



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

Reserved on: 21st August, 2025

Pronounced on: 12th September, 2025

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2739/2025**

GURJIT SINGH

.....Applicant

Through: Mr. N. Hariharan, Senior Advocate with Mr. Siddharth Yadav, Mr. Rahul Sambhar, Ms. Ayush Kr. Singh, Mr. Kashish Ahuja, Ms. Rekha Punya Angara, Ms. Sana Singh, Ms. Vasundhara N., Ms. Vasundhara Raj Tyagi, Ms. Gauri, Mr. Vinayak Gautam, Mr. Aman Akhtar and Mr. Arjan Singh Mandla, Advocates.

versus

NCB & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Arun Khatri, SSC with Ms. Shelly Dixit, Ms. Tracy Sebastian and Mr. Devender Singh, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

JUDGMENT

SANJEEV NARULA, J.:

1. The present application filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023¹ (formerly Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973²) seeks regular bail in proceedings arising from NCB Case No. VIII/01/DZU/2024, registered under Section

¹ "BNSS"

² "CrPC"



8/9A/22/23/25/25A/27A/28/29/30 of the Narcotics Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985³ at P.S. NCB-DZU.

FACTS

2. The brief facts as emerging from the complaint are as under:

2.1. On 17th January, 2024, acting on specific information, a parcel booked through DHL Express, Rama Road, New Delhi, bearing AWB No. 5115949005 and destined for Adelaide, Australia, was examined. The search led to the recovery of 2.946 kg of a white crystalline substance, subsequently confirmed to be Methamphetamine, which was seized under a Panchnama prepared on the spot. Investigation revealed that the parcel had been booked on 16th January, 2024 through a Jaipur-based DTDC franchise. Follow-up action at Jaipur resulted in the interception of Mukesh Chouhan and Pinku Singh Rajput, who admitted their role in booking the consignment and were arrested on 19th January, 2024.

2.2. On 22nd January, 2024, pursuant to further investigation and the disclosure of the arrested co-accused, Gaurav Singh Chauhan was apprehended in Rohini, Delhi, leading to the recovery of 12.160 kg of Methamphetamine from his residence. He was arrested the following day, i.e., 23rd January, 2024. On further investigation, the Applicant (Gurjit Singh) was intercepted at Ludhiana, Punjab on 29th January, 2024. Acting on his lead, a search at Vishwakarma Mechanical Works, Ludhiana, in the presence of the Applicant and Satnam Singh, yielded 5 kg of Ephedrine. Subsequent search of a godown rented by them (the Applicant and Satnam Singh) at Village Gill, Ludhiana, uncovered a clandestine laboratory being operated with the assistance of three Mexican nationals (Jose Manuel

³ “NDPS Act”



Badillo Lopez, Guillermo Manzo Yanez and Ulises Timoteo Bucio Yanez). The search led to recovery of 9 g of Methamphetamine, 1.082 kg of plastic sheet with traces of Methamphetamine, 4 kg of Ephedrine, other precursor chemicals, and manufacturing equipment. Consequently, the Applicant along with Satnam Singh and the three Mexican nationals were arrested on 30th–31st January, 2024.

2.3. Investigation has revealed that the cartel was an international syndicate coordinated by individuals based overseas, namely Jaswinder Singh @ Vegas, Inderdip Singh @ Ghost, and Ashish Satija @ Antoniyo. They recruited Indian operatives and arranged for the aforementioned Mexican nationals to establish and operate the meth lab at Ludhiana. Hawala channels were used to finance the operations. Statements of various witnesses, including the Hawala agent Harish Chawla, corroborated transfer of funds from abroad to cartel members in India.

2.4. On the basis of the statements of hotel staff where the Mexican nationals were residing, the godown owner (Ranjit Singh), and other witnesses, it was revealed that the Applicant and Satnam Singh set up and the Ludhiana laboratory and maintained regular contact with the foreign handlers. It was also revealed that chemicals required for the manufacture of the contraband were sent to the laboratory by Gaurav Singh, which was further corroborated by the statement of the transporter (Vikramjit Singh). These raw materials were used to produce narcotic substances, which were subsequently exported to Australia. The probe disclosed that multiple consignments had earlier been dispatched by Mukesh Chouhan and Pinku Singh, one of which was intercepted by the Australian Border Force in December 2023.



