



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 International (CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium provided the original work is properly cited.

Drug Cartels and Organised Crime in India: Legal Challenges and Judicial Responses

Mahmood Ahmad^aTooba Tarique^b

^aResearch Scholar, CMP Degree College, Prayagraj, India ^bShibli National College, Azamgarh, India

Received 03 August 2026; Accepted 04 September 2026; Published 08 September 2026

The problem of drug trafficking and organised drug networks has emerged as a significant challenge to the Indian legal system. It has also affected public order, health, and the national security of India. Drug cartels operate through complex and decentralised networks that extend beyond conventional drug trafficking. It may involve conspiracy, financial crimes, corruption, cross-border activities, and the use of highly sophisticated and advanced technologies. The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985 is the primary Statutory framework for controlling narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances in India. The Act provides stringent measures against illicit trafficking, financing of illicit trafficking, and harbouring offenders. However, the evolving nature of the organised drug network poses substantial challenges relating to drug trafficking. Due to its sophisticated and highly complex nature, drug trafficking put hurdle in investigation, evidence collection, financial tracing, inter-agency coordination, digital evidence, etc. The paper adopts a doctrinal and analytical research methodology based on primary and secondary legal sources. This paper will argue that although India possesses a substantial statutory framework for combating illicit drug trafficking, the effectiveness of the existing regime is affected by institutional, technological, and cross-border enforcement challenges. In its conclusion, the paper will propose some legal and institutional reforms aimed at strengthening the investigation and prosecution of drug cartels through preserving constitutional safeguards and the principle of Fair criminal justice.

Keywords: NDPS, drug cartel, organised crime, drug trafficking, judicial response.

INTRODUCTION

Drug trafficking has emerged as one of the significant manifestations of organised criminal activity in the contemporary world. Unlike isolated offences involving the unlawful possession or sale of narcotic substances, organised drug trafficking frequently involves coordinated networks engaged in procurement, transportation, financing, distribution and the concealment of illicit proceeds. The increasing sophistication of such networks has transformed drug-related crime into a matter involving not only criminal law enforcement but also questions of national security, financial crime and transnational cooperation.¹ The drug trade is closely associated with organised criminal groups that adapt their structures and methods in response to changing law-enforcement strategies. Such groups may operate through hierarchical or decentralised networks and often rely upon multiple actors performing specialised functions. The organised and network-based character of drug trafficking creates substantial difficulties in identifying the participants of criminal enterprises and establishing their individual roles and collective responsibility. The international law related to drug trafficking recognises the relationship between organised crime and illicit trafficking in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances. The United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime, 2000 defines an 'organised criminal group' as a structured group of three or more persons existing for a period of time and acting in concert for the purpose of committing serious crimes in order to obtain, directly or indirectly, a financial or other material benefit.² This convention is relevant to the study of drug cartels because organised drug networks generally exhibit continuity, coordination, economic motivation and collective criminal activity.

In India, the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 is the principal legislation governing narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances. The Act seeks to make stringent provisions for the control and regulation of operations relating to such substances and also provides for measures against illicit traffic and property derived from such activities.³ Further, provisions relating to financing illicit traffic, harbouring offenders, abetment and criminal conspiracy demonstrate the legislative recognition that drug-related offences may extend beyond individual acts and involve organised forms of criminal

¹ *World Drug Report 2025* (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2025)

² United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime 2000

³ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985

participation. But the prosecution of drug cartels presents challenges distinct from the prosecution of individual drug offenders. The investigation of organised networks may require the establishment of conspiratorial relationships, financial connections, coordinated criminal conduct and knowledge of unlawful activities. These difficulties are further intensified by technological developments, cross-border operations, multiple enforcement agencies and complex evidentiary requirements. The effectiveness of the legal system must therefore be assessed not merely on the basis of the severity of statutory punishment but also on its capacity to investigate and prosecute organised criminal structures. The judiciary plays an important role in this legal framework. Indian courts have interpreted several substantive and procedural provisions of the NDPS Act concerning possession, search and seizure, statutory presumptions, criminal conspiracy, evidentiary safeguards and bail. Judicial interpretation has influenced the balance between the stringent objectives of narcotics control legislation and the constitutional requirements of fair procedure and personal liberty.

