



2024:DHC:7713



* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

% *Reserved on: 12th September 2024*
Pronounced on: 04th October, 2024

+ **BAIL APPLN. 550/2024**

RAMANDEEP SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Harpreet Hora, Advocate, Mr.
Prabhjot Singh, Advocate for petitioner
(*through VC*)

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State with
SI Rahul Sagar, Special Cell/NDR.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

JUDGMENT

1. This bail application has been filed seeking regular bail for the petitioner in FIR no. 172/2021 registered at P.S. Special Cell under Sections 21, 25, 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 ('**NDPS Act**').

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 6th July 2021, basis secret information, search of a dicky of a scooty was carried out and a plastic packet was recovered which was found to be *heroin* as per the field-testing kit and weighed 1.017 kgs.

The Investigation

3. The FIR was registered and accused Rizwan Ahmed was arrested on 06th July 2021. Rizwan Ahmed disclosed that Gurjot Singh and Gurpreet Singh used

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: MANISH KUMAR
Signing Date: 05.10.2024
12:22:45

BAIL APPLN. 550/2024

1 of 19



2024:DHC:7713



to supply him drugs to sell it in small quantities. A raid was conducted at Sector 65, Faridabad, Haryana and the said Gurjot Singh and Gurpreet Singh were arrested 06th July 2021.

4. At the instance of Gurpreet Singh, 168.5 kgs of contraband was recovered from his Hyundai Verna car. And at the instance of Gurjot Singh, 116 kgs *heroin* was recovered from his Honda Amaze car parked in the parking of their flats. Further, 71 kgs of *heroin* was recovered at the instance of accused Gurjot Singh and Gurpreet Singh from the bed in their flat in Faridabad, Haryana.

5. Rizwan Ahmed further disclosed the name of his associate Hazrat Ali (*an Afghan national*) a resident of Gurugram, Haryana from whom he used to procure contraband. On 08th July 2021, at the instance of accused Rizwan Ahmed, accused Hazrat Ali was apprehended near Medanta Hospital, Sec-39, Gurugram, Haryana. At his instance, 2 kgs *opium* was recovered from his rented accommodation.

6. Accused Gurjot Singh and Gurpreet Singh revealed that they are peddlers primarily working in the capacity of drivers for Navpreet Singh, a resident of Amritsar, Punjab who is the main kingpin of this drug syndicate. They used to pick up the delivery of drugs from Shivpuri, Madhya Pradesh and then supply the same in Punjab.

7. During investigation it was revealed that Navpreet was also taking help of other Punjab based persons who had moved to Madhya Pradesh including one Luvjit @ Labba. The accused persons procured contraband in the guise of

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: MANISH KUMAR
Signing Date: 05.10.2024
12:22:45

BAIL APPLN. 550/2024

2 of 19



dry fruits and fertilizers from a foreign country and imported the same *via* sea route.

8. Basis online intelligence, local intelligence and disclosure statement, search was conducted at Nhava Sheva Port where it was apprehended that another consignment of *heroin* was kept. It was discovered that the said consignment had already been recovered by the Directorate of Revenue Intelligence ('DRI').

9. Three persons already arrested by the DRI, i.e. Hardev Singh, Manjeet and Prabhjit Singh were also interrogated and disclosed that they are managed by further three persons namely, Lovjit Singh @ Labba, Mandeep Singh and Navpreet Singh.

10. Accused Gurpreet Singh and Gurjot Singh disclosed the name of an accomplice of Navpreet Singh, namely Ramandeep Singh (*petitioner herein*) r/o village Budha Theh, under P.O. Beas, who provided them the Apple iPhone at the instance of Navpreet Singh, which were later recovered from Gurjot Singh and Gurpreet Singh.

11. Two godowns cum shops were raided in Shivpuri, Madhya Pradesh, the owners of the two premises furnished two rent agreements executed by Manjeet Singh in the name of Shandu Exports (a shell company run by Prabhjit Singh). Rent of the premises was being paid by Lovjit Singh; affairs were being managed by both Lovjit Singh and Manjeet Singh.

12. As per Gurjot Singh and Gurpreet Singh, the petitioner accompanied them to Shivpuri, Madhya Pradesh in June 2021, from where the drugs were



2024:DHC:7713



loaded and then transported to the territories of Delhi, Haryana, and Punjab. Said persons were being handled by Navpreet Singh and one Harry (*code name of another accomplice of Navpreet Singh*), who used to direct Gurjot, Gurpreet and Ramandeep to load the material from Shivpuri, Madhya Pradesh and drop the vehicle at a particular location and collect the same later in time.