2.5. During the course of investigation, further arrests were made, including Manpreet Singh Gill, Rahul Kumar Sarngal, and Vikramjit Singh, each found to be part of the supply chain. Statements of accused and witnesses confirmed that around 15 kg of Amphetamine had been manufactured at the Ludhiana facility in December 2023.

2.6. The contraband recovered tested positive for Methamphetamine and Ephedrine. Electronic devices seized from the accused were forensically examined at NFSU, Gandhinagar, and reports were received in November 2024. Based on the analysis of this data, a supplementary complaint/charge sheet was filed before the Trial Court on 7th May, 2025, bringing on record additional documentary and electronic evidence, including material relating to the present Applicant.

SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

3. Mr. N. Hariharan, Senior Counsel for the Applicant, has advanced elaborate submissions assailing the prosecution's case and the order of the Trial Court dated 6th February, 2024 refusing bail. The broad thrust of the argument is that the Applicant has been falsely implicated, that there is no legally admissible evidence linking him to the contraband, and that the statutory bar under Section 37 of the NDPS Act is either inapplicable or stands satisfied. His submissions are summarised thus:

3.1. The entire case against the Applicant rests on suspicion rather than tangible proof. No recovery of narcotic or psychotropic substance has been effected from the Applicant's person, residence, or at his instance. The seizures relied upon by the prosecution were made from other co-accused or from premises not owned or controlled by the Applicant. In the absence of a



personal recovery or discovery traceable to him, there is no direct nexus between the Applicant and the contraband in question.

3.2. The complaint and the documents annexed therewith are largely conjectural. The prosecution case leans heavily on statements recorded under Section 67 of the NDPS Act, either from the Applicant himself or from other co-accused. In view of the authoritative pronouncement of the Supreme Court in *Tofan Singh v. State of Tamil Nadu*⁴, such statements are inadmissible, being confessions made to officers which fall within the meaning of “police officers” under Section 25 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872.⁵ Reliance on such statements would trench upon the fundamental rights of the Applicant under Articles 14, 20(3), and 21 of the Constitution of India.

3.3. With reference to the seizure of 5 kilograms of Ephedrine at Vishwakarma Mechanical Works, it is submitted that the said premises were admittedly a concern of co-accused Satnam Singh, who was engaged in hardware and fabrication work. The Applicant had no ownership, tenancy, or control over this factory, and his mere presence at the time of search cannot by itself establish culpability.

3.4. As regards, the alleged recovery from the godown at Gill Village, Ludhiana, it is pointed out that the premises stood in the name of one Ranjit Singh, who, as per the prosecution’s case rented it out to Satnam Singh and the Applicant. However, there is no rent agreement, bank transfer, or any financial record evidencing payment of rent by the Applicant. The only documented transaction on record is between Satnam Singh and the landlord

⁴ (2021) 4 SCC 1

⁵ “IEA”



(Ranjit Singh). To attribute tenancy to the Applicant merely on the landlord's oral assertion is speculative and untenable.

3.5. The reliance on call detail records⁶ is misplaced. The telephonic contact between the Applicant and Satnam Singh stems from prior professional association, since both were engaged in similar line of business. Telephonic connectivity, without more, does not establish criminal conspiracy. Such material, it is argued, is at best circumstantial and must be tested at trial rather than being treated as incriminating at the bail stage.

3.6. As regards the alleged links with foreign nationals, particularly one "Ashish Satija @ Antonio", it is argued that the prosecution itself admits that the identity of several such individuals remains unverified. In these circumstances, any reliance on stray references in CDRs or WhatsApp chats to such names is premature and baseless.

3.7. The statutory bar under Section 37 of NDPS Act is not attracted on the facts of the present case. The recovery attributed to the Applicant, if at all, is of 9 kg of Ephedrine, which is a "controlled substance", and 9 g of Methamphetamine, which falls in the category of "small quantity". Reliance is placed on the *Manoj Kumar v. DRI*⁷ and *Niranjan Jayantilal Shah v. DRI*⁸ to contend that the embargo under Section 37 of NDPS Act applies only to narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances and not to controlled substances. In any event, the small quantity of Methamphetamine recovered does not attract the rigour of Section 37 of NDPS Act.

