



CRL.A. No.125/2021

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on	Pronounced on
04.06.2024	27.06.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

CRL. A. NO.125 OF 2021

1. Chidambaram
2. Jothi @ Nagajothi

.. Appellants

- Vs -

The State, rep. By
The Inspector of Police
J-9, Thuraipakkam Police Station
Chennai – 97.

.. Respondent

Criminal Appeal filed u/s 374 Cr.P.C. to set aside the conviction of the appellants in C.C. No.15 of 2020 dated 01.02.2021 passed by the learned Special Judge, I Addl. Special Court for Exclusive Trial of Cases under the Narcotic Drugs & Psychotropic Substances Act (for short 'the Act'), Chennai by allowing this appeal.

For Appellant : Mr. S.Senthilvel

For Respondents : Mrs. G.V.Kasthuri, APP



CRL.A. No.125/2021

WEB COPY

JUDGMENT

Assailing the judgment in C.C. No.15/2020 dated 01.02.2021 in and by which the appellants were convicted and sentenced by the learned Special Judge, I Addl. Special Court for Exclusive Trial of Cases under the NDPS Act, the present appeal has been filed by the appellants.

2. The appellants were arrayed as A-1 and A-2 in Crime No.462/2019 on the file of Thuraipakkam Police Station and they were charged for the offence u/s 8 (c) r/w 20 (b) (ii) (C) and 29 (1) of the Act. A-1 was also charged for the offence u/s 25 of the Act. After trial, the trial court found both the appellants guilty and convicted and sentenced them as under :-

S. No.	Array of Accused	Conviction & Sentence
1	A-1	Convicted u/s 8 (c) r/w 20 (b) (ii) (C) of the Act and sentenced to undergo RI for 10 years and to pay a fine of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only), in default to undergo RI for a period of six months.



CRL.A. No.125/2021

WEB COPY

		Convicted u/s 8 (c) r/w 29 (1) of the Act and sentenced to undergo RI for 10 years and to pay a fine of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only), in default to undergo RI for a period of six months.
	A-1	Convicted u/s 8 (c) r/w 20 (b) (ii) (C) of the Act and sentenced to undergo RI for 10 years and to pay a fine of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only), in default to undergo RI for a period of six months. Convicted u/s 8 (c) r/w 29 (1) of the Act and sentenced to undergo RI for 10 years and to pay a fine of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only), in default to undergo RI for a period of six months.

A-1 was acquitted of the offence u/s 25 of the Act. The sentences imposed on the appellants were directed to run concurrently and the period of detention already undergone by the appellants were directed to be set off as per Section 428 Cr.P.C. Aggrieved by the said conviction and sentence, the present appeal has been filed by the appellants.



CRL.A. No.125/2021

WEB COPY

3. The brief facts, which are necessary for the disposal of the appeal are as under :-

On 21.08.2019 at about 11.00 hrs., P.W.1, the Sub Inspector of Police of Thuraipakkam Police Station, upon receipt of secret information that ganja is being transported in a two wheeler bearing Regn. No. TN-03-M-0585, recorded the said information under Ex.P-1 and after submitting the same to the Inspector of Police, proceeded to the place where the house of A-1 and A-2 was situated and finding no vehicle, P.W.1 proceeded to Choolimanagar Main Road and Pillaiyar Koil Street Junction, Mettukuppam from where he maintained surveillance. During the course of surveillance, P.W.1 intercepted the two wheeler in which A-1 and A-2 were riding and upon A-1 and A-2 identifying themselves during enquiry, search was made of the vehicle after being informed about the information received by P.W.1 and as to their rights u/s 50 of the Act, as evidenced by Exs.P-2 and P-3.

4. Upon search of the vehicle bearing Regn. No.TN-03-M-0585, ganja weighing 23.500 Kgs., were seized from which P.W.1 lifted two samples of 50



WEB COPY

grams each for chemical analysis. P.W.1 pasted label containing particulars of seizure in the samples and also in the bulk quantity. Upon further search, amount to the tune of Rs.21,140/- was recovered from beneath the seat of the vehicle, which was also seized. The contraband, cash and the two wheeler were seized from A-1 and A-2 under the cover of mahazar, Ex.P-4. P.W.1 recorded the confession statement of A-1 on the spot and, thereafter, A-1 and A-2 were brought to the police station along with the seized materials. The two samples lifted by P.W.1 were marked as M.O.s 1 and 2 and the bulk quantity is marked as M.O.3.