13. Petitioner was arrested on 17th July 2021 and *heroin* weighing 210 grams was recovered at his instance from the house. Statement was recorded of one Mohit under Section 161 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ("C.r.P.C") that he sold the iPhones to petitioner which were later recovered from Gurpreet Singh and Gurjot Singh.

14. Accused Gurjot Singh, Gurpreet Singh and the petitioner revealed that communication between Gurjot Singh, Gurpreet Singh, Navpreet Singh, Ramandeep Singh and Harry was through FaceTime on the Apple mobiles using the following iCloud IDs:

NAME OF THE ACCUSED	ICLOUD ID
Navpreet Singh	aceoffspades@icloud.com
Harry	harrysingh000777@icloud.com
Ramandeep Singh (petitioner)	brar000777@icloud.com,
Gurjot Singh	baba000888@icloud.com,
Gurpreet Singh	honey000888@icloud.com.

Status report notes that initially petitioner used his iCloud ID to communicate with Navpreet Singh, Gurjot Singh and Gurpreet Singh before passing on his Apple iPhone to Gurpreet Singh.

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: MANISH KUMAR
Signing Date: 05.10.2024
12:22:45

RAIL APPLN. 550/2024

4 of 19



2024:DHC:7713



15. Further, petitioner disclosed that Hardev Singh and Manjeet Singh used to load the drugs on the vehicles at Shivpuri Madhya Pradesh.

16. Petitioner disclosed that he was friends since school with Navpreet Singh.

17. The petitioner also disclosed his iCloud ID was brar000777@iCloud.com which he used for communication with other individuals, Navpreet Singh, Gurjot Singh and Gurpreet Singh and Harry.

18. It is pertinent to note that the petitioner passed on his Apple iPhone carrying his iCloud ID to the accused Gurpreet Singh subsequently. The said information was substantiated by the Cert-In report confirming the Apple iCloud ID brar000777@icloud.com on the Apple iPhone bearing IMEI No. 356787116990260 and 356787 116974538, recovered from the possession of the accused Gurpreet Singh.

19. Petitioner disclosed that accused Navpreet Singh had sent papers, utensils and powderish material with intent to transfer the same to a house in Rajpura, Punjab. Basis said information, a raid was conducted at petitioners residence in Beas, on the intervening night of 31st July 2021 and 1st August 2021. Number of passbooks and cheque books, property papers and utensils were recovered. Petitioner disclosed that he gave the powderish substance to his uncle, one Sukhjinder for sale through his brother Happy.

20. Elections ID card, PAN card and Aadhar card carrying details of Navpreet Singh were recovered at the instance of the petitioner from Shri Radha Krishan Apartment, 641/2, Export Enclave, South Delhi.

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: MANISH KUMAR
Signing Date: 05.10.2024
12:22:45

RAIL APPLN. 550/2024

5 of 19



2024:DHC:7713



21. A used cheque book from Axis Bank bearing account no. 918010087065517 and consisting of cheque no. 941032 to 941040, was recovered. It was revealed that this Axis bank account was registered in the name of Navpreet Singh who is absconding in the matter.

22. Analysis of Axis bank account held by petitioner revealed that payment of Rs. 3.2 lacs was made through cheque bearing number 941031 on 14th January 2019 to Gopal Rampal who was the seller of the flat bearing No. B5, 2nd floor, Shri Radha Krishna Apartment, 641/2, Export Enclave, Devli, New Delhi. This premises was seized in FIR no. 237/ 2022 registered under the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 and Sections 21, 25, 29 of NDPS Act, conducted by the Special Cell.

23. The said cheque 941031 was part of the cheque book containing leaves 941032 to 941040 which was recovered at the instance of the petitioner.

24. In a supplementary disclosure, Gurpreet Singh revealed that in June 2021, he received a car with a petrol engine from an individual called as Brar, who was later identified as the petitioner, and the delivery took place in Badarpur, Delhi at the behest of accused Navpreet Singh. This was corroborated by the Cert-In report, where it was found that in June 26, 2021, the petitioner shared his location from his iCloud of Gurpreet Singh. The locations shared were of IP Estate, Jamia Nagar, Sector 35, Faridabad, Haryana, and Butterwood extension in Delhi. The petitioner and Gurpreet Singh had 8 calls on that day of June 26, 2021, indicating significant communication. Several calls have been noted from the iCloud ID of petitioner to Gurpreet



2024:DHC:7713



Singh. The FSL report has been obtained and the recovered contraband has been found to be *heroin*.