Against this background, the present study examines drug cartels as a manifestation of organised crime and critically evaluates the legal challenges associated with their investigation and prosecution in India. The study focuses on the adequacy of the existing legal framework, particularly the NDPS Act, and analyses judicial responses to significant issues arising in organised drug-trafficking cases. It further seeks to identify the institutional and legal reforms necessary for strengthening the Indian response to drug cartels while maintaining constitutional and procedural safeguards.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The present study seeks to address the following questions:

1. What is the nature and structure of drug cartels as a form of organised crime in India?
2. To what extent does the existing Indian legal framework effectively address organised drug trafficking and cartel activities?
3. What are the major legal, investigative and evidentiary challenges involved in the investigation and prosecution of drug-cartel activities?
4. How have Indian courts responded to issues relating to drug trafficking, criminal conspiracy, possession and procedural safeguards?

5. What legal and institutional reforms are necessary to strengthen India's response to drug cartels while maintaining constitutional and procedural safeguards?

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The present study has the following objectives:

1. To critically examine the adequacy and effectiveness of the existing Indian legal framework, particularly the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, in addressing drug cartels and organised drug trafficking, with special reference to investigative, evidentiary, institutional and cross-border enforcement challenges.
2. To analyse judicial responses to organised drug-trafficking cases in India and to identify appropriate legal and institutional reforms necessary for strengthening the enforcement framework while ensuring compliance with constitutional and procedural safeguards.

DRUG CARTELS AND ORGANISED CRIME: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The expression 'drug cartel' does not have a specific statutory definition under Indian law. In its broader criminological sense, however, the term may be used to describe an organised group or network engaged in the systematic production, movement, financing or distribution of illicit drugs for financial or material benefit. The concept should not be restricted to a rigid hierarchical organisation because present organised criminal groups may also operate through flexible and decentralised networks. The concept of organised crime is particularly useful for understanding the structure of drug cartels. Organised crime generally involves a degree of continuity, coordination and collective participation directed towards the commission of serious offences for material gain. The United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime identifies the essential elements of an organised criminal group as the existence of a structured group, consisting of three or more persons, operating over a period of time and acting in concert for the commission of serious crimes.⁴ The Convention further explains that a structured group need not possess formally defined roles, continuity of membership or a developed organisational hierarchy. This understanding is significant in the context of contemporary drug trafficking. Drug networks may consist of

⁴ United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime 2000

different participants performing specialised functions without all members directly interacting with one another. The organisational structure may include persons responsible for procurement, transportation, financing, communication and distribution. Such decentralisation can make it difficult to establish the complete structure of the organisation and the precise criminal responsibility of individual participants.

The distinction between an isolated drug offence and organised drug trafficking is therefore important. An individual may be prosecuted for unlawful possession or transportation of a prohibited substance, whereas the prosecution of an organised criminal network requires evidence demonstrating coordinated participation and a relationship between different actors. The legal challenge extends beyond proving the physical act relating to a prohibited substance and includes establishing elements such as knowledge, intention, conspiracy and participation in organised criminal activity.

In India, the NDPS Act addresses several dimensions of organised drug-related crime. Section 27A criminalises financing illicit traffic and harbouring offenders, while Section 29 provides punishment for abetment and criminal conspiracy.⁵ These sections are particularly relevant where drug offences involve collective criminal activity. Nevertheless, the effective prosecution of drug cartels depends upon the ability of investigative agencies to connect individual acts with a wider criminal enterprise. Thus, drug cartels may be understood as organised criminal networks engaged in coordinated drug-related activities for financial or material gain. Their flexible organisational structures, financial dimensions and, in some cases, transnational character create challenges that cannot always be addressed through the conventional prosecution of individual drug offences.

INDIAN LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR ADDRESSING DRUG CARTELS AND ORGANISED DRUG TRAFFICKING

The Indian legal response to organised drug trafficking is primarily centred on the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985. The Act consolidates the law relating to narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances and seeks to establish stringent control over their production, possession, transportation, distribution and illicit trafficking.⁶ The expression

