



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.14171 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.10.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.14171 of 2025

Karthick @ Kulla Karthick

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State Rep. By,
The Inspector of Police,
H5 New Washermenpet Police Station,
Chennai.
Crime No.1501 of 2024

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No.1501 of 2024 on the file of the respondent police.

For petitioner : Mr.G.Ezhilbalaji

For Respondent : Mr.A.Gopinath,
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 02.12.2024, for the offence punishable under Sections 8(c) r/w 20(b)(ii)(c) of NDPS Act, in Crime No.1501 of 2024, registered on the file of the respondent, seeks bail.



Crl.O.P.No.14171 of 2025

2. This Court had already dismissed the bail application of the petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.919 of 2025, dated 14.02.2025, by stating the following reasons:

“4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police submitted that the petitioner was in possession of 21 kgs of ganja; that contraband was seized from him is of commercial quantity and that there are 24 previous cases as against the petitioner and hence, opposed for grant of bail to the petitioner;

5. Considering the submission made by either side, taking into consideration of the fact that the contraband seized is of commercial quantity and that there are 23 previous cases as against the petitioner as he is a history sheeter and further, the petitioner failed to fulfill the two conditions under Section 37 of the NDPS Act, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed”.

3. Today, 27.10.2025, when the matter was taken up for hearing, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that there is CCTV footage to show that the petitioner was not involved in the alleged offence. Hence, he prayed for grant of bail.

4. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondent police submitted that this Court had already perused the CCTV footage relied



Crl.O.P.No.14171 of 2025

upon by the petitioner and found that the recovery was directly effected from the petitioner. He further submitted that the petitioner has bad antecedents. Hence, he opposed for grant of bail.

5. Heard the learned counsels on either side and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the fact that the earlier bail application filed by the petitioner was dismissed by this Court on merits, and taking into account that the recovery has been effected from the petitioner, the quantity involved being commercial in nature, and the petitioner having bad antecedents, this Court is of the view that the conditions prescribed under Section 37 of the NDPS Act are not satisfied. Hence, the petitioner is not entitled to be released on bail.

7. Accordingly, this criminal original petition stands dismissed.

27.10.2025

cda



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.14171 of 2025

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

cda

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
H5 New Washermenpet Police Station,
Chennai.
- 2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

Crl.O.P.No.14171 of 2025

27.10.2025