



\$~2

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 3220/2023**
SAQUIB PARVEZPetitioner
Through: Mr. Mohd. Suza Faisal, Adv.

versus

NARCOTICS CONTRL BUREAU DELHIRespondent
Through: Mr. Arun Khatri, Sr. SC for NCB
with Ms. Shelly Dixit and Ms.
Anoushka Bhalla, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

30.01.2025

%

1. The present petition has been filed seeking anticipatory bail in connection with Case No. VIII/21/DZU/2023 under Sections 8(C)/22(C)/23/29 of NDPS Act.
2. The case of the prosecution is that on 08.05.2023, on the basis of the secret information a seizure of 14,700 tablets of Alprazolam tablets and 10,030 tablets of Tramadol was affected from a parcel bearing Airway Bill No. 21115243822 at Garudavega International Courier, RZ-A-135, Ground Floor, Hall No.2, Near Grand Shobha Hotel, Mahipalpur, New Delhi - 110037. The said tablets were being sent outside India in conspiracy by Ankit Goel with other associates.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the only allegation against the present petitioner is that the bank account which has been opened in the name of the present petitioner was connected to the mobile number



which was in the name of co-accused Ankit Goel. Thus, it is the co-accused Ankit Goel who was operating the said account on behalf of the present petitioner.

4. He further submits that the petitioner was only working as an employee of Ankit Goel. He submits that there is no other incriminating material against the present petitioner to show his involvement.

5. He further submits that one of the co-accused Pankaj Sahu, who was initially arrested by the respondent agency, has already been enlarged on bail.

6. *Per contra*, the learned Sr. Standing Counsel for the NCB/respondent has argued on the lines of the Status Report.

7. On a query posed by the Court, he submits that the present petitioner has joined investigation on three different occasions after he was granted interim protection by the learned Special Judge and during investigation, he has also handed over his mobile to the concerned I.O.

8. It is not in dispute that the involvement of the present petitioner is only to the extent that bank account opened in his name was used by co-accused Ankit Goel and the said bank account was connected with the mobile which was in the name of co-accused Ankit Goel. Further in the backdrop of the fact that the petitioner is stated to be an employee of co-accused Ankit Goel, the petitioner does not appear to be directly involved in the sale of contraband.

9. Further, it is not the case of the respondent that any recovery was made from the present petitioner nor the petitioner has any criminal record.

10. Therefore, this court is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is not guilty of the alleged offence and that he is



not likely to commit any offence while on bail.

11. Having regard to the aforesaid circumstances, this Court is of the view that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of anticipatory bail.

12. In view of the above, it is directed that in the event of petitioner's arrest, he be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs. 50,000/- each and a surety bond of the like amount to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer / Arresting Officer and further subject to the following conditions that:-

(i) Petitioners shall join investigation as and when directed by the I.O concerned.

(ii) Petitioner shall not influence the witnesses in any manner or try to contact the complainant or tamper with the evidence.

13. With the aforesaid directions, the petition stands disposed of.

14. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

JANUARY 30, 2025/dss