3.8. There is no chain connecting the Applicant with the seizures effected in Delhi, which allegedly involved co-accused Gaurav Singh Chauhan,

⁶ "CDRs"

⁷ 2015 SCC OnLine Del 7830



Manpreet Singh Gill, and Vikramjit Singh. On the contrary, it is pointed out that aforementioned co-accused, against whom the allegations are more direct and graver, have already been enlarged on regular bail by this Court. On the principle of parity, the Applicant cannot be denied the same relief. Reference is placed on the orders of this court granting bail to co-accused Manpreet Singh Gill, Vikramjit Singh, and Rahul Kumar Sarangal.

3.9. Applicant's right to speedy trial is being infringed. Charges are yet to be framed, that the chargesheet runs into more than 2,500 pages, and that 39 witnesses are proposed to be examined. A trial of such magnitude is bound to take several years. In the meantime, the Applicant has already spent more than a year in custody. Reliance is placed on *Union of India v. K.A. Najeeb*⁹, *Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh v. State of Maharashtra*¹⁰, and *Manish Sisodia v. Directorate of Enforcement*¹¹ to contend that where trial is unlikely to conclude within a reasonable time, the rigour of Section 37 of NDPS Act must yield to the guarantee of personal liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

3.10. The Applicant has been sick and infirm for some time and has on occasions been granted interim bail to receive treatment. His continued incarceration, it is submitted, will not only aggravate his health condition but also violate his fundamental right to life and health under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

3.11. The Applicant has clean antecedents, deep roots in society, and has complied with all conditions when released on interim bail. He is not a flight

⁸ 2013 SCC OnLine Del 4608

⁹ (2021) 3 SCC 713

¹⁰ 2024 SCC OnLine SC 1693

¹¹ 2024 SCC OnLine SC 1920



risk, and with the investigation substantially concluded and the case resting largely on documentary evidence, the possibility of tampering stands ruled out.

SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF PROSECUTION

4. Opposing the grant of bail, Mr. Arun Khatri, Senior Standing Counsel for the Narcotics Control Bureau¹², contends that the Applicant is not a peripheral figure but a central actor in the conspiracy. The case does not rest on conjecture or statements under Section 67 of NDPS Act alone but on a collection of independent evidence unearthed during investigation which, when viewed cumulatively, points unflinchingly to the Applicant's complicity. Accordingly, he submits the following grounds opposing the Applicant's bail application:

4.1. The Applicant, along with co-accused Satnam Singh, was instrumental in establishing and operating a clandestine laboratory at Gill Village, Ludhiana, from where Ephedrine, Methamphetamine, and other precursor chemicals were seized. The landlord of the godown, Ranjit Singh, has categorically stated that the premises had been let out to the Applicant and Satnam Singh. This fact is further corroborated by the statement of Lakhwinder Singh, who confirmed that the Applicant was frequently present at the godown in the company of the Mexican nationals engaged as "cooks" for manufacturing Methamphetamine. The recovery from the premises, including 4 kg of Ephedrine, 9 grams of Methamphetamine, a plastic sheet weighing 1.082 kilograms containing traces of Methamphetamine, chemicals, and laboratory equipment, cannot be divorced from the Applicant merely because he was not physically apprehended at the spot.



4.2. The prosecution further highlighted the recoveries from the Applicant's electronic devices. A Google Pixel 6A phone seized from him contained WhatsApp groups with titles such as "Tommy Accounts", "Greggs Pb Pay", "Pickup" and "Greg Tokens", in which conversations relating to chemical procurement, financial management through hawala, and coordination with foreign cartel leaders were recorded. Incriminating photographs of drugs, raw materials, chemical lists, laboratory expense estimates, and passports and visas of the Mexican nationals were extracted. The forensic analysis revealed sustained digital connectivity between the Applicant and foreign-based cartel operators, identified by names such as 'Vegas', 'Ghost', 'Antonio', and 'Stack'. This exposes his role as the bridge between local operatives and international handlers.

