

IA15/25 SC6/22
FIR172/21
STATE v RAMANDEEP SINGH
PS Special Cell

27.03.2026

Present: Irfan Ahmad, Ld. Substitute Addl. PP for the
State.
Sh. Harish Chand, Ld. counsel for
applicant/accused.

Vide my separate order of even date, the application filed on behalf of the applicant/accused Ramandeep Singh, seeking grant of regular bail, is dismissed and disposed of accordingly.

Copy of the order be given *dasti* as well as be sent to jail superintendent for supplying the same to accused in jail.

(Jitendra Pratap Singh)
ASJ NDPS Act
(Special Judge)/PHC
NDD/27.03.2026

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

IA15/25 SC6/22

FIR172/21

STATE v RAMANDEEP SINGH

PS Special Cell

27.03.2026

ORDER

1. The present application is the third bail application moved on behalf of the applicant/accused, Ramandeep Singh, under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking the grant of regular bail in the aforesaid FIR. The applicant was arrested on 17.07.2021 and has remained in custody since then.

2. It is submitted by Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused and affirmed by the IO that there is no other bail application preferred by the present applicant/accused which is pending disposal before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, or any other Court in the present case FIR.

3. The brief facts of the case are that on 06.07.2021, acting upon specific secret information, a raid was conducted in the Ghitorni area of Delhi. Co-accused Rizwan Ahmed was apprehended while riding a scooty. Upon search of the dickey of the scooty, a plastic packet containing 1 kg 17 grams of heroin (confirmed positive through field testing kit) was recovered. FIR No. 172/2021 under Sections 21 and 25 NDPS Act was registered

at P.S. Special Cell, and Rizwan Ahmed was arrested the same day.

4. Rizwan Ahmed, during interrogation, named his associates Gurjot Singh and Gurpreet Singh, who were traced and arrested on 06.07.2021 from Flat No. 402, NSG Vihar, Sector-65, Faridabad, Haryana. At the instance of Gurpreet Singh, 168.5 kgs of heroin was recovered from the Hyundai Verna car parked in the basement of the flat. At the instance of Gurjot Singh, 116 kgs of heroin was recovered from the Honda Amaze car parked in the same parking area. Additionally, 71 kgs of heroin was recovered from inside the flat itself from a bed. Thus, in a single swoop, more than 355 kgs of heroin (far exceeding the commercial quantity) was seized from these two co-accused alone.

5. Rizwan Ahmed further disclosed the involvement of Hazrat Ali (an Afghan national), who was apprehended on 08.07.2021 near Medanta Hospital, Gurugram, leading to the recovery of 2 kgs of opium from his rented accommodation. Four plastic containers containing chemicals used for purification of heroin (Hydrochloric Acid, Ammonia and Dextromethorphan) were also recovered from Ghitorni.

6. The investigation revealed that Gurjot Singh and Gurpreet Singh were working for the main kingpin, Navpreet Singh @ Nav (resident of Taran Taran, Punjab), who is presently absconding and is suspected to be based in Turkey. The duo disclosed that they used to collect huge consignments of heroin

from Shivpuri, Madhya Pradesh, and supply the same in Punjab and Delhi-NCR at the directions of Navpreet Singh. They specifically named the present applicant, Ramandeep Singh @ Brar (resident of Beas, Punjab), as a close associate of Navpreet Singh who had provided them with the Apple iPhones (with specific IMEI numbers) at the instance of the kingpin. These very iPhones were seized from Gurjot and Gurpreet at the time of their arrest.

7. It is further alleged that the applicant accompanied Gurjot and Gurpreet to Shivpuri in June 2021 for loading of the contraband. On 17.07.2021, the applicant was arrested from his native village in Beas, Punjab. At his instance, 210 grams of heroin was recovered from his residential house. During interrogation, he admitted his long-standing association with Navpreet Singh @ Nav and disclosed that he had provided the iPhones and had been actively involved in the operation of the syndicate. He further got recovered, a used Axis Bank cheque book (Account No. 918010087065517 in the name of Navpreet Singh, containing cheque leaves 941032 to 941040), the Election ID Card, PAN Card and Aadhaar Card of Navpreet Singh and property papers. The cheque book was directly linked to the purchase of Navpreet Singh's flat at Shri Radha Krishan Apartment, Export Enclave, South Delhi (which flat has already been seized in a separate UAPA-cum-NDPS case bearing FIR No. 237/2022, PS Special Cell).

