



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 08.10.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE **K.RAJASEKAR**

Crl.O.P.No.20512 of 2025

Sanjana @ Sathish

... Petitioner

Vs.

State rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-2 Ayanavaram Police Station,
Chennai - 600 023.
(Cr.No.184 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in
Cr.No.184 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.Martin Manivannan
for Mr.P.Santhosh
For Respondent : Mr.A.Gopinath
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on
06.05.2025 for the alleged offence under Sections 8(c) r/w 20(b)(ii)(C) of
NDPS Act in Crime No.184 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police,
seeks bail.



WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 06.05.2025, the Sub Inspector of Police attached with Ayanavaram Police Station, received the information at 07.00 a.m. regarding transportation of Ganja by a woman aged about 32 years. Hence, the Sub Inspector of Police along with his police party, went to the place of occurrence and on identification by the police informer, they intercepted the petitioner/accused and on search, they found the petitioner was in possession of 21 kgs of Ganja. After complying with the formalities, the same was seized by the respondent police and the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 06.05.2025. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner was asked to appear before the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Anna Nagar on 06.05.2025 by serving a show cause notice on 04.05.2025 dated 30.04.2025. Thereafter, on 06.05.2025 around 6.20 a.m., the respondent police herein called the petitioner for the purpose of enquiry and thereafter, illegally confined her in the police station and subsequently implicated in the present case. The learned counsel further submitted that she came to know that the police officials are stated to have recorded statements and



WEB COPY

also prepare documents to implicate her in NDPS cases. Hence, she had refused to sign the documents including the compliance memo issued under Section 50 of NDPS Act and that based on the fabricated documents, she has been arrested and remanded to judicial custody. Hence, he prayed for grant of bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) vehemently opposed for grant of bail to the petitioner stating that the petitioner has 11 previous cases against her.

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

6. In the FIR itself it is stated that the petitioner agreed for personal search and also for other legal formalities and had participated voluntarily, whereas, the various documents reveal a different picture that she never agreed for personal search or for signing the documents. Apart from that, this Court is able to see that, the police have prepared various documents after taking her into custody. Considering the manner in which the case is registered she is entitled to bail by satisfying Section 37 of NDPS Act.



Therefore, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of **Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand only)** with **two sureties**, for a like sum to the satisfaction of the **learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore** and on further conditions that:

[a] the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the Application for Surety ship [Judicial Form No.46 annexed to 'The Criminal Rules of Practice, 2019']. The learned Magistrate shall obtain a copy of any one of the identity proofs to ensure their identity;

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m., for a period of two weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation;

[c] On breach of any of the aforementioned conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to pass appropriate orders against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the aforementioned 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 Court in **P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)13 SCC 283]**;



WEB COPY

[d] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR
can be registered under Section 269 of B.N.S.

08.10.2025

kmm

Note :

1. Registry is directed to forthwith upload this order in the Official Website of this Court.
2. All concerned to act on this order being uploaded in Official Website of this Court without insisting on certified hard copies. To be noted, this order when uploaded in the official website of this Court will be watermarked and will also have a QR code.



To
WEB COPY

1. The V Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore.
2. The Inspector of Police,
K-2 Ayanavaram Police Station,
Chennai - 600 023.
3. The Central Prison for Women, Puzhal, Chennai.
Coimbatore.
4. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

kmm

Crl.O.P.No.20512 of 2025

08.10.2025