4.3. Reliance was also placed on financial evidence. It is alleged that Gurjit Singh received 15,000 USDT from cartel leaders abroad, and approximately INR 13 lakh was delivered to his son Onkarjit Singh through hawala agent Harish Chawla. Both Harish Chawla and Onkarjit Singh have confirmed these transactions in their statements, and the WhatsApp chats between the Applicant and his foreign contacts contain references to "Harish", consistent with these disclosures. These financial trails, according to the prosecution, underscore the Applicant's position as a trusted operative entrusted with handling funds for the cartel's Indian operations.

4.4. Reliance is also placed on corroborative statements of co-accused Satnam Singh and the Mexican nationals, who have disclosed that the Applicant was actively involved in establishing the lab and in giving instructions regarding disposal of contraband once a parcel had been

¹² "NCB"



intercepted. This is supported by contemporaneous CDR data reflecting calls between Gurjit Singh and Satnam Singh on 29th January, 2024, the very date when instructions to clear the godown were allegedly issued.

4.5. The Applicant's plea that only "controlled substances" were recovered is misleading. The recoveries include Methamphetamine, a psychotropic substance under the NDPS Act, in commercial quantity. Even if Ephedrine were viewed as a controlled substance, the conspiracy charges under Section 29 of NDPS Act, read with recoveries of Methamphetamine from the lab and from parcels linked to this network, attract the full rigour of Section 37 of NDPS Act.

4.6. The Applicant's role cannot be equated with co-accused who have been granted bail. Unlike transporters or intermediaries, the Applicant was at the helm of the Ludhiana laboratory, directly liaising with cartel leaders abroad, supervising the manufacturing process, and ensuring funding through hawala channels. The principle of parity is, therefore, not applicable to the Applicant.

4.7. The seriousness of the allegations, the international ramifications of the cartel's operations, the continuing investigation into financial flows, and the risk of tampering with evidence weigh heavily against grant of bail. Section 37 of NDPS Act sets a high threshold, which, in light of the facts and circumstances, the Applicant fails to satisfy.

ANALYSIS

5. The Applicant is being prosecuted under multiple provisions of the NDPS Act, including Sections 22(c), 23(c), 27A, 28, and 29, which pertain to trafficking, criminal conspiracy, and financing of narcotic activities. The recoveries effected in the present case comprise 2.946 kg of



methamphetamine from a DHL parcel intercepted in Delhi, 12.160 kg of Methamphetamine from the residence of Gaurav Singh Chauhan in Rohini, Delhi, 5 kg of Ephedrine from Vishwakarma Mechanical Works and 4 kg of Ephedrine as well as 9 g of Methamphetamine along with a plastic sheet weighing 1.082 kg containing traces of Methamphetamine from the Godown at Gill, Ludhiana. These quantities are indisputably commercial, thereby attracting the stringent conditions imposed by Section 37 of the NDPS Act for grant of bail.

6. Section 37 of the NDPS Act mandates a twin-layered threshold to be satisfied before bail can be granted: (i) that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is not guilty of such offence; and (ii) that he is not likely to commit any offence on bail.

7. It is necessary to first address two preliminary objections raised by Mr. Hariharan regarding the applicability of Section 37 of NDPS Act.

8. The first submission pertains to the inadmissibility of confessional statements under Section 67 of NDPS Act, in view of the decision in **Toofan Singh**. It is contended that the Applicant's prosecution rests substantially on his statement under Section 67, which, being a confession made to officers deemed to be "police officers" within the meaning of Section 25 of IEA, is inadmissible in evidence. While it is well settled that such statements cannot, by themselves, form the substantive basis of conviction, the case at hand does not solely rests on confessions under Section 67 of NDPS Act. The prosecution, also relies on other material, including CDR connectivity, Whatsapp chats, financial transactions, and other recoveries from the Applicant's devices. Their probative value will be considered at a later stage while examining the first condition under Section 37 of NDPS Act.



However, the statements of co-accused along with the documentary evidence, establish a *prima facie* link between the Applicant and the alleged drug cartel.

