

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

**IA No. 20/26 in SC No. 378/2018  
State v. Ashish Sharma & Ors.  
FIR No. 64/2018  
PS Special Cell  
(Applicant/accused Harvinder Singh @ Balli)**

**23.03.2026**

Present: Sh. A.B Asthana, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.  
Ms. Sushma Sharma, Ld. Counsel for  
applicant/accused.

1. This order shall dispose of two applications, first the application dated 06.03.2026 moved on behalf of accused Harvinder Singh @ Balli seeking permission to travel to Vietnam, Europe and China for business purposes for a period of one year and second, the application dated 16.03.2026 moved on behalf of the accused for placing on record the travel itinerary with respect to the journey, the permission of which has been sought by way of the application dated 06.03.2026.

2. It is submitted by Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused that there is no other such 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 accused/applicant Harvinder Singh @ Balli has moved the application dated 06.03.2026, stating that he is engaged in international trading business under the name *Platinum Singh Wholesale Company* and his personal presence is required abroad for supervising shipment of goods, negotiating business transactions and promoting his company in international markets. It is stated that the applicant has purchased goods worth more than Rs.3 crores from companies situated in Vietnam, United Kingdom and China. In support of the said submissions various invoices and documents have been filed along with the application.

4. It is stated that the applicant has purchased goods from M/s *Nam Thai Son Export Import JSC*, Vietnam, *Anand International Ltd.* and *Prime Distsro Ltd.*, United Kingdom and *Shenzhen Joecig Technology Co. Ltd.*, China and the goods are to

be shipped and received at various locations including Felixstowe Port, England.

5. It is further stated that the applicant had purchased accessories from India for shipping to the United Kingdom. That the accused is required to travel to Vietnam for supervision of shipment, thereafter to various countries in Europe for sale and promotion of products and subsequently to China for business meetings and coordination regarding supply and trade.

6. It is further stated in the application that if the applicant did not personally attend to the business transactions and shipment clearances, he would suffer heavy financial losses and his business operations may suffer irreparable damage. It is also stated that the applicant is the sole person handling the business operations and therefore his presence abroad is necessary. It is stated that the accused also has to make sufficient arrangements for education and settlement of his children.

7. The applicant has further relied upon his past conduct and has stated that earlier also the Hon'ble High Court, vide order dated 03.03.2025 as well as this Court, vide orders dated 06.09.2025 and 11.12.2025 had granted him permission to travel abroad on multiple occasions and on each occasion he returned to

India within the permitted period and complied with all the conditions imposed by the Court.

8. The ld Addl PP for the State, has strongly opposed the application stating that the present case involves serious allegations under the NDPS Act and the accused was earlier extradited from the United Kingdom. That the accused/applicant is a British citizen and if permitted to travel abroad, there is a strong possibility of the accused absconding from the trial.

9. However, the Ld Addl PP, on the basis of the verification report filed by the IO in response to the notice of the present application, has admitted that verification was conducted regarding the invoices and business transactions mentioned in the application through emails sent to the concerned companies and most of the companies confirmed that the invoices were genuine and related to business transactions with the accused. The Ld Addl PP has stressed on the point that it is also mentioned in the report of the IO that in respect of one shipment pertaining to the *Three Arrows International Express*, the physical presence of the accused was not required at this stage. The State has accordingly opposed the application.

10. The court has considered the rival submissions in light of the record of the case.

11. From the record, it is apparent that the accused was earlier granted permission to travel abroad by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi as well as by this Court vide orders dated 03.03.2025, 06.09.2025 and 11.12.2025 and on each occasion the accused returned to India within the permitted period and did not violate any condition. Therefore, the past conduct of the accused is satisfactory and shows that he has complied with the directions of the Court earlier. However, at this time, the accused had sought a permission to travel abroad for a period of one year.

12. It cannot be ignored that the present case involves serious allegations and the accused was earlier extradited from abroad and is a foreign national. Considering the gravity of allegations and absence of any emergent and urgent requirement disclosed in the application justifying grant of permission to travel for a long period of one year, such permission at this stage does not appear to be justified in the facts of the case. No substantially new circumstances have been shown in the present application except business requirements which were also the grounds in earlier applications when permission for shorter periods was granted.

Therefore, there is no justification for granting permission for one year.

13. This Court also finds no reason to reduce or modify the condition regarding furnishing of title deed sureties which were imposed earlier to ensure the return of the applicant to India, which prayer has been made by the applicant verbally on 17.03.2026. Considering the fact that the applicant is a foreign national and was earlier extradited and his failure in satisfying the Court as to how he is suffering prejudice due to the said condition, the Court is of a view that this condition is necessary to secure his return and attendance before the Court. Accordingly, the earlier condition regarding submitting/furnishing title deed sureties shall remain unchanged.

14. In view of the past conduct of the applicant, the earlier permissions granted and considering no new circumstance justifying permission for prolonged period of one year, this Court is of the opinion that permission can be granted, but only for a limited period and on the same terms and conditions as imposed earlier.

15. Accordingly, the application for travel permission is partly allowed.

16. The applicant/accused Harvinder Singh @ Balli is permitted to travel to Vietnam/Europe/China for a period of three months only from the date of departure, on the following terms and conditions

i) accused/applicant shall submit all the self attested copies of the travel documents viz. Visa, air tickets, etc. relating to his journey with the Court and the IO.

ii) accused/applicant shall submit his detailed itinerary containing his full address of stay, contact number, email ID for the same period to the Court as well as to the concerned IO.

iii) accused/applicant shall submit an undertaking by way of an affidavit that he will not extend his stay and that he shall return to India within the time limit as specified above. Accused will also submit in the affidavit that no case is pending either in Criminal or Civil Courts against him in United Kingdom.

iv) accused/applicant shall furnish personal security to the tune of Rs 60 lakhs in the form of FDR. Furthermore, he shall also furnish two sureties in sum of Rs. 20 lakh each and two unencumbered titled deeds of immovable properties, having value of not less than Rs.50 Lakhs each, as a security of his

return. The said immovable properties must be owned by his relatives.

v) accused/applicant shall not raise any dispute as to his identity, if it so arises during the proceedings of the case during the period of his journey and that his counsel duly authorized shall represent him during the said period before this Court and he shall be present in person on the NDOH of the case subsequent to his return to India.

vi) The passport of the accused shall be released to him, on furnishing of the affidavits and personal bonds and surety bonds mentioned condition no. iv above and he shall re-deposit the passport after returning back to India.

vii) It is clarified that if the accused fails to return from his foreign journey on time, the FDRs as well as the immovable properties would be liable to be forfeited.

viii) The accused will not open any bank account outside India and if any bank account outside India is opened up, he shall file the details of the same in the court by way of an affidavit.

17. As observed above, the accused has also filed an application for placing on record the tentative travel itinerary detailing travel to the United Kingdom, Amsterdam, Vietnam and China and business-related visits. The same is taken on record. During the permitted travel period, the applicant shall be permitted to enter India as and when required for court proceedings or permitted purposes.

18. The IO shall communicate the present order to Bureau of Immigration and FRRO. In case an LOC is opened against the applicant/accused, the same shall remain suspended during the period of his travel.

19. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case at the stage of trial.

20. Both applications stand disposed of accordingly.. Copy of the order be given dasti to the concerned parties.

**(Jitendra Pratap Singh)**  
**ASJ NDPS Act**  
**(Special Judge)/PHC**  
**NDD/23.03.2026**