⁵ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985, ss 27A and 29

⁶ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985

'drug cartel' is not specifically defined under the Act; several provisions are capable of addressing the collective and organised dimensions of drug-related criminality. Section 8 of the NDPS Act provides the basic prohibition against various activities relating to narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances except for medical and scientific purposes and in accordance with the Act and the rules made thereunder.⁷ The provisions relating to production, manufacture, possession, sale, transportation and import or export provide the substantive basis for prosecuting individual participants involved in organised drug-trafficking networks.⁸ More specifically, section 27A addresses the financing of unlawful traffic and harbouring of offenders, recognising that organised drug trafficking depends not only upon persons directly involved in the physical movement of prohibited substances but also upon financial and logistical support.⁹ Section 29 extends criminal liability to persons involved in abetment and criminal conspiracy, making it particularly relevant in cases where multiple individuals participate in different stages of an organised criminal enterprise.¹⁰ The NDPS Act also provide provisions concerning the forfeiture of property derived from unlawful trafficking. Such provisions are important because organised drug trafficking is fundamentally motivated by financial gain, and an effective legal response must extend beyond the seizure of narcotic substances to the identification and deprivation of illicit proceeds.¹¹ The statutory framework contains provisions relating to search, seizure, arrest, investigation and evidentiary presumptions, which significantly influence the prosecution of organised drug offences.

The law for addressing drug cartels has also expanded beyond the NDPS Act. The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 introduces specific provisions dealing with organised crime and criminal syndicates, thereby providing a broader legal mandate for addressing coordinated criminal activity undertaken for material benefit.¹² This development is significant because organised drug trafficking may involve criminal activities extending beyond offences specifically punishable under the NDPS Act. The Prevention of Money-Laundering Act, 2002 assumes importance where the proceeds generated through drug trafficking are concealed, possessed, transferred or projected as legitimate property. Financial investigation and asset

⁷ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985, s 8

⁸ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985

⁹ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985, s 27A

¹⁰ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985, s 29

¹¹ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985

¹² The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023

tracing are therefore essential components of an effective legal response to organised drug crime.¹³ India possesses an extensive statutory mechanism for combating organised drug trafficking. The intensity of stringent legal provisions does not by itself ensure effective action against drug cartels. The practical application of the framework depends upon coordinated investigation, financial intelligence, reliable evidence, inter-agency cooperation and the ability to establish the connection between individual offenders and wider criminal networks.

LEGAL, INVESTIGATIVE AND EVIDENTIARY CHALLENGES IN THE INVESTIGATION AND PROSECUTION OF DRUG CARTELS

The existence of harsher penal provisions does not necessarily ensure the effective prosecution of organised drug-trafficking networks. Drug cartels often operate through multiple participants performing separate functions, making it difficult for investigating agencies to establish the complete structure of the criminal enterprise and the individual responsibility of its members. The prosecution is therefore required to connect apparently separate acts of possession, transportation, financing or communication with a wider pattern of coordinated criminal activity. In many cases, direct evidence establishing an agreement between all members of a criminal network may not be available. The prosecution may rely upon circumstantial evidence to establish knowledge, intention and coordinated conduct. But the existence of an organised criminal network cannot be presumed merely from the recovery of contraband from an individual accused. A legally sustainable prosecution requires reliable evidence connecting the accused with the alleged criminal enterprise.¹⁴ Search and seizure also constitute an important area of legal difficulty under the NDPS Act. Sections 41 to 43 provide extensive powers of search and seizure, while section 50 provides an important procedural safeguard in relation to the personal search of an accused.¹⁵ Judicial interpretation has repeatedly emphasised that the stringent nature of punishments under the Act requires substantial compliance with statutory safeguards. Procedural deficiencies in search and seizure may therefore affect the credibility and admissibility of evidence produced during trial.¹⁶

¹³ The Prevention of Money-laundering Act 2002

¹⁴ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985

¹⁵ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985, ss 41, 42, 43 and 50

¹⁶ *State of Punjab v Baldev Singh* (1999) 6 SCC 172

Another significant evidentiary challenge relates to the handling and preservation of seized substances. The prosecution must establish a reliable chain of custody demonstrating that the material examined by the forensic laboratory and produced before the court is connected with the substance originally seized during the investigation. Questions concerning inventory, sampling, safe custody and disposal are particularly relevant under section 52A of the NDPS Act.¹⁷ Judicial decisions have recently held the importance of establishing the integrity of the seized material and compliance with the statutory procedure, as well as procedural lapses must ultimately be assessed in the context of the overall evidence available in a particular case.¹⁸ Financial investigation presents a further challenge in cases involving organised drug trafficking. Drug cartels are primarily motivated by financial gain, and the prosecution of individual carriers or distributors may have limited impact unless the authorities can identify the persons financing the criminal activity and trace the proceeds derived from unlawful trafficking. The legal response under section 27A of the NDPS Act and the Prevention of Money-laundering Act, 2002 provides an important framework in this regard, but effective implementation requires specialised financial investigation and coordination between different agencies.¹⁹ Technological developments have also created new evidentiary difficulties. Organised criminal networks may rely on electronic communications and other forms of digital transactions, requiring investigating agencies to establish the authenticity, attribution and evidentiary reliability of electronic records. The Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 provides a statutory framework for electronic evidence, but the collection and presentation of digital material continue to raise questions concerning authenticity, chain of custody and the identification of the persons responsible for electronic communication.²⁰ Cross-border dimensions further complicate the investigation of organised drug trafficking. Where different stages of a criminal operation occur across jurisdictions, domestic agencies may require international cooperation for obtaining evidence, tracing financial transactions and identifying participants located outside India. Delays in