8. The technical evidence is significant in the matter. The

Cert-In report shows that the iCloud ID “brar000777@icloud.com” belongs to the applicant and was used for extensive communication and location sharing with the iCloud IDs of Navpreet Singh (“aceoffspades@icloud.com”), Gurjot Singh and Gurpreet Singh. Gurpreet Singh disclosed that a Verna car was delivered to him in Badarpur, Delhi, at the behest of Navpreet Singh by the applicant. Multiple FaceTime calls and chat conversations between these IDs were confirmed. An independent witness, Mohit, recorded his statement under Section 161 Cr.P.C. confirming that he had sold the said iPhones to the applicant. Charges against the applicant were formally framed on 13.01.2025 under Section 21(c) read with Section 29 NDPS Act. The case is now at the stage of prosecution evidence with 64 witnesses cited, out of which, four have been examined so far. The total heroin recovered in the entire case stands at approximately 358.8 kgs.

9. The applicant has been consistently denied bail at every forum. This Court dismissed his first bail application on 15.01.2024 and the second on 26.04.2025. The Hon’ble High Court of Delhi dismissed his bail application on 04.10.2024 (Bail Appln. No. 550/2024) and the subsequent application (filed after framing of charge) on 28.05.2025. The Hon’ble Supreme Court of India dismissed the SLP (CrI.) No. 17949/2024 filed by the applicant as withdrawn/not pressed on 20.12.2024. hence , the orders passed by the Hon’ble High Court have attained finality.

10. Learned counsel for the applicant strenuously argued that there has been a material change in circumstances since the last

dismissal by the High Court. He highlighted that the applicant has now undergone more than four years and eight months of incarceration, charges have been framed, yet only four out of sixty-four witnesses have been examined and the trial is likely to take several more years. He emphasised that the personal recovery from the applicant is only 210 grams of heroin – an intermediate quantity – and that too at his instance from his house in Punjab, not from his person. He submitted that two co-accused, Manjeet Singh and Hardev Singh, have been granted bail by this Court on 07.07.2025 and 27.11.2025 respectively. He further contended that the entire case rests on inadmissible disclosure statements, there is no independent public witness to the recovery, there is no evidence of conscious possession or direct dealing in the contraband, and the CDR/iCloud evidence can only be appreciated at the time of trial.

11. The learned counsel for the accused has placed reliance on the following judgments:

(i) Kashif vs Narcotics Control Bureau, 2026 SCC OnLine Del 589;

(ii) Sahil Sharma vs State Govt. of NCT of Delhi, 2025 SCC OnLine Del 8735;

(iii) Dheeraj Kumar Shukla vs State of U.P., SLP (Crl.) 6690/2022, decided on 25.01.2023 by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India;

(iv) Ankur Chaudhary vs State, SLP (Crl.) 4648/2024, decided on 28.05.2024 by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India;

(v) Zakir Hussain vs State Govt. of NCT of Delhi; Neutral

Citation:2025:DHC:330;

(vi)Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh vs State; Neutral

Citation:2024:INSC:645;

(vii)Sabana Khatoon vs State, Bail Application No. 429/2025, decided on 03.04.2025 by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi;

(viii)State by NCB vs Pallulabid Ahamad Arimutta, SLP (Crl.) No. 1569/2021, decided on 10.01.2022 by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India;

(ix)Vijender @ Harender vs State NCT of Delhi, Bail Appln. 4056/2024, Delhi High Court order dated 10.12.2024.

12. It is argued by the Ld. Counsel for the applicant on the basis of these judgments that where there is no recovery from the accused and the implication is based on disclosure statements, electronic evidence, financial transactions or delay in trial, bail can be granted. He also submitted that the applicant has no criminal antecedents, has deep roots in society, and his family is facing extreme financial hardship.

13. The learned Special PP strongly opposed the application and submitted that there is no fresh change in circumstances whatsoever since the Hon'ble High Court dismissed the second bail application on 28.05.2025 after framing of charge. He pointed out that the applicant's involvement is not peripheral but central to the syndicate. He is directly linked to the absconding kingpin through documentary and technical evidence. Section 37 NDPS Act is fully attracted because the applicant is charged with conspiracy under Section 29 for an offence involving commercial quantity of 358.8 kgs. He argued that parity with Manjeet and

Hardev Singh is misplaced because those co-accused had far lesser roles and no such direct nexus with the kingpin. That technical evidence (Cert-In report, bank records, iCloud data) provides strong corroboration beyond mere disclosures. It is argued that the applicant poses a real risk of fleeing the country (as the kingpin is abroad) and of continuing in the drug trade. The learned Special PP submitted that the judgments cited by the applicant are distinguishable on facts and that the societal interest in preventing drug trafficking outweighs the right to speedy trial in such organised crime cases.

