



* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

Reserved on: January 19, 2026
% *Pronounced on: January 31, 2026*

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3952/2025**

PRAMOD @ PARMALApplicant

Through: Mr. Abhishek Khari, Advocate

Versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)Respondent

Through: Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP for State with Ms. Vanshika Singh and Mr. Bhanu Pratap Singh, Advocates with SI Narender Singh, PS: Crime Branch

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

JUDGMENT

1. By virtue of the present bail application made under *Section 483* of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (*BNSS*), the applicant/accused¹ seeks grant of regular bail in proceedings arising from FIR No.233/2024 dated 12.11.2024 filed under *Section(s) 20/25/29* of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, Act, 1985, (*NDPS Act*) registered at PS.: Special Cell, Delhi.

2. As per facts, on 12.11.2024, acting on an intimation, the concerned ASI apprehended two persons namely, Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi and Jaspreet Singh @ Jassu, and after necessary compliance under the NDPS

¹ Hereinafter as "*applicant*"



Act, a total of '172.780' Kgs. of *Ganja* as also *eight* plastic *Kattas* were recovered from their Eicher Tempo bearing no.HR67B2312 at about 4:30 P.M. from Samshan Ghat Road, near Max Hospital, Haiderpur, Shalimar Bagh, Delhi. Subsequent thereto, FIR No.233/2024 was registered under *Section(s) 20/25/29* of the NDPS Act. Upon further investigation and based on the disclosure statement of the other two co-accused, it was found out that one Satyapal @ Sonu and his associate Pramod @ Parmal, i.e. applicant herein, were actively involved in drug trafficking network.

3. Thereafter on 19.03.2025, the applicant was arrested by officials of the Crime Branch at 01:00 P.M. near Bhiwini-Loharu Highway, however, neither any incriminating material was recovered from his possession or at his instance, nor was any material seized linking him directly to the alleged offence at the time of arrest. Subsequent to the police remand and after completion of investigation, a Charge Sheet was filed on 09.05.2025 whereafter charges under *Section(s) 20/25/29* of the NDPS Act were framed *vide* order dated 26.05.2025 by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-02, Special Judge NDPS Act, North-West Rohini, Delhi².

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that there are as many as 22 witnesses in the Charge Sheet, comprising police officials, formal witnesses, and forensic experts and considering the nature of the alleged offence, the substantial number of witnesses, and the voluminous record involved, it is apparent that the trial is likely to take a considerable time to reach its conclusion. The continued incarceration of the applicant for an indefinite period violates the fundamental right to personal liberty

² Hereinafter referred to as "*learned Trial Court*"



guaranteed under *Article 21* of the Constitution of India. The implication of the applicant rests solely on the disclosure statements of the co-accused persons and no independent, substantive, or corroborative evidence has been placed on record to either lend credence to such disclosure statements or to establish any direct nexus between the applicant and the alleged offence.

5. *Per contra*, learned APP for the State submitted that although the applicant has no previous criminal antecedents, the material collected during investigation clearly establishes his active involvement in the procurement, transportation, and financial facilitation of recovered *Ganja*. More so, the investigation is still ongoing *qua* the co-accused Santosh Pradhan, being a declared proclaimed offender under *Section 84* of the BNSS, who is alleged to be the main supplier of the said *Ganja*, and whose role and connection with the larger syndicate are yet to be fully unearthed. A supplementary Charge Sheet was subsequently filed against the other co-accused Satyapal @ Sonu on 27.10.2025, and the trial is presently at the stage of prosecution evidence. Thus, as the applicant is an active member of a well-organised interstate drug trafficking syndicate and there exists a real and reasonable apprehension that, if released on bail, he may influence the prosecution witnesses or tamper with evidence, thereby seriously prejudicing the ongoing trial.

6. This Court has heard the learned counsel for the applicant and the learned APP for the State as also perused the Status Report and the other documents on record.

7. While granting bail, the Court is to move within the defined



contours as per *Prasanta Kumar Sarkar vs. Ashis Chatterjee*³; *State of Uttar Pradesh vs. Amaramani Tripathi*⁴ and *Deepak Yadav vs. State of Uttar Pradesh*⁵ to consider if there is a *prima facie* case or reasonable ground to believe that the accused has committed the offence; circumstances which are peculiar to the accused; likelihood of the offence being repeated; the nature and gravity of the accusation; severity of the punishment in the event of conviction; the danger of the accused absconding or fleeing if released on bail; reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being threatened.

8. The primary contention raised by the learned counsel for the applicant herein for seeking bail pertains to the *alleged* long incarceration as also that no kind of illicit substance was ever recovered from him. Lastly, that the applicant was arrested essentially on the basis of the disclosure statements made by the other co-accused persons.

9. Considering that as per the investigation there are financial transactions establishing a monetary link between the applicant and the co-accused persons, indicating active coordination and involvement in the alleged offence of tracking *Ganja* in significant quantities, that the applicant is not named in the FIR fades into insignificance. This, at the stage of grant of bail, cannot be taken as the sole governing factor as it must be dealt with the surrounding circumstances cumulatively. It is imperative to keep in mind that still there are multiple witnesses to be examined and the co-accused, namely Satyapal @ Sonu and Santosh, are

³ (2010) 14 SCC 496

⁴ (2005) 8 SCC 21

⁵ (2022) 8 SCC 559



2026:DHC:778



still absconding.

10. The aforesaid variables whence taken into account weigh more than the period of incarceration undergone by the applicant.

11. Based on the aforesaid, it will be premature for releasing the applicant on bail, at this stage.

12. Accordingly, in view of the foregoing, the present application is dismissed.

13. Needless to say, the observation made, if any, on the merits of the matter are purely for the purposes of adjudicating the present application and shall not be construed as expressions on the merits of the matter.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J.

JANUARY 31, 2026/ab/aks