

IA 19/2026 SC No. 06/2022
State Versus Rizwan Ahmed & Ors.
FIR No. 172/2021
PS Special Cell
U/s 21/25/29 NDPS Act
(Applicant/accused Hardev Singh)

25.05.2026

Present: Sh. Akhand Pratap Singh, Ld. SPP for the State.
Sh. Himanshu Maru, Ld. Counsel for
applicant/accused.

Vide my separate order of even date, the application moved on behalf of applicant/accused Hardev Singh seeking modification of the bail order dated 27.11.2025 to the extent of reducing the number of sureties from two to one and for waiver of the condition requiring local surety, stands partly allowed.

Copy of this order be given dasti to the parties. Copy of this order be sent to the accused through the concerned Jail Superintendent.

(Jitendra Pratap Singh)
ASJ/Spl. Judge, NDPS/N Delhi
25.05.2026/p

**IN THE COURT OF JITENDRA PRATAP SINGH
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE /SPECIAL JUDGE (NDPS),
NEW DELHI DISTRICT, PATIALA HOUSE COURTS,
NEW DELHI**

**IA 19/2026 SC No. 06/2022
State Versus Rizwan Ahmed & Ors.
FIR No. 172/2021
PS Special Cell
U/s 21/25/29 NDPS Act
(Applicant/accused Hardev Singh)**

25.05.2026

ORDER

1. Vide this order, I shall dispose of the application moved on behalf of applicant/accused Hardev Singh seeking modification of the bail order dated 27.11.2025 to the extent of reducing the number of sureties from two to one and for waiver of the condition requiring local surety.

2. It is submitted by the applicant that no similar application is either filed or is pending before this Court or before Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. During the course of arguments, the Ld. Counsel has submitted that no such application has also been filed before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

3. The applicant/accused was granted regular bail vide order dated 27.11.2025 subject to certain conditions, including furnishing of personal bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- with two local sureties of the like amount.

4. It is submitted in the present application that the applicant is a permanent resident of the State of Madhya Pradesh and has remained in judicial custody since 17.07.2021. It is further submitted that due to prolonged incarceration, the financial condition of the family of the applicant has deteriorated considerably and the applicant is not in a position to arrange two local sureties in Delhi. It is further submitted that despite grant of bail, the applicant has not been able to avail the benefit of the said order on account of the stringent condition regarding local sureties. Prayer has accordingly been made for reduction of the number of sureties from two to one and for permitting the applicant to furnish surety from any State.

5. The Ld. Addl. PP has opposed the application arguing that relaxing the bail conditions might result in the accused absconding and thereby affecting the trial. It is prayed that the application may be dismissed.

6. I have heard submissions advanced and have perused the record.

7. The object of bail conditions is to secure the presence of the accused during trial and to ensure that the liberty granted is not misused. Conditions imposed while granting bail are not intended to become so onerous that the order granting bail itself becomes incapable of compliance. It is a settled principle that insistence upon local sureties in every case may result in undue hardship, particularly where the accused belongs to another State and does not have social or familial roots in Delhi.

8. In the present matter, the applicant is stated to be a resident of Madhya Pradesh and has remained in custody for a considerable period. There is nothing on record at this stage to suggest that the applicant had earlier attempted to abscond or evade the process of law. In such circumstances, insistence on two local sureties appears excessive and is likely to frustrate the very purpose of grant of bail.

9. At the same time, this Court is of the opinion that sufficient safeguards are required to secure the presence of the applicant during trial. The furnishing of one surety of the like

amount, to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court/Duty Judge concerned, would adequately safeguard the interest of the prosecution.

10. Accordingly, the present application is partly allowed. The condition imposed vide order dated 27.11.2025 requiring the applicant/accused to furnish two local sureties is modified to the following extent:

The applicant/accused shall furnish one surety in the sum of Rs.50,000/- alongwith personal bond of the like amount to the satisfaction of the Court/Duty Judge concerned. The surety need not necessarily be a local surety and may be furnished from any State, subject to proper verification and satisfaction of the Court.

11. All other terms and conditions of the bail order dated 27.11.2025 shall remain unchanged.

12. Needless to state, any violation of the aforesaid conditions shall entail consequences in accordance with law including cancellation of bail.

13. Application stands disposed of accordingly. Copy of the order be given dasti. It be also sent to the accused through the concerned Jail Superintendent.

(Jitendra Pratap Singh)
ASJ/Spl. Judge, NDPS/N Delhi
25.05.2026