

Bail Provisions Under Narcotics and Drugs Laws in India: A Legal Analysis

Ms. Archana Charak

Advocate, District Court Complex Samba

Abstract

The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (NDPS Act) is a special statute enacted to control and regulate operations relating to narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances in India. It prescribes stringent provisions, especially regarding bail. This research paper explores the legal framework governing bail under the NDPS Act, analyzes the interpretation of these provisions by Indian courts, and examines whether the existing bail jurisprudence balances individual liberty and the need to control drug trafficking.

1. Introduction

The problem of narcotics and drug abuse has emerged as one of the most pressing challenges for law enforcement agencies and policymakers across the world. The global drug trade, estimated to be worth billions of dollars, has not only undermined public health and safety but has also contributed significantly to transnational crime, terrorism, and economic instability. In India, the response to this threat has been primarily legislative, with the enactment of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (NDPS Act), which aims to consolidate and amend laws relating to narcotic drugs, to make stringent provisions for the control and regulation of operations relating to narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances, and to provide for the forfeiture of property derived from or used in illicit drug trafficking.

The NDPS Act is widely regarded as one of the harshest criminal laws in India, primarily because it departs significantly from the general principles of criminal jurisprudence—especially the right to bail. The Act imposes a strict liability regime for certain offences and, most importantly, contains draconian bail provisions under Section 37. Unlike the general provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (CrPC), which operate under the presumption of innocence and emphasize the discretionary power of courts to grant bail, the NDPS Act reverses this presumption in certain categories of cases, particularly those involving "commercial quantity" of narcotics or psychotropic substances.

Section 37 of the NDPS Act provides that bail shall not be granted unless the court is satisfied that there are "reasonable grounds" to believe that the accused is "not guilty" of the offence and "not likely to commit any offence while on bail." This "twin condition" test has led to a significant number of bail applications being denied, thereby resulting in prolonged undertrial detention, even in cases where eventual acquittals are secured. The provision has frequently been criticized by legal scholars and human rights activists for violating Article 21 of the Constitution, which guarantees the right to personal liberty and a fair trial.

The Indian judiciary, while acknowledging the rigorous nature of Section 37, has generally adopted a cautious approach. In *Union of India v. Ram Samujh*, the Supreme Court emphasized that the object of

the NDPS Act is to curb the drug menace with an iron hand, thus justifying the denial of bail in most cases involving commercial quantities. However, in subsequent decisions such as *Tofan Singh v. State of Tamil Nadu*, the Court has introduced safeguards by striking down certain evidentiary presumptions under the Act, thereby opening limited windows for bail.

This research aims to examine the evolving legal landscape surrounding bail under the NDPS Act. It analyses statutory provisions, judicial interpretations, and their alignment with constitutional mandates. In doing so, it seeks to strike a balance between the imperatives of criminal justice and the fundamental rights of the accused.

2. Statutory Framework of Bail under the NDPS Act

The legal framework for bail in India is generally governed by principles embedded within the broader domain of criminal law. Under ordinary circumstances, the right to bail is determined by the nature and gravity of the offence, the likelihood of the accused tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses, and the possibility of the accused absconding. However, the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (NDPS Act) deviates from these general principles, particularly in cases involving serious offences like possession or trafficking of commercial quantities of narcotic drugs or psychotropic substances.

2.1 General Rule: Bail under Criminal Law

Under general criminal law, bail is governed by statutory provisions that aim to ensure the liberty of the accused while balancing the interests of justice. Sections 480 and 483 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) deal with bail in bailable and non-bailable offences respectively. In essence, these provisions empower both Magistrates and Sessions Courts to grant or deny bail after taking into account the seriousness of the offence, the antecedents of the accused, and the interest of the society. The underlying assumption in these provisions is the presumption of innocence until proven guilty, a cornerstone of criminal jurisprudence.

However, the NDPS Act departs significantly from this principle, especially in cases involving a commercial quantity of contraband. This special legislation prescribes stricter bail conditions, reflecting the legislature's intent to combat drug trafficking with an uncompromising approach.

2.2 Special Conditions: Section 37 of the NDPS Act

Section 37 of the NDPS Act lays down a more stringent framework for granting bail to persons accused of serious offences under the Act. It acts as a non obstante clause, explicitly overriding the provisions of the general criminal law regarding bail. Specifically, Section 37(1)(b) provides that an accused person shall not be released on bail for an offence involving a commercial quantity of drugs unless two essential conditions are satisfied:

- (i) The Public Prosecutor has been given an opportunity to oppose the application for bail;
- (ii) The court is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is not guilty of such offence and is not likely to commit any offence while on bail.