¹⁷ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985, s 52A

¹⁸ *Bharat Aambale v The State of Chhattisgarh*, 2025 INSC 78; *Sajan Yadav v Directorate of Revenue Intelligence* (2026) CGHC:13912

¹⁹ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985; The Prevention of Money-laundering Act 2002

²⁰ The Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam 2023; Aparna M P, 'Dark Web Narcotics Markets and the Evidentiary Crisis under the NDPS Act' (2026) 9(4) *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities* <<https://ijlmh.com/article/view/dark-web-narcotics-markets-and-the-evidentiary-crisis-under-the-ndps-act>> accessed 29 July 2026

information sharing and differences between national legal systems can consequently affect the effectiveness of investigation and prosecution.²¹

JUDICIAL RESPONSES TO DRUG CARTELS AND ORGANISED DRUG TRAFFICKING IN INDIA

The judiciary has played an important role in shaping the enforcement of the NDPS Act by interpreting its stringent substantive provisions alongside procedural and constitutional safeguards. But Indian courts do not ordinarily use the expression 'drug cartel' as a distinct statutory category; judicial decisions concerning conspiracy, conscious possession, search and seizure, evidentiary presumptions and bail have considerable relevance to the prosecution of organised drug-trafficking networks.²² The Supreme Court has held that the stringent punishments prescribed under the NDPS Act require careful compliance with statutory safeguards. In *State of Punjab v Baldev Singh*, the Constitution Bench accepted the importance of section 50 and held that a person subjected to a personal search must be informed of the legal right to be searched in the presence of a Gazetted Officer or Magistrate.²³ The decision established that procedural safeguards cannot be treated as mere technical formalities where the prosecution relies substantially upon recovery resulting from a personal search. This approach reflects an important judicial balance. While the NDPS Act seeks to combat serious drug-related offences, the severity of its penal consequences requires fairness and legality in investigative procedures. The judicial insistence upon compliance with statutory requirements therefore acts as an institutional safeguard against arbitrary investigation.

The idea of possession occupies a central position in NDPS prosecutions. Judicial interpretation has distinguished mere physical proximity from conscious possession, which involves knowledge and control over the prohibited substance. In *Mohan Lal v State of Rajasthan*, the Supreme Court recognised that possession under the NDPS Act may involve physical possession as well as dominion and control accompanied by the requisite mental element.²⁴ This principle is particularly relevant in cases involving organised drug

²¹ United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances 1988; United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime 2000

²² *Compilation of Important Judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and High Courts under the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985* (Narcotics Control Bureau, 2022)

²³ *State of Punjab v Baldev Singh* (1999) 6 SCC 172

²⁴ *Mohan Lal v State of Rajasthan* (2015) 6 SCC 222

trafficking. Members of a criminal network may perform different functions, and contraband may not always be physically recovered from every alleged participant. So, the courts are required to assess whether the available evidence establishes conscious possession or another legally recognised form of participation in the alleged criminal activity. The doctrine therefore prevents criminal liability from being imposed solely based on association while allowing the prosecution to rely upon evidence demonstrating knowledge and control. Section 29 of the NDPS Act is particularly important in cases involving organised drug networks because it extends criminal liability to abetment and criminal conspiracy. The prosecution of a cartel or organised trafficking network frequently depends upon establishing the relationship between different participants and demonstrating that their separate activities formed part of a coordinated criminal enterprise.²⁵ The Supreme Court has recognised that conspiracy is generally proved through circumstances because direct evidence of an unlawful agreement is often unavailable. However, the existence of a conspiracy must still be established through reliable circumstances demonstrating a meeting of minds and coordinated participation.²⁶ In the context of drug cartels, this principle is important because mere association with an accused person or incidental contact cannot automatically establish participation in a larger criminal enterprise.

