



\$~4

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 4048/2025 & CRL.M.A. 35697/2025**

ARVIND SINGH

.....Applicant

Through: Mr. Sanjay Hedge, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Rahul Kumar, Mr.
Mantosh Kumar and Mr. Gautam
Kumar, Advocates

versus

STATE GOVT NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Raghuinder Verma, APP for
State with Mr. Aditya Vikram
Singh and Ms. Upasna Bakshi,
Advocates with SI Vikas Deep,
ANTF/ Crime Branch

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

19.03.2026

%

1. By virtue of the present application under *Section 483* of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (***BNSS***) (corresponding to *Section 439* of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973) the applicant seeks regular bail in the proceedings emanating from FIR No.212/2024 dated 27.10.2024, registered under *Sections 22(c)/25/29* of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at P.S. Crime Branch..

2. *Briefly put*, based on secret information a trap was laid down and the co-accused Chandan Kumar Rout was apprehended. Upon search, co-accused Chandan was found in possession of 6.972 kg of Tramadol in tablet form, who disclosed that the said contraband had been illegally



supplied to him by the present applicant and was going to supply the same to one Sushant. At the instance of co-accused Chandan, applicant was identified. During investigation, though it was revealed that the contraband recovered from the possession of co-accused Chandan were part of the stock that were legally procured by the present applicant from Frederick Healthcare LLP and other sources, however, the applicant failed to produce any sale invoices or records of the recovered contraband. Moreover, drug inspection also confirmed that the applicant was the source of the recovered contraband. Thereafter, the applicant was arrested on 28.10.2024.

3. In these facts, learned counsel for the applicant praying for enlarging the applicant on regular bail submits that *[i]* the applicant runs a licensed (now expired) medical shop and has been falsely implicated in the present case by the investigating agency; *[ii]* there is no recovery from the possession or premises of the applicant and the only material which has come on record against him is the disclosure statement; *[iii]* there is no videography of the alleged recovery from the co-accused Chandan, or of the premises of the applicant; *[iv]* all the drugs mentioned in the Inspection Report are legally obtained drugs; *[v]* at best, it is a case of accounting error by applicant; *[vi]* the applicant has been in judicial custody for a period of nearly *17 months* and the investigation qua him stands completed and the matter is currently at the stage of framing of charges, and therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the applicant in custody anymore; and lastly *[vii]* three co-accused persons have already been granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned APP for the State opposing the present



application, submits that *[i]* the allegation against the applicant is serious in nature inasmuch as he is the source of the drugs recovered from the co-accused and was engaged in the illegal sale without invoices/ prescriptions; *[ii]* applicant is also involved in other FIRs as well in similar illegal activities; and *[iii]* the quantity of contraband recovered from the co-accused falls under ‘commercial quantity’.

5. Heard learned counsels and gone through the documents on record.

6. The applicant, who is a Chemist, was/ is expected to adhere to a higher standard of care, diligence and statutory compliance, especially while dealing with drugs. This is a case wherein the applicant is guilty of unleashing narcotic substance as if it is a common salt across the counter. This means the applicant is in more than one way responsible for making something public, *albeit* in a different form, which is not *per se* medically and/ or legally permissible. The same will, *no doubt*, have a far-reaching impact on the innocent and vulnerable members of the public. Interestingly, applicant in the present case is alleged to be the source of the drugs recovered from the other accused persons, and since he does not possess the (mandatory) records/ documents, the same raises a cause of concern. The arguments, thus, raised by learned counsel for the applicant need not be adverted to at this stage, which are, in any event, a matter of trial.

7. Considering the aforesaid factors, in cases of this nature this Court is to tread with care and caution as also apply a stringent and strict approach. As such, though the applicant is facing incarceration for nearly *17 months* and the investigation *qua* him stands concluded with the chargesheet having been filed, however, balancing the same with the



aforesaid factors there are no grounds for the grant of bail at this stage, particularly in view of his role.

8. As such, the present bail application is dismissed.

9. Needless to say, since the expression of opinion, if any, are for the purposes of adjudicating the present application only, they have no bearing on the overall merits/ trial involved.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J.

MARCH 19, 2026/So