5. On reaching the police station, P.W.1 submitted Ex.P-7 report u/s 57 of the Act to P.W.6, the Inspector of Police. On receipt of the report of P.W.1, P.W.6 registered the FIR, Ex.P-10 u/s 8 (c) r/w 20 (b)(ii)(C), 25 and 29 of the Act in Crime No.462/2019 and prepared intimation memos, Exs.P-11 and P-12. A-1 and A-2 were sent for remand and investigation was taken up by P.W.6.

6. Upon taking up investigation, P.W.6 submitted the case properties along with a requisition to the Court to forward the samples for chemical analysis and



WEB COPY

on receipt of the sample through Court brought by P.W. 4, P.W.5, the Scientific Officer conducted analysis and found cannabinoids in the sample and the opinion furnished is Ex.P-9. Upon receipt of the report, P.W.6 recorded the statement of P.W.5 and other members of the raiding party u/s 161 Cr.P.C. The money, which was seized was submitted under Ex.P-15, challan to the RBI. On completion of investigation, P.W.6 filed the final report before the Court against A-1 and A-2 for the offences aforesaid.

7. In order to prove the case, the prosecution examined P.W.s 1 to 6 and marked Exs.P-1 to P-5 and M.O.s 1 to 3. The appellants were questioned u/s 313 (1) (b) Cr.P.C. on the incriminating materials available against them in the evidence of the prosecution witnesses and they denied the same as false. Neither any oral evidence nor any documentary evidence was marked on the side of the appellants. Upon hearing the submissions on either side and perusing the materials available on record, the trial court found both the appellants guilty for the offence u/s 8 (c) r/w 20 (b)(ii)(C) and 8 (c) r/w 29 (1) of the Act and convicted and sentenced them as aforesaid aggrieved by which the present appeal has been filed by the appellants.



WEB COPY

8. Learned counsel appearing for the appellants submitted that Ex.P-1 could not be relied on as it is not a document as contemplated u/s 42 (1) of the Act, as it is the deposition of P.W.1 that he had taken the information in writing, whereas Ex.P-1 is a typed document.

9. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that similarly Exs.P-2 and P-3 also cannot be relied upon as P.W.1 in his deposition has nowhere stated that he had taken a typewriter to type the said documents and, therefore, the said documents could not be said to be in compliance of Section 50 of the Act.

10. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that no independent witnesses have attested the seizure and in the absence of examining such witnesses in court, the seizure could not be relied on. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that there is contradiction in the evidence of P.W.s 1 to 3 relating to seizure and, therefore, no reliance can be placed on the said seizure.



WEB COPY

11. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that the two samples, which are alleged to have been taken by P.W.1 under Ex.P-4 mahazar, but the same does not contain any details about the samples, which have been marked as S-1 and S-2 and further sample S-1 alone is opined to be ganja based on which the entire seizure is said to be commercial quantity of ganja. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that Ex.P-14 does not reference the samples as S-1 and S-2.

12. It is the pivotal submission of the learned counsel that though Ex.P-4 and Ex.P-14, the mahazar and Form-95, there is a specific mention that after taking two samples, viz., S-1 and S-2 to 50 grams each, the remaining bulk quantity is said to contain 23.500 Kgs., of ganja, which is alleged to be the actual quantity seized. If that be the case, the sample S-1, which was forwarded to the lab could not have been the sample taken out from the seized property, as there the entire quantity is said to weigh 23.500 Kgs., even after drawing out two samples of 50 grams each.



WEB COPY

13. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that though P.W.2 in cross examination had stated that he wrote S-1 and S-2 over the samples, yet the papers affixed to the samples does not contain any writing as S-1 and S-2, which clearly show that the deposition of P.W.2 is a patent lie and, therefore, the same could not be relied on to prove that the samples alleged to have been drawn are the samples which were sent for chemical analysis.

14. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that though the contraband is alleged to have been seized on 21.09.2019 and produced at the time of remand before the Magistrate, yet the same was produced before the Special Court only on 30.10.2019 with a delay of 40 days. The interregnum period between its production before the Magistrate and the Special Court, there is no clear material to show as to where the contraband was stored and who had handled the contraband. Therefore, tampering with the contraband cannot be ruled out and, therefore, the same cannot form the basis for fastening the guilt on the appellants.