The NDPS Act provide statutory presumptions under sections 35 and 54. Section 35 permits the court to presume the existence of a culpable mental state in specified circumstances, while section 54 permits a presumption from possession of illicit articles.²⁷ These provisions strengthen the prosecution in appropriate cases but do not remove the fundamental obligation to establish foundational facts. The judicial approach has emphasised that presumptions cannot arise automatically without proof of the basic facts necessary to invoke them. Before a presumption relating to possession can operate, the prosecution must first establish a legally sustainable recovery and the relevant connection of the accused with the seized substance.²⁸ This limitation is significant because organised crime investigations may involve multiple accused persons whose individual roles differ considerably. A significant development in NDPS jurisprudence concerns the evidentiary value of statements recorded under section 67 of the Act. In *Tofan Singh v State of Tamil Nadu*, the Supreme Court held

²⁵ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985, s 29

²⁶ *Kehar Singh & Ors v State (Delhi Administration)* (1988) 3 SCC 609

²⁷ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985, ss 35 and 54

²⁸ *Sanjeet Kumar Singh @ Munna Kumar Singh v State of Chhattisgarh* (2022) Crim App No 871/2021

that statements recorded under section 67 cannot be treated as confessional statements admissible for the trial of an offence under the NDPS Act.²⁹ The decision has particular importance for the prosecution of organised drug networks. Investigative agencies may obtain information from multiple participants regarding the structure and operation of an alleged criminal enterprise. The inability to rely upon confessional statements as substantive evidence requires the prosecution to strengthen independent sources of proof, including documentary, electronic, financial and other legally admissible evidence. Section 37 of the NDPS Act imposes restrictive conditions for the grant of bail in specified serious offences, particularly those involving commercial quantity and offences under sections 19, 24 and 27A.

The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that the statutory conditions must be satisfied before an accused can be released on bail.³⁰ In *Union of India v Md. Nawaz Khan*, the Supreme Court says that courts dealing with serious NDPS offences must carefully examine the material on record in accordance with the statutory requirements of section 37.³¹ The judicial approach towards bail demonstrates the seriousness with which organised drug-trafficking allegations are treated. At the same time, the constitutional requirement of personal liberty and the right to a speedy trial remain relevant, particularly where prolonged incarceration occurs without timely conclusion of proceedings.³² The judicial response to organised drug trafficking reflects a continuing attempt to balance two competing considerations. On one hand, courts recognise the serious social consequences of organised drug trafficking and the legislative objective of imposing stringent controls. On the other hand, courts have insisted that the exceptional powers and severe punishments under the NDPS Act must operate within the framework of fair procedure and constitutional safeguards. The approach of the judiciary therefore neither treats every procedural irregularity as insignificant nor permits the objective of drug control to override fundamental criminal justice principles. This balancing approach is very important in cases involving alleged drug cartels, where investigative agencies may rely upon complex networks of circumstantial, financial and electronic evidence.

²⁹ *Tofan Singh v State of Tamil Nadu* AIR (2020) Supreme Court 5592

³⁰ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985, s 37

³¹ *Union of India through Narcotics Control Bureau v Md Nawaz Khan* (2021) Crim App No 1043/2021

³² *Narcotics Control Bureau v Mohit Aggarwal* (2022) 4 SCC 713; *Union of India v K A Najeeb* (2021) 3 SCC 713

EMERGING CHALLENGES: TECHNOLOGY, FINANCIAL NETWORKS AND TRANSNATIONAL DRUG TRAFFICKING

The current structure of organised drug trafficking has undergone significant transformation with the increasing use of technology and transnational communication networks. Drug cartels are no longer necessarily confined to identifiable geographical territories or traditional hierarchical structures. Digital communication, electronic transactions and international transportation networks have enabled criminal groups to coordinate activities across jurisdictions while reducing direct physical interaction between participants. One of the emerging challenges relates to the use of digital communication and electronic records in criminal investigations. Electronic devices, communication records and digital transactions may provide important evidence for establishing links between different participants in an organised drug-trafficking network. But the evidentiary value of such material depends upon its authenticity, reliability and proper collection in accordance with the applicable legal framework.