25. As per the prosecution, even though 210 grams contraband was recovered from the petitioner, the total recovery of the contraband from the accused is 358.6 kgs.

Submissions on behalf of the Petitioner

26. Counsel for the petitioner contended that he was apprehended on the basis of disclosure of other co-accused and the recovery from him was only of 210 grams and that too, was allegedly at his instance and not on his person. The said quantity is an intermediate quantity and there was no independent witness as to the seizure. He contended that the raiding party could not organize even one independent witness between Delhi till Beas in Punjab, where the prosecution alleges to have recovered the 210 grams from the residence of the petitioner.

27. As per the charge sheet, two samples of 50 grams each were drawn by the raiding party and were sealed in *pulandas* and were handed over to S.I. Ravi Yadav. Counsel for petitioner states that this is a violation of the mandatory procedure under Section 52A of the NDPS Act.

28. Further, Petitioner's counsel states that recovery from petitioner was of an intermediate quantity and at best would invite a sentence of maximum 10 years and that he has already been in custody for about 138 months. He states that petitioner's case is not in parity with co-accused Gurjot and Gurpreet from whom *contraband* weighing 70 Kgs had been seized.

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: MANISH KUMAR
Signing Date: 05.10.2024
12:22:45

RAIL APPLN. 550/2024

7 of 19



29. Petitioner's counsel relies on the decision of the Supreme Court in *Mohd. Muslim v. State (NCT of Delhi)* 2023 SCC OnLine SC 352 and of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana in *Sumit Khatri & Anr. v. State of Punjab* 2022:PHHC:042194, to stress on the issue of prolonged custody. He contended that when he had filed the second bail application in November 2022 his petition was kept pending for 13 months and was not disposed of, which triggered a petition before this Court in CRL. M.C. 9388/2023, which was disposed of *vide* order dated 20th December 2023 directing the Trial Court to expeditiously dispose of the application.

30. Accordingly, the Trial Court dismissed his bail in January 2024. He pointed out that charges have not been framed till date and 64 witnesses are to be examined; the trial is yet to commence.

31. Counsel for petitioner contended that the contraband as well as the cheque books were planted by the Investigating Agency in order to falsely implicate the petitioner.

Submissions on behalf of the State

32. APP for State has pointed out to the status report, facts of which have already been narrated above. APP contended that he was an active member of the syndicate and the case is listed for arguments on charge before the Trial Court.

33. The recovery of the *heroin*, even though an intermediate quantity, was at the behest of the petitioner. As regards the Section 52A compliance, as per



2024:DHC:7713



Masibur Khan v. State (NCT of Delhi) 2023 SCC OnLine Del 3326 these are matters of trial and no prejudice has been caused to the petitioner.

34. The aspect of independent witnesses has been dealt with by the Supreme Court in order dated. 2nd November 2023 passed in ***Jagwinder v. State of Punjab*** CrI. A. No. 2027/2012 where the Court held that absence of independent witnesses was not fatal to the prosecution.

35. Further, co-accused have been in custody and the main kingpin Navpreet has been absconding.

Analysis

36. As per the case of the prosecution not only is there a recovery of 210 g of *heroin* at the instance of the petitioner, just 40 g short of the commercial quantity of 250 g but also, the investigation has revealed a deep nexus and syndicate for sourcing, supplying and peddling drugs such as *heroin*, of which the petitioner seems to be an important and critical link.

37. Investigation revealed that Petitioner is an accomplice of Navpreet Singh, and in the facts of this case has been responsible for providing a car to accused Gurpreet Singh in June 2021, his Apple iPhone to co-accused Gurpreet Singh through which various communications took place with co-accused Navpreet Singh through the iCloud network. The recovery from Gurpreet Singh and Gurjot Singh is of 168.5 kgs (from Gurpreet Singh's Verna car), 116 kgs (from Gurjot Singh's Honda Amaze car), and 71 kg at their instance from their flat, totaling to about 355.5kg. The provision of petitioner's phone (duly identified as having been sold to him by one Mohit), communications with co-



2024:DHC:7713



accused Navpreet (who IS absconding) through petitioners iCloud, supply of the Verna car by petitioner to accused Gurpreet Singh (corroborated by the CDR locations and corroborated by the Cert-In report regarding location and significant communication through petitioner's iCloud ID), are all *prima facie* indicative that petitioner was an inextricable part of this supply chain and in fact was facilitating the supply of drugs. Petitioner's counsel's contention that it was purely the disclosure statement of Gurjot and Gurpreet Singh, basis which the implication was made, cannot seek to *prima facie* exculpate the accused particularly in view of numerous corroborative evidence.