WEB COPY

15. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that there are material contradictions with regard to preparing of the documents, arrest of the accused and producing the property before the court and the investigation has not been conducted in a proper manner. All the contradictions and interpolations definitely warrant the benefit to be given to the appellants, as the prosecution have not proved its case and the appellant are thus entitled for an acquittal.

16. In support of the aforesaid submissions, learned counsel for the appellants placed reliance on the following decisions :-

- i) *Rajesh Jagdamba Avasthi – Vs – State of Goa (2005 (9) SCC 773);*
- ii) *Vijay Pandey – Vs – The State of U.P. (AIR 2019 SC 3569);*
- iii) *Kottaisamy & Anr. – Vs – The State (Crl. MP No.3975/2023 in CA No.284/2023 – Dated 14.6.2023);*
- iv) *Mangilal – Vs – State of M.P. (Crl. A. No.1651/2023 – Date - 12.07.2023);*
- v) *Mohammed Khalid & Anr. – Vs – The State of Telengana (CA Nos.1610/2023 – Date - 01.03.2024);*



WEB COPY

17. Per contra, learned Addl. Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent submits that merely because the weight of the contraband has been mentioned as 23.500 Kgs., even after drawal of two samples of 50 grams each, the said discrepancy cannot be said to affect the prosecution version, as the samples, which have been drawn were the samples, which were received by P.W.s 4 and 5, which reveal that the contraband seized was cannabinoids.

18. It is the further submission of the learned Addl. Public Prosecutor that the discrepancy relating to recording of the weight of the entire contraband after drawal of samples, which is shown to be 23.500 Kgs., even though two samples of 50 gram each were drawn and, therefore, the submission that contraband under M.O.3 is not the same as that of the samples and that M.O.3 has not been tested to show that M.O.s 1 and 2 were in fact samples drawn from M.O.3 is wholly misconceived, as the samples after drawal, M.O.3 was sealed and was under the custody of the respondent and upon production of the same in the court, the seal is not alleged to have been tampered with and, therefore, in the absence of any material, the claim of tampering cannot be sustained.



WEB COPY

19. It is the further submission of the learned Addl. Public Prosecutor that mere procedural lapses, in not examining independent witnesses to attest the mahazar, which do not affect the substratum of the prosecution case cannot be the basis to doubt the prosecution version. The prosecution having proved the involvement of the appellants in possession of the contraband, the court below, rightly appreciating the evidence in proper perspective has held the appellants guilty and the same does not warrant any interference at the hands of this Court.

20. This Court gave its careful consideration to the submissions advanced by the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials available on record as also the decisions relied on by the learned counsel for the appellants.

21. P.W.1 is the Sub Inspector of police, who, on information, had intercepted the appellants and seized the contraband. M.O.s 1 and 2 are the samples of contraband drawn from M.O.3 the bulk of contraband. P.W.1 has spoken about the manner in which the interception has been made the procedure which was followed before the contraband and other materials were



WEB COPY

seized. P.W.s 2 and 3 are witnesses to the seizure and preparation of mahazar, which witnesses are police authorities. P.W.s 2 and 3 have spoken in unison about the manner in which the interception and seizure and the subsequent arrest were carried out. The deposition of P.W.s 2 and 3, in sum and substance, corroborate the evidence of P.W.1.

22. The grievance canvassed by the appellants is that no independent witnesses have been examined nor were they made attesting witnesses to the seizure and mahazar, which throws a doubt in the prosecution version, as the search and seizure was made in a locality, which was surrounded by vast number of houses.

23. It is to be pointed out that it is the consistent view of the courts that non-examination of independent witnesses cannot be a ground to doubt the prosecution version so long as the witnesses, who have been examined have deposed in unison. As stated above, P.W.s 2 and 3 have corroborated the evidence of P.W.1 on all material particulars. In fact, P.W.s 2 and 3 have deposed that though at a distance of 50 mtrs., there are houses, yet no person was



WEB COPY

available and, therefore, P.W.s 2 and 3 were made witnesses to the seizure. It is not the case of the defence/appellants that the locality where the vehicle of the appellants was intercepted, there was frequent movement of pedestrians or vehicles so that there would have been no difficulty to obtain signatures from independent witnesses. There is no suggestion made in this regard to the witnesses by the defence at the time of cross examination and in the absence of any suggestion and eliciting a response, the mere non-examination of independent witnesses or attesting of the mahazar by the official witnesses could form the basis to doubt the prosecution version. Therefore, the said contention deserves to be rejected.

