



2026:DHC:7731



\$~4

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

%

Date of Decision: 10.09.2026# **CNR No. DLHC010285512026**+ **BAIL APPLN. 2529/2026**

VAJID

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aditya Aggarwal and Ms.
Shivani Sharma, Advocates.

versus

STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State
with IO/SI Amit.**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA****J U D G M E N T (ORAL)**

1. The accused/applicant seeks anticipatory bail (*pre-arrest*) in case FIR No. 171/2025 of Police Station Crime Branch for offence under Section 20(b)(ii)(c)/25/29 of NDPS Act.

2. After last date, an elaborate status report was filed on behalf of prosecution. Today, I have heard learned counsel for accused/applicant and learned APP for State assisted by IO/SI Amit.

3. Broadly speaking, the allegation against the accused/applicant is that he supplied *ganja* to co-accused Ashish, from whom the same was



2026:DHC:7731



recovered. According to prosecution case, the accused/applicant is a part of a large drug syndicate dealing in *ganja*. The alleged syndicate got exposed on the basis of a secret information, which led to apprehending co-accused persons one by one and recovery of *ganja* from them. According to prosecution, the *ganja* used to be brought from Odisha. As regards the present accused/applicant, the allegation is that he supplied *ganja* to co-accused Ashish, from whom it was recovered. Nothing incriminating was recovered from or at the instance of the accused/applicant.

4. The evidence collected by IO against the accused/applicant is that he travelled to Odisha with the co-accused Ashish and received through online banking transaction, a sum of Rs.1,89,000/- from Ashish.

5. Learned counsel for accused/applicant submits that all the remaining co-accused persons have been granted regular bail by the trial court after perusal of CCTV footage which reflected that the car from which *ganja* was allegedly recovered was being driven by the police officials.

6. Learned APP submits that the accused/applicant has not handed over his mobile phone for investigation. In this regard, learned counsel for accused/applicant, on instructions of his client, submits that the mobile phone which the accused/applicant uses shall be handed over to the IO, but the IO wants some other mobile phone, which is not with the accused/applicant.



2026:DHC:7731



7. I find substance in the submission of learned counsel for accused/applicant that it is difficult to believe that the tainted money transactions would be through online banking channel, leaving a trace of movement of money.

8. Besides that, the remaining accused persons from whom contraband was allegedly recovered have already been granted bail, largely keeping in mind that the CCTV footage depicted that the vehicle allegedly used for transportation of the contraband was being driven by the police officials.

9. Of course on the above aspects, the learned trial court shall take independent view on the basis of evidence adduced.

10. Considering the overall circumstances as described above, I find no reason to deprive the accused/applicant liberty. The application is allowed and it is directed that in the event of his arrest, the accused/applicant shall be released on bail, subject to his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the IO/SHO concerned.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

SEPTEMBER 10, 2026/ry