



\$~80

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 4925/2025**

TRILOK CHAND

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Sakshi Mehley, Ms. Harshita Kumar, Mr. Sajal Manchanda and Mr. Varun Garg, Advocates

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Aashneet Singh, APP for the State with SI Rohit ANTF, Crime Branch

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

02.02.2026

%

1. By way of the instant application, the applicant seeks grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR bearing No. 0270/2024, registered at Police Station Crime Branch, North District, Delhi for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 22(C)/25/29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereafter '*NDPS Act*').
2. The brief facts of the present case are that on 25.12.2024, at about 03:30 PM, a secret informer conveyed information to the police team of ANTF, Crime Branch that Salman and Samaludden @ Sadiq were involved in the illegal supply of narcotic and psychotropic substances, namely Alprazolam, Tramadol and Codeine-based cough syrup, and that they would arrive on the same day between 04:30 PM and 05:30 PM near N-Block, Bawana Industrial Area, Delhi, for the purpose of supplying the said



contraband. After recording the said information and complying with the provisions of Section 42 of the NDPS Act, and upon obtaining directions from the senior officers, a raiding team was constituted. At about 04:45 PM, on the identification of the secret informer, a white commercial vehicle bearing No. DL-1LP-0758 was intercepted near N-176, Bawana Industrial Area, and four persons, namely Samaludden @ Sadiq, Gulzar, Salman and Sumer (driver of the vehicle), were apprehended. After complying with the mandatory provisions of Section 50 of the NDPS Act, personal searches of all the apprehended persons were conducted, however, no contraband was recovered from their personal possession. Thereafter, upon checking the rear portion of the said vehicle, 63 cardboard boxes were recovered, which on inspection were found to contain Codeine-based cough syrup and Alprazolam tablets. On detailed verification, the recovery comprised 9,000 bottles of Codeine-based cough syrup and 1,80,000 tablets of Alprazolam, which fall within the category of *commercial quantity*. Drug Inspectors from the Delhi Drugs Control Department were present at the spot, and the accused persons failed to produce any valid licence or document for possession, storage or transportation of the recovered substances. Later the recovered contraband was seized and sealed at the spot, and the accused persons were arrested.

3. Further investigation was thereafter handed over to the concerned Investigating Officer, and the main chargesheet was filed against nine other accused persons whose names surfaced during the course of investigation. During the investigation, notices under Section 94 BNSS were also issued to certain firms/companies. In the course of further investigation, on 19.09.2025, a notice under Section 67 of the NDPS Act was served upon



present applicant/ accused Trilok Chand, the owner of TS Enterprises, directing him to join the investigation in the present case. Pursuant thereto, the said Trilok Chand joined the investigation at the office of ANTF, Crime Branch, Delhi. He was interrogated, and upon completion of interrogation, he was arrested on 19.09.2025 in the present case.

4. The learned counsel for the applicant/accused argues that the applicant/accused has been falsely implicated and that he is a bona fide pharmaceutical trader holding valid GST registration and drug licence. Further it is argued that the transaction in question was a lawful commercial sale supported by purchase orders, invoices, and e-way bills, carried out in the ordinary course of business. It is argued that the applicant/ accused has fully cooperated with the investigation and duly replied to notices under Section 94 BNSS. No incriminating recovery has been made from him, and he is not even named in the FIR. It is also argued that the investigation *qua* the applicant/ accused stands completed, and there is no risk of absconding or tampering with evidence. Hence, continued custody serves no purpose, and the applicant/accused undertakes to abide by all bail conditions. In view of these circumstances, it is submitted that the applicant/accused is entitled to the relief of bail.

5. *Per contra*, the learned APP for the state has strongly opposed the present bail application on the ground that the allegations are grave and involve *commercial quantity* of narcotic substances. Investigation reveals that T.S. Enterprises supplied 1080 boxes of Tramadol to C.S. Enterprises, which was found to be a shell company with forged drug licences, a fact verified by the Drug Inspector. The documents of Chhinder Singh were misused to create the said shell entity, and he has denied any connection



with T.S. Enterprises. Further, it also emphasized that non-production of accused Sangam Kumar despite issuance of multiple production warrants clearly indicates that the investigation is still at a crucial stage, and custodial interrogation of the applicant may be necessary to unearth the larger conspiracy and network involved. In view of the seriousness of the offence and the rigours of the NDPS Act, the applicant is not entitled to the relief of bail. It is further contended by the Ld. APP that there exists a reasonable apprehension that, if released on bail, the applicant may tamper with evidence or influence witnesses. In view of the above, it is prayed that the bail application be rejected.

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

7. Upon careful consideration of the material placed on record and the rival submissions, this Court finds that the role attributed to the applicant/accused is not peripheral in nature. The investigation *prima facie* reveals that T.S. Enterprises, of which the applicant is the proprietor, supplied 1080 boxes of Tramadol capsules to C.S. Enterprises without proper verification of its credentials. Subsequent investigation reveals that C.S. Enterprises is a shell entity with no physical existence and that the purported drug licences in Forms 20B and 21B are forged and not registered on the official portal. The statement of Chhinder Singh discloses the misuse of his personal documents for the creation of the said firm, without his knowledge or consent. These circumstances, *prima facie*, reflect a serious breach of statutory safeguards governing NRx medicines and indicate serious lapses and active involvement on the part of the applicant in the illicit supply chain.



8. This Court further notes that the offence alleged is grave and serious in nature and involves the recovery of narcotic and psychotropic substances in *commercial quantity* from another co-accused, Sangam Kumar, which was sold by the present applicant/accused to him, thereby attracting the strict bar under Section 37 of the NDPS Act. At this stage, the material on record discloses reasonable grounds to *prima facie* link the applicant with the offence as the magnitude of the quantity involved, coupled with the organised manner in which the transactions were structured, attracts the rigours of the NDPS Act and raises a strong presumption against the applicant at this stage.

9. The material on record *prima facie* indicates C.S. Enterprises was a shell entity with no physical existence and without valid or registered drug licences. In such regulated trade, it was incumbent upon the applicant/accused, as a licensed pharmaceutical dealer, to verify the credentials and licences of the purchasing firm before effecting supply.

10. This Court further notes that the interrogation *qua* co-accused Sangam Kumar, a key link alleged to have facilitated the creation and operation of the shell company C.S. Enterprises is still pending. In view thereof, the existence of a larger conspiracy and a wider network cannot be ruled out which requires custodial interrogation of the applicant to effectively unravel the entire chain of events .

11. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is satisfied that there exists a reasonable apprehension that, if released on bail, the applicant may tamper with evidence, influence witnesses, or impede the course of justice. The nature of the allegations, the commercial quantity involved, the apparent use of shell entities, and the likelihood of the offence



involving a wider network of persons clearly outweigh the grounds urged for bail. Consequently, this Court finds no merit in the bail application, and the same is accordingly rejected.

12. The present bail application is, accordingly, dismissed.

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

14. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

FEBRUARY 02, 2026/A

GJ/R