24. The most pivotal contention raised on behalf of the appellants is that the quantity of contraband seized is alleged to be 23.500 kgs., of which 2 samples of 50 gram each was drawn, which was alleged to have been marked as S-1 and S-2, which is marked as M.O.s 1 and 2, however, after drawal of the samples, the balance of contraband in M.O.3 is noted to be 23.500 Kgs. It is the contention of the appellants that though it could be said to be an inadvertent error by the prosecution, however, the deposition of P.W.5, the chemical examiner, smashes



WEB COPY

the said stand, as P.W.5 in his deposition as well as in Ex.P-9 has stated that the sealed cover with the contraband was weighing 40.6 gram, which clearly shows that the said sealed cover could not have been the sample which was drawn from M.O.3. Further, M.O.3 has not been established by the prosecution to show that the samples M.O.s 1 and 2 were drawn out from M.O.3 as there is no order of the Magistrate to show that the bulk seizure was established.

25. To appreciate the aforesaid contention, this Court turned back to the evidence of P.W.s 1 to 3, which reveals that M.O.3 contraband was seized from the appellants and the same was recorded under the cover of mahazar Ex.P-4, which was attested by P.W.s 2 and 3. The total quantity of contraband seized was 23.500 Kgs., which was weighed, which finds place in the recovery mahazar. Out of the said quantity, two samples of about 50 grams were drawn and was labelled as S-1 and S-2, which has been marked in the trial court as M.O.s 1 and 2. However, the deposition of P.W.s 1 to 3 indicate that the weight of the bulk quantity of seized contraband is 23.500 Kgs., which according to the appellants only show that the samples which were sent for analysis were not the one drawn from M.O.3. However, in the deposition of P.W.s 1 to 3, it has been spoken to by



WEB COPY

the witnesses that out of 23.500 Kgs., of contraband, two samples of 50 grams each were drawn and the balance was erroneously recorded as 23.500 Kgs. and the quantity of samples drawn has not been shown by minimising the same from the bulk quantity.

26. It is to be pointed out that the drawal of samples is only to the extent of about 50 grams each in two packets, totalling to about 100 grams. From the deposition of P.W.s 1 to 3 it is evident that the fallacious human mind has made a mistake in not reducing the contraband, which was drawn towards the samples. Further, it is to be noted that the samples drawn are only to an extent of about 50 grams each.

27. In this scenario, a perusal of Ex.P-9 and the evidence of P.W.5 reveal that a sample pack was received from the court, which was marked as S-1 along with the name of the appellants written on it and it was duly sealed and packed. The weight of the contraband was found to be 40.6 grams. After analysis, Ex.P-9 was issued and balance of 25.6 grams of contraband was put in a cover and sealed and sent to court along with Ex.P-9.



WEB COPY

28. Though there is a shortage of 10 grams of contraband, it is to be noted that P.W.5 in his deposition has clearly deposed that the wordings in the sealed packet showed that it contained about 50 grams of contraband. The cover did not mention that it contained 50 grams, but about 50 grams. In this regard, a perusal of the letter Ex.P-13, written by P.W.6 to the Asst. Director, Forensic Laboratory reveals as also the FIR, Ex.P-1 reveals that what was taken as sample in two packets were a quantity of about 50 grams each. It is not specifically mentioned that two packet of samples of 50 grams each of contraband contraband was lifted from the bulk quantity of contraband of 23.500 Kgs., seized from the appellants.

29. In this regard, the decision of the Apex Court in *Rajesh Jagdamba Avasthi* case has been relied on, wherein, the Apex Court held as under :-

"14. We do not find it possible to uphold this finding of the High Court. The appellant was charged of having been found in possession of Charas weighing 180.70 gms. The Charas recovered from him was packed and sealed in two envelopes. When the said envelopes were opened in the laboratory by Junior Scientific Officer, PW-1, he found the quantity to be



WEB COPY

different. While in one envelope the difference was only minimal, in the other the difference in weight was significant. The High Court itself found that it could not be described as a mere minor discrepancy. Learned counsel rightly submitted before us that the High Court was not justified in upholding the conviction of the appellant on the basis of what was recovered only from envelope 'A' ignoring the quantity of Charas found in envelope 'B'. This is because there was only one search and seizure, and whatever was recovered from the appellant was packed in two envelopes. The credibility of the recovery proceeding is considerably eroded if it is found that the quantity actually found by PW-1 was less than the quantity sealed and sent to him. As he rightly emphasized, the question was not how much was seized, but whether there was an actual seizure, and whether what was seized was really sent for chemical analysis to PW-1. The prosecution has not been able to explain this discrepancy and, therefore, it renders the case of the prosecution doubtful."