The increasing importance of electronic evidence therefore requires investigating agencies to develop specialised technical and forensic capacities. Financial networks constitute another significant dimension of organised drug trafficking. Drug cartels are primarily motivated by economic gain, and the proceeds generated from unlawful trafficking may be transferred, concealed or integrated into apparently legitimate economic activities. The identification of financial beneficiaries is therefore essential for dismantling organised criminal networks. The Prevention of Money-laundering Act 2002 provides a mechanism for addressing the laundering of proceeds of crime, but effective financial investigation requires coordination between narcotics enforcement agencies, financial intelligence authorities and other investigative institutions.³³ The transnational nature of drug trafficking presents additional jurisdictional difficulties. India occupies a geographically significant position in relation to major international drug-trafficking routes, and illicit substances may enter or pass through the country through land, maritime and other channels. Organised networks may involve participants located in different countries, thereby requiring cooperation in intelligence sharing, extradition, mutual legal assistance and the collection of evidence located outside domestic jurisdiction. International law recognises the importance of cooperation in

³³ The Prevention of Money-laundering Act 2002

combating illicit drug trafficking. The United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, 1988 encourages States to strengthen measures relating to extradition, mutual legal assistance and other forms of international cooperation.³⁴ Similarly, the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime, 2000 emphasises international cooperation as an essential component of combating organised criminal groups operating across national boundaries. The addition of new technologies with sophisticated and transnational drug networks demonstrates that conventional enforcement strategies directed solely at individual possession or transportation may be insufficient to dismantle organised criminal enterprises. Effective legal responses require the integration of digital investigation, financial intelligence, forensic capacity and international cooperation.

CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE INDIAN LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE

The preceding discussion demonstrates that India possesses a comparatively comprehensive law for controlling narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances and prosecuting activities connected with illicit trafficking. This Act contains stringent provisions relating to production, possession, transportation, financing of illicit traffic, abetment and criminal conspiracy.³⁵ The legal framework is further supplemented by laws relating to organised crime, money laundering, customs control and electronic evidence. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of the legal system against drug cartels depends substantially upon the practical capacity of institutions to identify, investigate and prosecute organised criminal networks. A significant limitation is the absence of a specific and comprehensive statutory concept of a 'drug cartel' within the NDPS Act. The Act primarily focuses on particular prohibited activities and the quantity of contraband involved, whereas organised drug trafficking frequently involves complex networks in which different participants perform separate functions. Sections 27A and 29 provide important mechanisms for addressing financing and conspiracy; the prosecution of higher-level organisers may remain difficult where direct evidence of their involvement is unavailable.³⁶ The multi-agency nature of narcotics enforcement presents both advantages and challenges. Agencies responsible for narcotics control, customs enforcement, financial investigation and state policing may possess

³⁴ United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime 2000

³⁵ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985

³⁶ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985, ss 27A and 29

different statutory powers and institutional capacities. The involvement of multiple agencies may also create difficulties relating to coordination, information sharing and overlapping jurisdiction. Effective action against organised criminal networks requires an integrated investigative approach rather than isolated prosecution of individual offenders.³⁷

Another limitation concerns the distinction between arresting lower-level participants and dismantling the broader criminal enterprise. Conventional enforcement operations may result in the seizure of contraband and the arrest of carriers or local distributors, but such actions do not necessarily establish the identity of financiers, organisers and beneficiaries. An effective response to drug cartels must therefore prioritise financial investigation, communication analysis and the identification of the organisational structure supporting illicit trafficking.

The framework also presents practical challenges. The stringent provisions of the NDPS Act are accompanied by important procedural safeguards relating to search, seizure, sampling and possession. Judicial decisions have appropriately emphasised compliance with these safeguards because serious penalties cannot justify departures from fair procedure.³⁸ Deficiencies in investigation and evidence collection may result in the failure of prosecution even where intelligence indicates the existence of organised criminal activity. Strengthening professional investigation and forensic capacity is therefore as important as strengthening substantive criminal law. The introduction of organised crime provisions under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 represents a potentially significant development. These provisions may assist in addressing criminal syndicates whose activities extend beyond individual offences. But their effective application to organised drug trafficking will depend upon the manner in which investigative agencies and courts interpret the relationship between general organised-crime provisions and the specialised framework of the NDPS Act.³⁹

A further concern relates to the balance between effective enforcement and constitutional safeguards. The NDPS Act incorporates severe punishments, statutory presumptions and restrictive bail conditions. While these provisions reflect the seriousness of drug trafficking,