38. Notably, the connection of petitioner with Navpreet Singh is further sought to be proved through the recovery of the cheque book of Navpreet Singh at the instance of the petitioner, one of the cheques from that cheque book was in fact used to purchase a flat at Shri Radha Krishna apartments, which belongs to Navpreet Singh. Communication analysis also revealed that several calls have been made through petitioner's iCloud to Navpreet Singh's iCloud. Also, cheque book, PAN card and Election Card of Navpreet Singh were recovered at petitioner's instance.

39. As per the status report, the main king pin Navpreet Singh is suspected to be based out of Turkey and there is a serious flight risk as regards the petitioner.

40. The petition suffers from specific allegations against him as regards having played a central and facilitative role in the entire operation. It was at his instance and from his residence, that various identification cards and property papers belonging to accused Navpreet Singh (alleged kingpin) were recovered.

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: MANISH KUMAR
Signing Date: 05.10.2024
12:22:45

RAIL APPLN. 550/2024

10 of 19



2024:DHC:7713



Further, he gave accused Gurpreet Singh a car at the behest of accused Navpreet Singh. The iPhone that has been used by the ‘syndicate’ to carry out their illegal activities were made available to co-accused Gurpreet and Gurjot by the petitioner, again at the behest of Navpreet Singh. iPhone carrying the iCloud ID of the petitioner was recovered from the instance of accused Gurpreet Singh, at whose instance a recovery of 239.5 Kg *heroin* has been recovered.

41. It is imperative to take into account the complexity of the *modus operandi* involved in the present case. The drug syndicate carries out its activities across various states of the country through the means of sophisticated technology and shell companies. Further the nature of the drug involved in the present case (*heroin*) and the amount of quantity *recovered in toto* from the entire transaction (358.6 Kgs) cannot be lost sight of.

42. Considering the nature of the crime, the complexity and sophistication of the syndicate operations and the role of the petitioner, it is pertinent to advert to the decision of a co-ordinate bench of this court in ***Mansher v. State (NCT of Delhi)*** 2024 SCC OnLine Del 1286, which although is a decision passed at the stage of anticipatory bail, yet dealt with a factual situation starkly similar to the present case. The accused in ***Mansher (supra)*** as in the present case, used various technological softwares such as Telegram, Facetime, Voxer etc. to communicate with each other. The accused in ***Mansher (supra)*** alleged that he was falsely implicated. The observations made by the Court in this regard are extracted hereunder:

“23. The internet usage of these numbers of the applicants further revealed that they were used to

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: MANISH KUMAR
Signing Date: 05.10.2024
12:22:45

RAIL APPLN. 550/2024

11 of 19



communicate by way of private internet calls, through Telegram, Facetime, Voxer, Session, etc. The co-accused Mukul also disclosed that he had previously delivered a drug parcel via Porter App to applicant Lokesh Dhingra at the road near Inderpuri. The data retrieved from the Porter App used by the co-accused Mukul corroborates that the parcel was picked to be delivered at Inderpuri.

xxx

xxx

xxx

35. The menace of drug trafficking has the potential of affecting a large number of gullible people. Looking at the manner which is alleged by the State to have been employed by the applicants, the task of the investigating agency is arduous. Various means of technological advancements seem to have been employed that has made the task tougher for the investigating agency. In such a scenario, in the opinion of this Court, some play in the joints has to be provided to the State. It cannot be expected that in such circumstances, the investigating agency would be through with the investigation at such a nascent stage. The same would require the custodial interrogation of the accused persons.

xxx

xxx

xxx

36. Even though, it is alleged that the applicants have been falsely implicated by certain police officials who had accompanied the raiding party, the same, at this stage, is not a relevant fact for deciding the present applications. However, since specific allegations have been made against police officials, the respondent is directed to enquire the said aspect.

xxx

xxx

xxx

39. The present case involves recovery of a commercial quantity of contraband. The allegations against the



present applicants are that they are the kingpins of the syndicate. The contrabands are alleged to have been imported from the other countries through dark web and distributed amongst the public in this country.

xxx

xxx

xxx

41. Dismantling such a complex modus operandi, which is alleged to have been used by the applicants and the other accused persons, by its very nature, requires thorough investigation and custodial interrogation.”