These twin conditions significantly restrict judicial discretion and effectively create a reverse burden on the accused to prove innocence at the pre-trial stage—contrary to the ordinary presumption of innocence. This approach has drawn considerable criticism from jurists and human rights advocates, who argue that it leads to unjustified pre-trial incarceration, especially when trials are delayed. Moreover, courts have often interpreted the "reasonable grounds" test as requiring a *prima facie* evaluation of evidence, which is generally considered inappropriate at the bail stage.

The statutory framework under Section 37 thus exemplifies the NDPS Act's overarching punitive orientation. While it is intended to address the societal harm caused by drug trafficking, its rigid application often leads to denial of bail even in cases lacking strong evidence or where the accused plays a minor role in the alleged offence.

3. Judicial Interpretation

Judicial interpretation of bail provisions under the NDPS Act has seen a delicate balance between strict enforcement of the statute and safeguarding fundamental rights of the accused. Indian courts have, over time, navigated the rigid framework of Section 37 by carving out nuanced interpretations depending on the facts, quantity of contraband, and evidentiary concerns. This section analyses landmark decisions that have shaped bail jurisprudence under the NDPS regime.

3.1 Strict Interpretation – *Union of India v. Ram Samujh*

In *Union of India v. Ram Samujh*, the Supreme Court emphasized the stringent nature of the NDPS Act and stated that the legislative intent was to curb the drug menace with an iron hand. The Court held that bail under Section 37 must not be granted liberally and that the "twin conditions" under Section 37(1)(b) must be strictly satisfied. The decision laid the foundation for a conservative approach in bail adjudication under the Act.

3.2 Relief-Oriented Interpretation – *Tofan Singh v. State of Tamil Nadu*

In a landmark verdict, the Supreme Court in *Tofan Singh v. State of Tamil Nadu* ruled that confessions made to officers under Section 53 of the NDPS Act are not admissible in evidence, as such officers are deemed "police officers" under the Evidence Act. This ruling had a ripple effect on bail jurisprudence, as the inadmissibility of confessions significantly weakened the prosecution's case in many instances, thereby allowing courts to reconsider bail more favourably.

3.3 Distinction Based on Quantity – *State of Punjab v. Baldev Singh*

The Court in *State of Punjab v. Baldev Singh* underscored the need to distinguish between traffickers and individuals caught with drugs for personal use. While reiterating the gravity of drug offences, it recognized that punitive measures should be balanced with rehabilitative goals in minor quantity cases, thereby laying ground for more lenient bail consideration for addicts or first-time users.

3.4 Bail Despite Commercial Quantity – *Narcotics Control Bureau v. Mohit Aggarwal*

In *NCB v. Mohit Aggarwal*, the Court granted bail despite the involvement of a commercial quantity, noting discrepancies in the chain of custody and other procedural lapses. It held that non-compliance with mandatory safeguards under Sections 42 and 50 could affect the credibility of the prosecution's case, warranting bail even under Section 37.

3.5 Personal Liberty Emphasized – *Arnesh Kumar v. State of Bihar*

Though not an NDPS case, *Arnesh Kumar v. State of Bihar* had persuasive value. The Court directed that arrests should not be made routinely, and bail should be the norm rather than the exception, especially in cases where the offence is punishable with imprisonment of less than seven years. This reasoning has been invoked in NDPS cases involving small or intermediate quantities.

3.6 Procedural Irregularity – *Gurbax Singh v. State of Haryana*

In *Gurbax Singh v. State of Haryana*, the Punjab & Haryana High Court granted bail where procedural lapses in search and seizure were evident. The court emphasized that failure to follow due process under Sections 42 and 50 of the NDPS Act may lead to vitiation of trial and justify pre-trial bail.

These decisions demonstrate that while the judiciary acknowledges the seriousness of drug-related offences, it does not hesitate to protect individual liberty when procedural safeguards are compromised or evidence is weak.

4. Commercial Quantity vs. Small Quantity

A distinctive feature of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (NDPS Act) is its categorization of offences based on the quantity of the contraband involved. This classification directly impacts sentencing and bail decisions. The Act recognizes three categories—small quantity, intermediate quantity, and commercial quantity—which are defined in the Schedule appended to the Act, as notified by the Central Government.

Small quantity offences generally involve drugs meant for personal use. The punishment prescribed for such offences under Section 27 is relatively lenient, often not exceeding one year of imprisonment or a fine. Correspondingly, courts tend to adopt a liberal bail approach in such cases, especially where the accused is a first-time offender or an addict. The rationale is grounded in the principles of rehabilitation and restorative justice.