³⁷ *Annual Report 2023–24* (Narcotics Control Bureau, 2023)

³⁸ *State of Punjab v Baldev Singh* (1999) 6 SCC 172; *Tofan Singh v State of Tamil Nadu* AIR 2020 SC 5592

³⁹ The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023

their implementation must remain consistent with the requirements of fair investigation, due process and personal liberty.⁴⁰ Judicial scrutiny is therefore essential to ensure that the objective of combating organised drug crime does not result in arbitrary or procedurally defective prosecution. The principal weakness of the existing Indian response does not necessarily lie in the absence of stringent laws. Rather, the challenge lies in transforming a fragmented and offence-oriented enforcement model into a coordinated strategy directed at the entire criminal enterprise. Effective action against drug cartels requires the simultaneous use of criminal prosecution, financial investigation, technological capacity, intelligence sharing and international cooperation.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Major Findings: The present study demonstrates that drug cartels constitute a complex form of organised criminal activity that cannot be effectively understood merely through individual offences of possession, transportation or sale of narcotic substances. Organised drug trafficking involves coordinated networks in which different participants may perform specialised functions relating to procurement, transportation, financing, communication and distribution. So an effective legal response must focus not only on the physical recovery of contraband but also on identifying the wider criminal structure responsible for organised trafficking.

The study further finds that India possesses a substantial legal framework for addressing drug-related offences. The NDPS Act contains stringent provisions dealing with illicit trafficking, financing, abetment, criminal conspiracy and the forfeiture of illegally acquired property. The framework is supplemented by the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002. The existence of multiple statutory provisions does not automatically ensure the effective dismantling of organised drug networks. A major challenge lies in the investigation and prosecution of higher-level organisers and financiers. Law-enforcement action may successfully result in the seizure of contraband and the arrest of persons directly involved in transportation or local distribution, while the persons responsible for financing and coordinating the larger criminal enterprise remain outside the immediate scope of prosecution. The effective use of section 27A and section 29 of the NDPS

⁴⁰ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985

Act, together with financial investigation mechanisms, is therefore essential for addressing the organisational and economic foundations of drug cartels.⁴¹ The judicial response has also significantly influenced the operation of the NDPS framework. Courts have recognised the seriousness of drug trafficking while insisting upon compliance with procedural safeguards and evidentiary requirements. Judicial decisions concerning personal search, confessional statements, statutory presumptions and bail demonstrate that the effectiveness of drug-control legislation must remain consistent with the requirements of fair procedure and constitutional protection.⁴² A successful legal response must consequently combine criminal prosecution with financial investigation, technological capacity, institutional coordination and international cooperation.

Recommendations: Investigation should move beyond an offence-oriented approach focused exclusively on the recovery of contraband. Investigative agencies should adopt an integrated strategy aimed at identifying the entire criminal network, including organisers, financiers, facilitators and beneficiaries of illicit trafficking. Such an approach would assist in distinguishing isolated drug offences from coordinated organised criminal activity.

Since organised drug trafficking is primarily motivated by financial gain, greater emphasis should be placed upon tracing and identifying illicit proceeds. Coordination between narcotics enforcement agencies, financial intelligence institutions and agencies responsible for investigating money laundering should be strengthened. The investigation of financial transactions should become an integral component of major organised drug-trafficking investigations.⁴³

Sections 27A and 29 of the NDPS Act should be effectively utilised against persons who finance or coordinate illicit trafficking rather than limiting prosecution primarily to persons found in physical possession of narcotic substances. But their application must be supported by reliable evidence establishing the required connection between the accused and the organised criminal activity.⁴⁴

⁴¹ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985, ss 27A and 29

⁴² *State of Punjab v Baldev Singh* (1999) 6 SCC 172; *Tofan Singh v State of Tamil Nadu* AIR 2020 SC 5592; *Union of India through Narcotics Control Bureau v Md Nawaz Khan* (2021) Crim App No 1043/2021

⁴³ The Prevention of Money-laundering Act 2002

⁴⁴ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985, ss 27A and 29

The increasing use of electronic communication and digital transactions requires specialised technological and forensic capacity. Investigating agencies should develop appropriate mechanisms for the collection, preservation and authentication of electronic evidence in accordance with statutory requirements. Improved forensic infrastructure would also assist in maintaining the integrity of physical evidence and strengthening the reliability of prosecution.

