



\$~16

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 6647/2025**

MANPREET SINGH GILL

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Sana Raees Khan, Mr. Pranay
Chitale and Mr. Aditya Dutta,
Advocates

versus

NARCOTICS CONTROL BUREAU & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Arun Khatri, SCC NCB, Ms.
Shelly Dixit, Ms. Poonam Rani, Ms.
Priyanka, Ms. Tracy Sebastian and
Ms. Anisha Maan, Advocates

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

%

23.09.2025

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner is seeking modification of the order dated 12.09.2024, passed by the learned Trial Court, to extent that to waive or suitable reduce the required to submit personal security and surety of Rs.25 Lakhs and substitute such security as may be found reasonable by this Court.

2. *Vide* order dated 19.09.2025, this Court has observed as under:

“....1. Notice has already been issued in this matter on 17th September 2025.

2. Status Report has been handed over by the SSC on behalf of the Narcotics Control Bureau (‘NCB’) who has vehemently objected to the plea raised by petitioner for reduction of personal security and surety.



3. Counsel for petitioner states that petitioner, being a Canadian citizen, has been unemployed for the last two years, as he is in India, and has been incarcerated. He would therefore be unable to submit Rs. 25 lakhs as personal security as well as to arrange surety of Rs. 25 lakhs, and he would be able to only manage about Rs. 5 lakhs.

4. Mr. Khatri, SSC for the NCB, states that they have also filed a petition challenging the order whereby the petitioner is permitted to go to Canada and seeks to place the Status Report on record, which he shall do, on or before, the next date of hearing, with advance copy to counsel for the petitioner.

5. Counsel for petitioner states that they are willing to pay expenses of the police escort to Canada for the purposes of ensuring that the petitioner does not abscond in any manner and is available on the date, at the stage of framing of charge.

6. List on 23rd September 2025....”

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has stated that on 19.09.2025, he was willing to pay expenses of the police escort to Canada for the purposes of ensuring that he does not abscond and is available on the date, at the stage of framing of charge.

4. This Court is of the view that taking up to his escort Canada would entail more expenses than furnishing a surety of Rs. 25 Lakhs and if he has the finances to finance police escort team to Canada and to be back with them, he can furnish surety of Rs. 25 Lakhs.

5. This Court has gone through the impugned order. Having considered overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that the learned Trial Court’s order directing tendering of surety on personal bond in the sum of Rs. 25 Lakhs has been passed with a view to ensure the presence of the accused in India at the time when the case is taken up for trial or framing of charge, etc.

6. However, the contention of the accused is that he has no person to stand surety for him, this Court, however, notes that the petitioner herein is a



person of Indian region as per statement of the petitioner himself, and he had come to India for the purpose of getting married and had got married. If that be his contention, the very fact that he had got married in India, would point out that now he has relatives in India to stand surety for him.

7. However, considering the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, the personal security and surety of Rs.25 Lakhs is reduced to Rs.20 Lakhs.

8. In view of the above, the present petition stands disposed of.

9. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

SEPTEMBER 23, 2025/zp