30. From the ratio laid down above, it is clear that the duty of the prosecution is to explain the discrepancy in the quantity seized and if the same has not been explained, that would raise doubts about the seizure. However, in the case on hand, the quantity, which is alleged to have been seized was to an



WEB COPY

extent of 23.500 Kgs., of which the prosecution, through P.W.s 1 to 3 claims that about two samples of 50 grams each was taken for the purpose of chemical analysis.

31. The deposition of P.W.5 proves that he received a quantity of 40.6 grams in one sealed cover from the court, as evidenced by Ex.P-9. The letter of P.W.6, which has been annexed with Ex.PP-9 also reveals that two samples of about 50 grams each were taken for the purpose of chemical analysis. Therefore, not only there is corroboration, but there is not too much variance in the quantity sent for chemical analysis and, therefore, the contention that the samples, which were alleged to have been sent were not the ones that were drawn out of M.O.3 does not merit acceptance. The minor discrepancy in the quantity does not have much relevance, moreso, when it is the specific case of the prosecution that about 50 grams was taken as sample and not exactly 50 grams.

32. Further, it should also not be lost sight of that the initial seizure and recovery was made on 21.09.2019 and, thereafter, on 30.10.2019, on the orders of the court, one of the sample packet, viz., S-1 was sent for chemical analysis.



WEB COPY

The time lapse between 21.9.2019 and 30.10.2019 also has to be taken into consideration while the weight of the sample is considered as the freshness of the sample on 21.9.2019 would have waned by 30.10.2019, as even the recording of P.W.5 in Ex.P-9 shows that the leaves along with the seeds were found broken, which clearly shows that the samples, which were received by P.W.5 were dry. The seizure had been made on 21.9.2019 and the sample was sent on 30.10.2019 and during the interregnum 40 day period, the sample would have dried and the loss of moisture in the sample would have been the cause of reduction in weight of the sample from about 50 grams to 40.06 grams. Therefore, the reduction in weight, not being too enormous, the decision in *Rajesh Jagdamba Avasthi case* would not be of any assistance to the appellants. Further, even in the said decision, the Supreme Court had held that minor discrepancies in the weight could not be given too much weightage so long as the discrepancy in the weight is not too enormous. Therefore, the contention of the appellants with regard to discrepancy in weight, creating a doubt with regard to the samples does not merit acceptance.



WEB COPY

33. The other contention of the appellants is that the quantity of samples which is alleged to have been drawn from the bulk quantity has not been established and, therefore, the bulk quantity cannot be claimed to be the quantity that has been seized. In this regard, reliance was placed on the decision of the Apex Court in *Mangilal case*, with regard to the certification required u/s 52-A of the Act.

34. In this regard, a careful perusal of the entire materials submitted before this Court reveals that the samples that were taken were on 21.09.2019 and upon seizure of the bulk quantity, the same was produced before the Magistrate, as is evidenced through Ex.P-13, which is the communication addressed by P.W.6 to the Assistant Director of Forensic Department. In this regard, an application has been filed before the Magistrate with regard to the bulk quantity which has been seized and the samples, which were drawn out and seeking to send the samples for chemical analysis and for the safe custody of the bulk quantity seized in which the following order has been passed by the Magistrate dated 20.10.2019:-

“ i) Yes send S1 for chemical analysis;



CRL.A. No.125/2021

WEB COPY

- ii) Keep S-2 in court safe custody;*
- iii) Return P-1 for Safe custody;*
- iv) Yes. Return the vehicle for police safe custody*
- v) Yes. Remit cash in the RBI."*

35. From the above, it is clearly evident that not only were the sample packets marked with S-1 and S-2 even as early as on 30.10.2019, before the same was sent to the Forensic laboratory, but the same also stands corroborated through the evidence of P.W.5, who has spoken that he received a sample marked S-1. Though a suggestion has been made by the defence that S-1 and S-2, which are alleged to have been marked in the samples, are interpolations, as there were no markings, but it has been denied by P.W.1 saying that it would have got erased due to certain acts of nature, which finds favour for the reason that even as early as on 30.10.2019, in the petition in A. No.283/2019 filed before the Magistrate, the markings have been clearly mentioned, which makes it clear that the samples S-1 and S-2 were drawn from the bulk quantity and the bulk quantity weighs 23.400 Kgs., after drawal of samples. Therefore, the contention of the appellants that there is discrepancy in the weight and the samples, which



WEB COPY

are alleged to have been drawn from the bulk quantity have not been established does not merit acceptance.