14. I have heard the rival submissions and have carefully perused the record.

15. This is the third bail application before this Court and the applicant has already been unsuccessful twice before the Hon'ble High Court in securing bail, once after framing of charge. The only developments since 28.05.2025 are the passage of a few more months and examination of four formal/official witnesses. In the considered opinion of this Court, these do not constitute such a material change as would warrant reconsideration of the earlier orders that have attained finality up to the apex court. It is a settled law that successive bail applications are maintainable only when there is substantial change in circumstances. In the present case, no new circumstance or change in circumstances has been shown by the accused after the dismissal of the bail application by the Hon'ble High Court and dismissal of SLP by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Therefore, on this ground alone, the present bail application is liable to be dismissed.

16. The commercial quantity under the NDPS Act of Heroin is 250 grams. The personal recovery from the applicant is 210 grams (intermediate quantity), but he is not charged in isolation. He is charged under Section 21(c) read with Section 29 NDPS Act for conspiracy and abetment in the larger syndicate recovery of 358.8 kgs. Section 29 expressly provides that whoever abets or is a party to a criminal conspiracy to commit an offence under the NDPS Act shall be punished with the same punishment as the principal offence. Therefore, the twin conditions of Section 37 – (i) reasonable grounds to believe that the applicant is not guilty, and (ii) that he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail – must be satisfied. The material on record prima facie shows deep involvement of the applicant in the operation of the entire syndicate.

17. The prosecution case against the applicant is not based merely on disclosure statements. It is fortified by independent evidence including the following: the Cert-In forensic report irrefutably links the applicant's iCloud ID to location sharing and multiple communications with co-accused and the kingpin at the crucial time. It is also supported with recovery of Navpreet Singh's personal documents and the exact cheque book used to purchase the seized flat. It is also supported with the statement of independent witness Mohit under Section 161 Cr.P.C.

18. This material clearly establishes conscious possession, active participation and a direct nexus with the person allegedly operating the entire syndicate. The judgments relied upon by the applicant are distinguishable because in those cases there was

either no corroborative documentary/technical evidence or the accused were not part of a larger conspiracy involving massive commercial quantities. Here, the prima facie case is strong, the risk of the applicant fleeing (given the international links of the kingpin) and re-offending is real, and the societal interest in curbing the drug menace must be given due weight. Article 21 rights of the accused have to be balanced against the rights of society at large

19. Co-accused Manjeet Singh and Hardev Singh have been admitted to bail as the Court did not find any substantial material linking them directly to the operation of the syndicate. Their roles are materially different from that of the applicant, who is shown to be a trusted aide of the absconding kingpin with documentary and electronic evidence linking him directly. Parity cannot be claimed as a matter of right when the evidence and degree of involvement differ substantially. The Court is conscious of the applicant's long custody and the fact that only four witnesses have been examined. However, in cases involving organised narcotic syndicates dealing in hundreds of kilograms of heroin, the delay in trial itself cannot be allowed to override the statutory bar under Section 37 unless the twin conditions are met. The trial is progressing. The learned counsel for the accused has relied upon various judgments. The same have been carefully considered. However, the said judgments are distinguishable on facts and do not come to the aid of the accused.

20. The contention of no independent public witness does not advance the case of the applicant because the recovery of 210

grams was effected at his own instance from inside his residential house in Punjab, not during a public search.

21. Conclusively, in the overall conspectus of the facts, the evidence on record, the statutory rigours of Section 37 NDPS Act and the absence of any fresh material change in circumstances, this Court is of the opinion that the applicant does not deserve to be released on bail at this stage. The application is, therefore, dismissed.

22. Nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case during trial.

23. The coversheet in compliance of the practice directions no. 124/Rules/DHC dated 10.12.2024, containing the directions passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in "***Suhas Chakma Vs. Union of India & Ors.***", Neutral Citation 2024 INSC 813 is issued separately.

24. The application stands disposed of accordingly. Copy of the present order be given *dasti* and same be also sent to concerned jail superintendent, to be supplied to the applicant/accused.

(Jitendra Pratap Singh)
ASJ NDPS Act
(Special Judge)/PHC
NDD/27.03.2026