(emphasis supplied)

43. A co-ordinate bench of this Court in **Joyce Karoung v. Narcotics Control Bureau** 2018 SCC OnLine Del 9599 denied bail to an accused who was a major link in a drug syndicate, considering his role in the entire transaction involving commercial quantity of *cocaine*, even though there was no recovery from the petitioner therein. The relevant paragraphs of the said judgment have been extracted hereunder:

“23. It is not a case that the Petitioner has been apprehended solely on the basis of statement given by the co-accused. Petitioner is also alleged to have been arrested as part of the search and seizure operation from one of the places, which was disclosed by the co-accused during the operation. Not only is the petitioner alleged to have been apprehended, she is alleged to have led to the arrest of another co-accused Stephen, who is alleged to have come to collect the bag of drugs from the petitioner. The petitioner is alleged to be a major link in the entire operation. Stephen who is apprehended on the disclosure of the petitioner in his statement under section 67 has also named the petitioner and shown her involvement. Not only has he named her, but has also stated that earlier also he had



come with one James to collect drugs from the petitioner.”

(emphasis added)

44. Further, the judgment of the High Court of Chhattisgarh in ***Sambhav Parakh v. State of Chhattisgarh*** 2021 SCC OnLine Chh 469, while discussing the judgment of this Court in ***Joyce Karoung*** (*supra*) held as follows:

“23. In Joyce Karoung v. Narcotics Control Bureau, the Delhi High Court has held that all those persons who are major link in the entire operation have to be treated in the same manner as if they have taken part in trading of commercial quantity of drugs.”

(emphasis added)

45. In ***Mehabub Rahaman v. State (NCT of Delhi)*** 2023 SCC OnLine Del 3488 commercial quantity *heroin* had been recovered from co-accused, however no recovery had been effected from the petitioner therein. This Court while dealing with allegations of conspiracy, basis other evidence on record, held that while disclosure statements themselves are not admissible, existence of conspiracy will have to be proven during trial and reasonable grounds do not exist to record that accused is not guilty of offence alleged. Relevant paragraphs of the said judgment have been extracted hereunder:

“15. Therefore, pursuant to appreciation of the contentions of the parties and perusal of records of the case, in the considered opinion of this Court, the possibility that the petitioner would be likely to commit an offence while on bail cannot be ruled out considering his antecedents as also it would be difficult to reach a prima facie conclusion at this stage that he was not involved in the conspiracy of supply of heroin. This



Court also takes note of the investigating agency's strong reliance on the various interceptions of phone conversations over a period of time, along with matching voice samples of Bajlur Rahaman, Abu Bakar, Saidul, and the petitioner, and the large recovery of 10.5 kg of heroin, the source of which was finally traced out to the petitioner, as part of the investigation. Even though disclosure statements alone are not admissible, the existence of the conspiracy would have to be proved during the trial and it would be difficult in these circumstances to accord satisfaction that there are reasonable grounds to believe that he is not guilty of such an offence.”

(emphasis added)

46. As regards the objection relating to lack of independent witnesses, reliance is placed on the Supreme Court's observation in **Jagvinder Singh v. State of Punjab**, Order dt. 2nd November 2023 in CrI. Appeal No. 2027/2012, relevant portion of the said order has been extracted as under:

“We find no merit in this appeal. Law does not require only an independent witness to prove a charge attracting the provisions of NDPS Act. As was rightly held by the Courts below, there is procedural compliance with respect to arrest, seizure and recovery. PW-3 is competent to undertake the exercise of gathering evidence and, in any case, PW-7 who himself is a gazetted officer was very much present. The recovery was also made from the car. The views expressed by the Courts below that non-filling of the CFCL form at the site where the arrest and recovery was made would not vitiate the case as it constitutes a part of procedural law.”



47. And as regards the objection of the process under Section 52A not being followed, it is noted that there is no bar in taking the samples at the stage of seizure, particularly in light of what is explicitly stated in Standing Order No. 1/89 which mandates sampling at stage of seizure and, thereafter, Section 52A procedure for the purpose of pre-trial disposal.

Prolonged custody and delay in trial

48. The petitioner's counsel submitted that petitioner has been incarcerated for about 3 years and 3 months and the charges are yet to be framed and therefore claims release on the ground of prolonged custody.