36. From the above, it is evident that not only there is compliance of Section 52-A of the Act, as the bulk quantity and samples were placed before the Magistrate and orders solicited in which orders were passed based on which the sample was sent for chemical analysis, but also the fact that the bulk quantity seized from the appellants were directed to be kept in the safe custody. The said samples S-1 and S-2 as well as the bulk quantity of the seized contraband were marked as M.O.s 1 to 3 at the time of trial, which has been proved through oral evidence of P.W.s 1 to 3 as well. The above said materials conclusively prove that the samples S-1 and S-2, which are marked as M.O.s 1 to 2, were indeed samples, which were drawn from the bulk quantity of the contraband, which has been marked as M.O.3. Therefore, this conclusively proves that the bulk quantity of the contraband and the samples are one and the same. Therefore, the prosecution has established the recovery and seizure of contraband from the appellants and also produced the same before the Magistrate for safe custody and the material objects were also produced before the Special Court at the time



WEB COPY

of trial. Therefore, there is complete compliance of the requirements of the Act and the contentions raised in this regard deserve to be rejected.

37. Insofar as the contention of the appellants that Ex.P-1 to P-3, though claimed to have been handwritten, but it is typed and, therefore, the said documents cannot form the basis of the recovery and seizure is concerned, it is seen from the deposition of P.W.s 1 to 3 that they have stated that the same was recorded in writing. P.W.s 1 to 3 have not deposed that it was handwritten, but only written, meaning thereby, it could either have been handwritten or written. Further, the appellants have subscribed their signature in Exs.P-1 to P-3 and they have not denied their signatures. In the absence of any denial and in the absence of the specific stand of the appellants that the same was recorded elsewhere and not at the place as claimed by the prosecution, the mere fact that it was typed and it is not written would not make the said documents doubtful. Therefore, the said contention is also liable to be rejected.

38. Insofar as seizure and recovery of the contraband are concerned, the main grievance expressed is that the provisions of the Act relating to seizure and



WEB COPY

recovery have not been followed, which renders the seizure and recovery doubtful. In this regard, a careful perusal of the materials placed before this Court reveals that the relevant provisions of the Act have been followed while effecting the seizure and recovery. The Special Court has gone into the various provisions of the Act and based on the manner in which the seizure and recovery has been made, has given a finding that the seizure and recovery have been done following the procedures contemplated under the Act. Mere technicalities are expressed by the appellants as infractions, which renders the seizure and recovery doubtful, but the said contentions deserve to be negated for the reason that the Special Court has recorded cogent and convincing reasons with regard to the provisions being followed, which is just and proper and, therefore, this Court accepts the findings recorded in this regard and no interference is warranted with the said findings.

39. On a holistic consideration of the entire materials placed before this Court and the findings recorded by the Special Court on the basis of the said materials, this Court is of the considered view that the Special Court has rendered proper findings on the basis of the materials placed by the prosecution to prove



CRL.A. No.125/2021

WEB COPY

the case as against the appellants and, therefore, no interference is warranted with the same.

40. Accordingly, this criminal appeal is dismissed confirming the conviction and sentence imposed on the appellants in C.C. No.15/2020 by the Special Court under the NDPS Act, Chennai, vide judgment dated 1.2.2021.

27.06.2024

Index : Yes / No

GLN



WEB COPY



CRL.A. No.125/2021

To

1. The Special Judge
Special Court under NDPS Act
Chennai.
2. The Inspector of Police
J-9, Thuraipakkam Police Station
Chennai – 97.
3. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY 1.



CRL.A. No.125/2021

M.DHANDAPANI, J.

GLN

**PRE-DELIVERY JUDGMENT IN
CRL. A. NO. 125 OF 2021**

Pronounced on



WEB COPY



CRL.A. No.125/2021

27.06.2024