stage, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the petitioner is directed to appear before the Assistant Director, STF, New Delhi and on his appearance, he shall be admitted to interim bail to the satisfaction of Investigating Officer subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 482 (2) of BNSS.

9. The petitioner is also directed to appear before the Investigating Officer on all such dates as and when called by the Investigating Officer. The petitioner is also directed to cooperate with the Investigating Officer of the present case in all respects.

10. List on 29.07.2025.”

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent-ED has submitted that the petitioner has joined investigation and he is not required

for custodial interrogation. He has, however, submitted that the petitioner be directed to join investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer.

4. Keeping in view the factual milieu of the case in hand, especially the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and he is not required for custodial interrogation, the petition is allowed and the order dated 29.04.2025 granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner is hereby made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS.

5. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

6. Liberty is reserved in favour of State to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS or upon showing any other sufficient cause.

7. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

**14.07.2026**

*Naveen*

**(SUMEET GOEL)  
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Yes/No

Whether Reportable :

Yes/No