49. It is submitted that there is no standard guideline to assess as to what would be the period of custody that should be considered as '*prolonged*'; each case would have to be seen in its own facts and circumstances. Especially when no other factor, as contended by petitioner would enable him to overcome the prescribed threshold under Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

49.1 The Supreme Court has consistently held in various decisions that bail on ground of undue delay in trial is unfettered by rigors by Section 37 of the NDPS Act, where there is prolonged custody even in cases of commercial quantity. In this regard, the decisions of the Supreme Court in, ***Rabi Prakash v State of Odisha*** 2023 SCC OnLine SC 1109 (recovery of 247 kgs of *ganja* and applicant had been in custody for more than three and a half years), ***Dheeraj Kumar Shukla v State of U.P.*** 2023 SCC OnLine SC 918 (seizure of about 65 kgs of *ganja* and the petitioner was in custody for about two and



2024:DHC:7713



a half years), ***Man Mandal & Anr. v State of West Bengal*** 2023 SCC OnLine SC 1868 (seizure which was commercial in nature and the petitioner had been incarcerated for about two years), ***Badsha Sk. v State of West Bengal*** 2023 SCC OnLine SC 1867 (seizure of 100 bottles of Phensedyl Cough Syrup, 100 ml. each, containing Codeine Phosphate, the petitioner had been in custody for about 2 years 4 months) and ***Mohd. Muslim alias Hussain v State (NCT of Delhi)*** 2023 SCC OnLine SC 352 (recovery of 180 kg of *ganja* and applicant was in custody for over 7 years and 4 months), are relevant.

49.2 Coordinate benches of this Court have also considered the principles set out by the Supreme Court and granted bail in ***Gurpreet Singh v State of NCT of Delhi*** 2024 SCC OnLine Del 696 wherein a seizure of 26.790 kgs of *ganja* was done and only 2 witnesses had been examined, having been in custody for three and a half years, the petitioner was granted bail; in ***Ramesh Kumar v D.R.I.*** 2024 SCC Online Del 5304, where recovery of 457 kgs of *ganja*, the petitioner having been in custody for about three and a half years, the Court in relying upon these principles laid out by the Supreme Court granted bail; in ***Gopal Dangi v State*** 2024 SCC OnLine Del 4825, a case of recovery of 260 kgs of *ganja* and only one witness having been examined and the petitioner having been in custody for about 2 years, was granted bail.

49.3 In SLP (Crl) 4648/2024 titled ***Ankur Chaudhary v State of Madhya Pradesh*** order dated 28th May 2024, it was held by the Supreme Court as under:

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: MANISH KUMAR
Signing Date: 05.10.2024
12:22:45

BAIL APPLN. 550/2024

17 of 19



“It is to observe that failure to conclude the trial within a reasonable time resulting in prolonged incarceration militates against the precious fundamental right guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, and as such, conditional liberty overriding the statutory embargo created under Section 37(1)(b) of the NDPS Act may, in such circumstances, be considered.”

(emphasis added)

49.4 What may be relevant to weigh in balance in the present case, is the nature of the contraband seized. Most of the decisions cited above, giving benefit of bail for prolonged custody, seem to be cases where *ganja* was involved and were based on their own peculiar facts. Though this cannot be formulaic, the analysis serves as a useful guidepost.

50. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, considering the large amount of *heroin* involved (about 359 kg), the sophisticated and complex nature of the conspiracy, *modus operandi* of the accused, role ascribed to the petitioner, and a serious possibility of flight risk. it cannot be said that the petitioner has been able to overcome the rigors of Section 37. The plea for regular bail cannot be granted, at this stage.

51. Notably, the Supreme Court in ***Ranjan Kumar Chadha v State of Himachal Pradesh*** 2023 SCC OnLine SC 1262 took note of the adverse effects of the menace of drug trafficking, upon the society, as under:

“129. It has been observed in Baldev Singh (supra) that drug abuse is a social malady. While drug addiction eats into the vitals of the society, drug trafficking not only eats into the vitals of the economy of a country, but illicit money generated by drug trafficking is often used for illicit activities including encouragement of terrorism. It



2024:DHC:7713



has acquired the dimensions of an epidemic, affects the economic policies of the State, corrupts the system and is detrimental to the future of a country.”

(emphasis added)

52. Accordingly, petition is dismissed. Pending applications (if any) are rendered infructuous.

53. Judgment be uploaded on the website of this Court.

(ANISH DAYAL)
JUDGE

OCTOBER 04, 2024/RK/kp

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: MANISH KUMAR
Signing Date: 05.10.2024
12:22:45

RAIL APPLN. 550/2024

19 of 19