Intermediate quantity refers to quantities that fall between small and commercial thresholds. Although not expressly defined under the Act, this category invites judicial discretion. Courts examine the circumstances of each case—including the nature of the drug, the accused's intent, and involvement in trafficking—to decide bail matters. There is no automatic application of Section 37 in such cases, which provides some leeway to courts.

Commercial quantity attracts the most stringent bail provisions. Section 37 of the NDPS Act becomes operative in these cases, imposing a twin test for the grant of bail: (i) the Public Prosecutor must be given an opportunity to oppose the bail application, and (ii) the court must be satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing the accused is not guilty and will not reoffend. This reverse burden significantly curtails judicial discretion and emphasizes deterrence over rehabilitation. The quantities considered "commercial" vary depending on the substance—for example, 1 kg of heroin or 1 kg of charas is deemed commercial.

Thus, the categorization of quantity is a crucial determinant in bail jurisprudence under the NDPS Act, shaping the balance between individual liberty and societal protection.

5. Recent Developments and Reforms

In recent years, there has been a noticeable shift in the judicial discourse toward a more humane and reformative approach, particularly in cases involving drug users rather than traffickers. Courts have begun to differentiate between addiction-driven possession and commercial trafficking, reflecting global trends emphasizing decriminalization and rehabilitation.

In *Arun Kumar v. State of Rajasthan*, the Supreme Court held that courts must not deny bail merely on the ground that the seized quantity falls within the commercial bracket. Instead, trial courts are encouraged to consider the overall context, including the role of the accused, antecedents, procedural compliance, and the likelihood of rehabilitation. The judgment signified a growing judicial awareness of substance abuse as a public health issue, not just a criminal matter.

Additionally, the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment has proposed policy reforms aiming at integrating addiction treatment into the criminal justice system. These proposals include diverting small

quantity offenders to de-addiction programs and suspending prosecution where medical treatment is accepted—marking a significant shift toward harm reduction.

These reforms and judicial trends indicate a paradigm shift in NDPS jurisprudence—where rehabilitation, proportionality, and procedural fairness are slowly gaining ground against the rigid enforcement model.

6. Challenges and Criticism

Despite the NDPS Act's deterrent objectives, its bail provisions—especially Section 37—have attracted substantial criticism for undermining the foundational principles of criminal jurisprudence in India. These challenges concern both constitutional guarantees and procedural justice.

One major criticism is the presumption of guilt embedded within Section 37. The section mandates that bail in cases involving commercial quantities can be granted only when the court is satisfied that the accused is “not guilty” and unlikely to commit any offence while on bail. This reverses the presumption of innocence, a cornerstone of criminal law, and shifts the burden of proof onto the accused even before the trial begins. It thereby contravenes the principle that an accused is innocent until proven guilty beyond reasonable doubt.

Second, there is the issue of delayed trials and prolonged pre-trial detention, which frequently result from the overburdened judiciary and investigative agencies. In *Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar*, the Supreme Court declared that speedy trial is a fundamental right under Article 21 of the Constitution. In NDPS cases, however, accused persons often remain incarcerated for years without conviction due to slow judicial processes, infringing upon their right to life and personal liberty.

Third, the lack of definitional clarity in Section 37 contributes to inconsistent judicial outcomes. Terms like “reasonable grounds” and “not guilty” are subjective and undefined within the statute, giving wide discretion to judges but also causing unpredictability. This inconsistency is especially visible in lower courts, where similar factual situations yield different bail outcomes, undermining the rule of law and equality before law.

7. Conclusion and Suggestions

The NDPS Act's bail regime, particularly for offences involving commercial quantities, was crafted with the intent of curbing drug trafficking through strict enforcement. However, the overbroad and rigid application of Section 37 has led to harsh outcomes, often affecting those who are minor offenders, addicts, or wrongfully accused.

The judiciary has increasingly acknowledged that blanket denial of bail can amount to punitive incarceration without trial, especially when procedural safeguards are violated or where evidence is tenuous. Thus, there is a pressing need to balance societal interest in combating drug offences with the constitutional commitment to individual liberty and fair trial.

Recommendations:

Amend Section 37 to incorporate a degree of judicial discretion, particularly in cases involving procedural lapses or marginal involvement of the accused. A prescriptive standard of “not guilty” should be replaced with a prima facie assessment of evidence.

Ensure speedy trials through special NDPS courts with dedicated judges and investigators, to prevent prolonged undertrial detentions that violate Article 21.

Provide statutory exceptions in bail provisions for first-time users and addicts, along with mechanisms for diversion to rehabilitation centres rather than incarceration, aligning with global trends on drug law reform.

These reforms will help evolve the NDPS Act from a punitive to a more just and reformatory legal framework while retaining its deterrent value against organized drug trafficking.