9. It was next urged that since Ephedrine is a ‘controlled substance’, the bar under Section 37 of NDPS Act does not apply. This submission also cannot be accepted. The case at hand is not limited to Ephedrine; the recovery from the godown also included Methamphetamine, a notified psychotropic substance under the NDPS Act. Although the recovery from the godown was only 9 g of Methamphetamine, which falls below the threshold of commercial quantity, the prosecution case against the Applicant rests on his active participation in a wider conspiracy to manufacture and export Methamphetamine. The recovery from the godown must, therefore, be read in conjunction with the seizure of 2.946 kg of Methamphetamine from a DHL parcel intercepted in Delhi and the recovery of 12.160 kg of Methamphetamine from the residence of co-accused Gaurav Singh Chauhan at Rohini, Delhi. Taken together, these recoveries disclose a concerted operation. Once a *prima facie* case of conspiracy is established, each conspirator is liable for the acts of the others under Section 29 of the NDPS Act. Accordingly, the bar under Section 37 stands attracted.

10. The Court now proceeds to examine whether the twin-conditions for grant of bail as stipulated under Section 37 of NDPS Act, stand satisfied or not.

Whether there are Reasonable Grounds to Believe the Accused is Not Guilty

11. The requirement that there must exist reasonable grounds to believe the accused is not guilty is not synonymous with a demand for proof of



innocence. Nonetheless, assessment under this condition obliges the Court to examine, on a *prima facie* basis, whether the prosecution's case is marred by such infirmities that the allegations fail to make out the offence charged. To that effect, the Supreme Court, in its judgement in ***Union of India v. Shiv Shanker Kesari***¹³ has observed as follows:

"11. The court while considering the application for bail with reference to Section 37 of the Act is not called upon to record a finding of not guilty. It is for the limited purpose essentially confined to the question of releasing the accused on bail that the court is called upon to see if there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is not guilty and records its satisfaction about the existence of such grounds. But the court has not to consider the matter as if it is pronouncing a judgment of acquittal and recording a finding of not guilty.

12. Additionally, the court has to record a finding that while on bail the accused is not likely to commit any offence and there should also exist some materials to come to such a conclusion."

12. The Applicant's principal contention is that he has been falsely implicated, as no recovery was effected from his person or at his instance. While it is correct that no direct seizure has been made from him, the prosecution's case is not founded on personal recovery alone. The material on record, *prima facie*, indicates that the Applicant, along with co-accused Satnam Singh, was involved in managing the godown at Gill Village, Ludhiana, where a clandestine laboratory was unearthed and substantial incriminating material was recovered. The landlord, Ranjit Singh, specifically stated that the premises had been rented to both the Applicant and Satnam Singh, a version corroborated by Lakhwinder Singh, who

¹³ (2007) 7 SCC 798.



confirmed the Applicant's presence at the site along with the Mexican nationals engaged in drug manufacturing. These statements, read with the recoveries, *prima facie*, establish more than a casual connection.

13. The Applicant further disputes any nexus with the factory at Vishwakarma Mechanical Works or the godown at Gill Village, contending that there are no rent agreement or financial document to show his tenancy. The absence of a formal lease deed, however, is not decisive at this stage. The landlord's statement, supported by statements of Lakhwinder Singh and hotel records evidencing meetings with the Mexican nationals, *prima facie*, provides tangible material to suggest his involvement. At this stage, the Court is not to conduct a mini-trial or weigh the evidentiary value of each document with precision; it is enough that the material on record raises a strong *prima facie* inference of complicity.

14. As to the contention that the CDRs only reflect business interactions, overlooks the broader context. When examined together with digital forensics from the Applicant's devices, comprising WhatsApp group chats, incriminating photographs, financial records, and hawala transactions through Harish Chawla, the CDRs assume probative value. They do not reveal casual or sporadic exchanges but sustained and coordinated communication with cartel members operating from Dubai and the United Kingdom. Taken cumulatively, this material discloses a *prima facie* case of the Applicant's active role in an organised international drug trafficking syndicate, thereby negating the plea of false implication.

No Likelihood of Committing an Offence while on Bail

15. The second condition that the Applicant is not likely to re-offend, must also be considered. The Applicant seeks to satisfy the second condition



under Section 37 of NDPS by pointing to his clean antecedents and compliance with previously granted interim bail conditions. These factors cannot be considered in isolation, particularly in the backdrop of the material unearthed during investigation.

16. The case involves running of a clandestine laboratory at Ludhiana, collaboration with foreign nationals brought in for manufacturing Methamphetamine, and coordination of finances through digital platforms and hawala networks. In cases of this magnitude, involving an international cartel, the absence of prior convictions or social roots cannot outweigh the statutory concerns. Therefore, the risk of reoffending remains a real possibility.

