



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 9TH DAY OF APRIL, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE E.S. INDIRESH
CRIMINAL PETITION NO.13015 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

ERANNA
S/O KALAI AH,
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS,
R/OF BAIRANATTA VILLAGE,
HANOOR TALUK,
CHAMARAJANAGAR DISTRICT - 571 313.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SHARAS CHANDRA M., ADVOCATE)

AND:

THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY HANUR P.S.
CHAMARAJANAGAR DISTRICT,
THROUGH THE S.P.P.,
HIGH COURT PREMISES,
BENGALURU CITY - 560 001.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SMT. WAHEEDA M.M., HCGP)

THIS CRIMINAL PETITION IS FILED UNDER SECTION 439 (U/S.483 OF BNSS) OF THE CRIMINAL PROCEDURE CODE PRAYING TO ENLARGE THE PETITIONER ON BAIL IN S.C.NO.42/2022 TRIED FOR OFFENCES PUNISHABLE UNDER SECTIONS 20(a)(i) AND 20(b)(ii)(B) OF THE NARCOTIC DRUGS AND PSYCHOTROPIC SUBSTANCES ACT, 1985 REGISTERED BY HANUR P.S., PENDING ON THE FILE OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE AT CHAMARAJNAGARA.



THIS PETITION COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY,
ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE E.S.INDIRESH

ORAL ORDER

This petition is filed under Section 439 of the Criminal Procedure Code praying to enlarge the petitioner/accused on bail in Crime No.54/2021 of Hanur Police Station, Chamarajanagara District, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 20(a)(i) and 20(b)(ii)(B) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985.

2. Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and learned High Court Government Pleader appearing for the respondent-State. Perused the material on record.

3. It is contended by learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that the respondent-Police have not detained the petitioner and as such, the petitioner had appeared before the Trial Court soon after he came to know about the fact that the Non-Bailable Warrant has been issued against him. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner had filed the application for recalling the Non-Bailable Warrant, however, the



Trial Court rejected the application and taken the petitioner in to custody.

4. Per contra, learned High Court Government Pleader appearing for the respondent sought to justify the order of rejection of Bail application by the Trial Court. Learned High Court Government Pleader contended that the respondent-Police have recovered 1132 grams of Psychotropic substance from the petitioner and offences alleged against the petitioner are grave in nature. Accordingly, she sought for dismissal of the petition.

5. In the light of submission made by learned counsel appearing for the parties, on careful consideration of the petition papers, the same would indicate that, Crime No.54/2021 has been registered by Hanur Police Station against the petitioner for the offences punishable under the provisions of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act. It is also forthcoming from the material on record that the respondent-Police have recovered 1132 grams of Ganja from the petitioner. In that view of the matter, in the event, if the petitioner is released from the custody, there is a likelihood of



**NC: 2026:KHC:19735
CRL.P NO.13015 OF 2025**

threatening the witnesses and evading the Court proceedings by the petitioner. Therefore, I am of the view that, the petition filed for grant of Bail under Section 439 of the Code of Civil Procedure deserves to be rejected. Accordingly, Criminal Petition is ***dismissed.***

**SD/-
(E.S. INDIRESH)
JUDGE**

ARK
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 2