



\$~62

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1101/2026**

RAJAT @ RANJIT @ RAJIT

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pradeep Chowdhary, Mr. Vikrant Chowdhary and Mr. Gaurav Kapoor, Advs.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for the State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

% **19.03.2026**

CRL.M.A. 8341/2026 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 1101/2026

3. By way of the present application, the applicant seeks grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 251/2025, registered at Police Station Sarita Vihar, Delhi, for offences punishable under Sections 20/29 of the Narcotic and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereafter '*NDPS Act*').

4. Briefly stated, on 01.04.2025, a secret information was received that one Dilip (co-accused), allegedly involved in the supply of *ganja* in South-East Delhi, would arrive near Sarita Vihar District Park at about 11:00 PM to receive a large consignment of *ganja* from his associates. Acting upon the said information, a raiding team was constituted and a trap was laid. At about 10:45 PM, co-accused Sidharth Karada, Subroto Mondal and Jhuni



Jena arrived in a Wagon-R taxi bearing No. UP17AT1175 to supply ganja to co-accused Dilip, who had reached the spot on a motorcycle. On being pointed out by the secret informer, all four co-accused persons were apprehended. Upon search, 11.180 kg of *ganja* was recovered from co-accused Dilip, 12.05 kg from co-accused Sidharth Karada, and 5.110 kg from co-accused Jhuni Jena, leading to registration of the present FIR.

5. During investigation, the aforesaid accused persons were arrested and, upon interrogation, disclosed that the consignment had been procured from Odisha on the instructions of co-accused Dilip. They further disclosed that the present applicant, Rajat @ Ranjit @ Rajit, was the main supplier of the recovered ganja from Odisha to Delhi. Thereafter, raids were conducted at the applicant's native place; however, he could not be apprehended and was allegedly absconding. It is further the case of the prosecution that notices under Section 67 of the NDPS Act were pasted at his residence and rented premises directing him to join investigation, but he failed to do so. Consequently, NBWs were issued against him, and he was declared a Proclaimed Offender *vide* order dated 27.02.2026.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant argues that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and has no role in the commission of alleged offence. It is contended that the alleged involvement of the applicant is based solely on the disclosure statement of a co-accused persons, which, being inadmissible in evidence, cannot form the sole basis of his implication, particularly in the absence of any independent corroboration. It is also argued that custodial interrogation of the applicant is not required, as no recovery is to be effected from him, and the case of the prosecution is primarily based on documentary evidence and Call Detail



Record (CDR) analysis, which are already within the possession of the investigating agency. It is further submitted that the applicant is willing to cooperate with the investigation and undertakes to join the same as and when required by the Investigating Officer. In these circumstances, it is prayed that the applicant be granted anticipatory bail.

7. On the other hand, the learned APP for the State opposes the bail application and argues that commercial quantity of *ganja* was recovered in the present case from the co-accused persons, who have disclosed that the present applicant is the source of recovered *ganja*, who supplies narcotic substance between Odisha and Delhi, and therefore, his custodial interrogation is necessary to unearth the entire syndicate. It is also argued that the applicant has deliberately avoided the process of law and has been declared a proclaimed offender by the learned Trial Court and therefore, he is not entitled to the relief of anticipatory bail.

8. This Court has **heard** arguments on behalf of the applicant as well as the State, and has perused the material available on record.

9. In the present case, this Court notes that four co-accused persons were apprehended with a total recovery of 28.340 kg of *ganja*, which falls within the category of commercial quantity, from a vehicle bearing registration No. UP17AT1175. During the course of investigation, it has been revealed that the applicant herein is allegedly the main supplier of the said narcotic substance and constitutes a crucial link in the supply chain operating between Odisha and Delhi.

10. This Court also notes that during the course of investigation, the CDRs of the accused persons were analysed, which reveals that the present applicant was in regular telephonic contact with them, which at this stage,



indicates his involvement in the commission of the offence.

11. It is also pertinent to note that despite notices having been duly served at the applicant's residence in Odisha and the issuance of NBWs against him, the applicant failed to join the investigation. Consequently, he has been declared a Proclaimed Offender by the learned Trial Court *vide* order dated 27.02.2026.

12. The argument of the learned counsel for the applicant that he has been implicated solely on the basis of disclosure statements of co-accused persons is unpersuasive at this stage for grant of anticipatory bail, particularly in view of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***State of Haryana v. Samarth Kumar***: 2022 SCC OnLine SC 2087, inasmuch as commercial quantity of *ganja* was recovered from the co-accused persons, which is alleged to have been supplied by the present applicant.

13. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, particularly the recovery of commercial quantity of *ganja* from co-accused persons, the CDR analysis, and the conduct of the applicant in not joining the investigation, this Court finds no ground for grant of anticipatory bail to the applicant.

14. Accordingly, the present application is dismissed.

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

16. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

MARCH 19, 2026/A

ap