17. In light of the foregoing discussion, this Court concludes that the twin conditions prescribed under Section 37 of NDPS Act are not satisfied in the case of the Applicant.

Principle of Parity

18. The Applicant has also strongly pressed the plea of parity, relying on the fact that three co-accused, namely Manpreet Singh Gill, Vikramjit Singh and Rahul Kumar Sarangal, have been released on regular bail by this Court. This contention however, does not advance his case. The principle of parity in bail jurisprudence is not an abstract rule of uniformity, but one of comparative evaluation of roles, responsibilities and the degree of involvement attributed to each accused. In absence of similarity in circumstances and allegations, parity cannot be invoked.

19. A scrutiny of prosecution's case makes it evident that the role arrayed to Applicant is distinct. As per the prosecution's version, the role ascribed to the three co-accused who have been granted bail, was peripheral: Manpreet



Singh Gill is alleged to have supplied a consignment of Amphetamine to Gaurav Singh Chauhan; Vikramjit Singh is alleged to have transported contraband once; and Rahul Kumar Sarangal is alleged to have assisted in packaging the seized parcel. Each one of them thus, allegedly functioned as an intermediary or courier at some stage in the operations. The Applicant, in contrast, is alleged to be a central figure. The investigation attributes to him the role of running clandestine Methamphetamine laboratory at Ludhiana, in partnership with Satnam Singh where significant quantities of contraband were manufactured. Thus, his role was not limited to one of transportation or facilitation, but extended to coordination with foreign cartel leaders, based abroad (included individuals operating under the names ‘Vegas’, ‘Ghost’ and ‘Antonio’), arranging hawala funding to sustain the operations, overseeing production with the assistance of Mexican nationals sent specifically for ‘cooking’, and monitoring the quality of samples. The WhatsApp data, CDR analysis, hawala transactions and statements of co-accused *prima facie* depict his involvement at the highest level of decision making. In such circumstances, the principle of parity relied upon by Applicant by equating himself with intermediaries, is misplaced.

Delay in Trial

20. Mr. Hariharan has emphasised that the charges have not been framed and considering the size of the record, the trial will be long and protracted and therefore, Applicant’s prolonged custody would amount to punitive detention. The argument has force in principle, however, it must be assessed in the statutory framework of Section 37 of NDPS Act. Firstly, the yardstick is not delay in abstract, but inordinate delay. The brief being voluminous or involving multiple accused and witnesses does not, by itself translate into



punitive detention constituting a violation of Article 21 of the Constitution of India. In NDPS cases, Section 37 cannot be watered down merely by invoking the general bail precepts. The prolonged incarceration may relax rigour only in truly exceptional circumstances when the custody approaches a significant fraction of the maximum sentence and the prosecution is unable to progress the trial despite diligence from the defence. The prospects of lengthy trial, therefore, cannot *ipso facto* dilute the seriousness of the offence and the gravity of allegations against the Applicant of working in conspiracy with a manufacturing hub involving foreign based cartel operators. This threshold is not crossed in the facts of the present case.

21. The Applicant's plea on the medical grounds, again, does not tip the balance in his favour. The jail authorities are duty bound to provide adequate medical care, and interim bail has in fact been granted earlier whenever necessary.

22. Further, considering the scale and magnitude of the present case, which involves an organised international cartel, large-scale manufacturing of Methamphetamine and financing through hawala channels, the apprehension raised by the State that the Applicant may tamper with evidence or influence witnesses cannot be regarded as speculative.

Conclusion

23. In light of the foregoing discussion, this Court is of the considered view that the material on record, *prima facie*, implicates the Applicant in the offence of manufacturing and trafficking Methamphetamine in commercial quantity as part of an organised international cartel. The allegations, supported by witness statements, recoveries, digital forensics and financial trails, disclose active participation in a conspiracy which attracts the rigours



of Section 29 of NDPS Act. As a result, the restrictions under Section 37 of NDPS stand attracted, and this Court is, therefore, not inclined to release the Applicant on bail.

24. Needless to state, any observations concerning the merits of the case are solely for the purpose of deciding the question of grant of bail and shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

25. Accordingly, the bail application is dismissed.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

SEPTEMBER 12, 2025

d.negi