



\$~3

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

BAIL APPLN. 3406/2025

MANJULA

.....Petitioner

Through: Dr. Shashi Kiran Senior Advocate
with Mr. Rohit Pandey, Mr.
Adhyayan Gupta, Ms. Ashtha
Shrivastav, Ms. Aryama Dubey, Mr.
Amit Kumar Mishra, Mr. Ipsit Pallav,
Ms. Jyoti Dedha, Ms. Tannu Tyagi,
Mr. Utkarsh Chauhan, Mr. Ajay
Pratap Singh and Mr. Hridyesh Singh,
Advocates

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for the State

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

19.11.2025

%

1. By way of the present application, the applicant seeks grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 0209/2025, registered at Police Station Lajpat Nagar, Delhi, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 20/29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereafter '*NDPS Act*').
2. Briefly stated, the facts of the present case are that on 11.05.2025, a secret information, eventually recorded as DD No. 5A at AATS/SED, had been received regarding two persons transporting *ganja* in an auto-rickshaw in the Jal Vihar area, Lajpat Nagar, Delhi. A raid was conducted, whereafter



one Tarun and one Md. Usman had been apprehended from TSR No. DL1RQ6193 with two white plastic *kattas* containing a total of 22.670 kg of *ganja*. The said narcotic substance was seized, and the accused persons were arrested. During the course of investigation, the accused persons disclosed that they used to procure *ganja* from one Waseem, on the directions of one Arumugam, and from one Sikander, on the directions of applicant Manjula, after procuring the same, they used to deliver narcotic substances to Arumugam and Manjula. Co-accused Tarun also revealed the mobile number of the present applicant as 92*****29. Thereafter, a raid was conducted at the *jhuggi* of the applicant, however, the same was found to have been locked. The present applicant was eventually arrested on 15.05.2025 and at her instance, a mobile phone box bearing IMEI 86868407692576 was recovered from her *jhuggi*. The Call Detail Records (CDRs) analysis revealed that the mobile number allegedly used by the applicant, actually stood registered in the name of co-accused Tarun; however, the same was being operated from the mobile phone having the above-mentioned IMEI. During subsequent investigation, raids were also conducted on 27.08.2025 and 30.08.2025 at co-accused Arumugam's *jhuggi*; however, the same was found locked, and the said accused could not be located, despite issuance of NBWs and initiation of requisite proceedings under Section 84 of BNSS qua him. The chargesheet in the present case stands filed against the present accused.

3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant argues that that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is argued that the only incriminating material against the applicant is the disclosure statement of the co-accused persons, which is inadmissible in law.



Moreover, it is submitted that bail cannot be denied to the applicant only on the basis of CDRs between the applicant and the co-accused persons. It is contended that since the chargesheet now stands filed against the applicant, her further custody is unwarranted and therefore, she be granted regular bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned APP for the State argues that the allegations against the present applicant are serious in nature, and that the applicant herein was actively involved in the supply of the narcotic substance in connivance with co-accused persons. It is contended that at the applicant's instance, a mobile phone box linked to the IMEI used with the relevant SIM was recovered from the applicant's *jhuggi*. Additionally, it is submitted that the CDR analysis establishes her regular communication with the co-accused persons, Tarun and Arumugam. The learned APP also submits that commercial quantity of *ganja* was recovered from the co-accused Tarun, in whose name the SIM card used by the applicant is actually registered. Therefore, it is prayed that the present application be rejected.

5. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed by the learned counsel for the applicant as well as the learned APP for the State and has also perused the material available on record.

6. In the present case, this Court finds that there has been a recovery of 22.670 kg of *ganja* from the possession of co-accused persons Tarun and Md. Usman, which constitutes commercial quantity under the NDPS Act. The role attributed to the present applicant is that she was allegedly distributing the narcotic substances, procured by the said co-accused persons on her directions.



7. It is not in dispute that the name of the present applicant surfaced in the disclosure statements of the co-accused persons; however, during the course of investigation, the applicant was arrested and, at her instance, a mobile phone box bearing IMEI No. 86868407692576 was recovered from her *jhuggi*. The CAF details of Mobile No. 92*****29*, allegedly used by the applicant, revealed that the said mobile number was registered in the name of co-accused Tarun, from whom recovery of commercial quantity of ganja was effected. Although the mobile handset itself could not be recovered, it was found that the aforesaid mobile number was being operated from a handset having the same IMEI number as that on the box recovered from the applicant's *jhuggi*. Further, the CDR analysis of the said mobile number reflected regular and repeated contact between the present applicant and co-accused persons Tarun and Arumugam. These facts, emerging from the investigation, taken together, *prima facie* indicate the applicant's nexus and involvement with the co-accused persons in connection with the alleged offences.

8. In this backdrop, this Court also notes that, as pointed out by the learned APP for the State, co-accused Arumugam – with whom the applicant shares CDR connectivity – is still absconding.

9. Considering the above circumstances, including the recovery of commercial quantity from co-accused persons, the recovery of the mobile phone box linking her to the IMEI used with the relevant mobile number, the CDR connectivity showing regular contact with co-accused persons including an absconding accused, and the stage of the case where prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined, this Court is of the view that



no ground for grant of regular bail is made out.

10. The bail application is accordingly dismissed.

11. It is, however, clarified that nothing expressed hereinabove shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on merits of the case.

12. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

NOVEMBER 19, 2025/ns

VS