A coordinated institutional mechanism should be developed for cases involving large-scale or organised drug trafficking. Information sharing between narcotics agencies, state police, customs authorities and financial investigation agencies should be strengthened through clear operational procedures. Effective coordination is particularly important where different aspects of a criminal enterprise fall within the jurisdiction of different agencies.

Given the transnational nature of organised drug trafficking, India should continue to strengthen mechanisms relating to mutual legal assistance, extradition, intelligence sharing and cross-border investigation. International cooperation is essential for identifying participants and financial transactions located outside domestic jurisdiction.⁴⁵

The fight against organised drug trafficking should not weaken fundamental principles of criminal justice. Compliance with statutory requirements relating to search, seizure, sampling and evidence collection should be treated as an essential component of effective prosecution. Strengthening investigative professionalism is preferable to reducing procedural safeguards because legally sustainable evidence ultimately improves the effectiveness of criminal justice.⁴⁶

Investigating officers and prosecutors dealing with organised drug trafficking should receive specialised training relating to financial investigation, electronic evidence, conspiracy, international cooperation and forensic procedures. Such capacity building would assist the criminal justice system in responding more effectively to the increasingly sophisticated structure of drug cartels.

⁴⁵ United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances 1988; United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime 2000

⁴⁶ *State of Punjab v Baldev Singh* (1999) 6 SCC 172

CONCLUSION

Drug cartels represent a complex manifestation of organised crime that extends beyond conventional offences involving the possession, transportation or distribution of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances. Their activities are frequently characterised by coordinated participation, financial motivation, specialised roles and, in certain cases, transnational connections. The changing structure of organised drug trafficking has therefore created challenges that cannot be effectively addressed through an approach limited to the prosecution of individual offenders. The present study demonstrates that India possesses a substantial statutory framework for addressing drug-related offences. The NDPS Act, 1985 provides stringent measures against illicit trafficking and contains provisions relating to financing illicit traffic, criminal conspiracy and forfeiture of illegally acquired property. This framework is supplemented by laws dealing with organised crime, money laundering and electronic evidence.⁴⁷

The effectiveness of these provisions depends significantly upon the ability of enforcement agencies to identify the complete criminal network rather than limiting investigation to persons directly found in possession of contraband. The analysis further reveals that the principal legal challenge lies in establishing organised criminal responsibility through legally admissible evidence. The prosecution of drug cartels requires proof of coordinated participation, financial connections, knowledge and criminal intent. These difficulties are intensified by decentralised organisational structures, technological developments and cross-border operations. Consequently, effective investigation must integrate conventional narcotics enforcement with financial investigation, digital evidence, forensic capacity and international cooperation.⁴⁸

Judicial interpretation has played an important role in maintaining a balance between the stringent objectives of drug-control legislation and the requirements of fair criminal procedure. Decisions relating to search and seizure, statutory presumptions, confessional statements and bail demonstrate that effective enforcement cannot be separated from compliance with constitutional and procedural safeguards.⁴⁹ The judiciary has therefore

⁴⁷ The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act 1985; The Prevention of Money-laundering Act 2002; The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023

⁴⁸ United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime 2000

⁴⁹ *State of Punjab v Baldev Singh* (1999) 6 SCC 172; *Tofan Singh v State of Tamil Nadu* AIR 2020 SC 5592

contributed to the development of an approach in which the seriousness of organised drug trafficking does not eliminate the obligation of the prosecution to establish guilt through legally sustainable evidence. The central finding of the study is that India's difficulty in combating drug cartels does not arise primarily from the absence of stringent legislation. Rather, the principal limitations relate to institutional coordination, financial investigation, technological capacity, evidentiary reliability and the ability to identify organisers and financiers operating behind lower-level participants. The legal response should therefore move from an offence-oriented model towards a coordinated strategy directed at the entire organised criminal enterprise.

So, the hypothesis of the study is substantially supported. While the existing Indian legal framework provides a significant statutory basis for combating organised drug trafficking, its effectiveness against sophisticated drug cartels remains constrained by investigative, evidentiary, institutional, technological and cross-border challenges. Strengthening the response requires greater coordination among enforcement agencies, effective financial investigation, improved digital and forensic capabilities and enhanced international cooperation. At the same time, such reforms must remain consistent with constitutional guarantees and procedural safeguards. A sustainable response to organised drug trafficking ultimately requires not merely stricter punishment but a more coordinated, evidence-based and institutionally effective criminal justice strategy.