



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 27/04/2022

PRESENT

WEB COPY

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice K.MURALI SHANKAR

CRL OP(MD) . No.7409 of 2022

C.Gopi

... Petitioner/Accused No.4

Vs

1. The State Rep. By,
The Sub Inspector of Police,
Dhadikombu Police Station,
Dindigul District.
Crime.No.117 of 2021.

... Respondent/Complainant

2. J.Rafeek

... Respondent/Defacto Complainant

For Petitioner : M/s.Pandi Dorai J, Advocate.

For Respondents : Mr.R.Meenakshi Sundaram,
Additional Public Prosecutor
for R1.

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.438 of Cr.P.C

PRAYER :-


For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.117 of 2021 on the file of the Respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner/accused, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 8 (c) r/w 20(b)(ii)(B) and 25 of NDPS Act, in Crime No.117 of 2021, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that based on the secret information received, the respondent Police conducted raid and they found that the accused was in possession of Ganja weighing 5.500 kgs. Hence, the present complaint.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that there was no recovery from the petitioner and that the petitioner was implicated only on the basis of the confession statement alleged to have taken from the co-accused.



4.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State would submit that the entire contraband was recovered from the co-accused and only on the basis of the confession statement given by the co-accused, the petitioner was added as an accused. He would further submit that the another case in Crime No.133 of 2021 has been registered against the petitioner for similar offence.

5.In reply, the learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that in subsequent case also there was no recovery from the petitioner and 1.300 kg of Ganja recovered from the co-accused and only on the basis of the confession taken from the co-accused, he was implicated.

6.Admittedly, there was no recovery from the petitioner.

7.Considering the above and also the facts that the petitioner was implicated only on the basis of the confession allegedly taken from the co-accused, that the entire contraband was recovered from the co-accused and that except the subsequent case in Crime No.133 of 2021, the petitioner is not having any previous case under the NDPS Act, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, but with certain conditions.

8. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dindigul District, on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) with two sureties, each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent Police or to the Police Officer, who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Special Judge concerned and on further conditions that:

(a)the petitioner and the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity;

(b)the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 am for a period of one month and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation.

(c)the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

(d)the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

(e)on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/ Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme

<https://hccservices.courts.gov.in/Kse/sha> **P.K.Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560];** and;



(f) if the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

sd/-
27/04/2022

WEB COPY

/ TRUE COPY /

/ /2022

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

Note : In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate/litigant concerned.

TO

1. THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.II,
DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
2. DO-THROUGH : THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
3. THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
DHADIKOMBU POLICE STATION,
DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
4. THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1 CC to M/s.J.PANDI DORAI, Advocate (SR-4031[I] dated 28/04/2022)

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.7409 of 2022
Date :27/04/2022

DAS
USK/JM/SAR-II/04.05.2022/3P/6C