



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS



DATED: 16.12.2025

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. RAJASEKAR

CrI.O.P.No.31796 of 2025

Manivannan

... Petitioner

-Vs-

State Rep by,
The Inspector of Police,
M-4, Redhills Police Station,
Chennai.
(Crime No.645 of 2025)

... Respondent

Prayer:- Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS Act, 2023,
pleaded to enlarge the petitioner on bail in Crime No.645 of 2025 on the file of
the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Abdul Hadi

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

ORDER

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on
01.10.2025, for the offence punishable under Sections 8© r/w 22(b), 22(c),
29(1) of NDPS Act, in Crime No. 645 of 2025, registered on the file of the
respondent, seek bail

2. The case of the prosecution is that on the basis of information received
by the authorized officer, on 01.10.2025, at about 17:00 hours, after obtaining
1/5



authorization, the police party intercepted A1 and A2, and after compliance with the mandatory provisions, recovered 10 grams of Methamphetamine from possession of A1 (Manivannan). Thereafter, a statement was recorded from A1, and based on the statement recorded from A1, the house of A3 was searched, and 65 grams of Methamphetamine (commercial quantity) was recovered, and A3 and A4 were also arrested and remanded to judicial custody. Now, the petitioner has come forward with the present bail petition. Hence, the case.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is arrayed as A1 in the present case and that the grounds on which bail was granted to A2 are equally applicable to the petitioner herein. He further submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is that he, along with A2, purchased 10 grams of Methamphetamine from A3, and that the petitioner has no previous criminal antecedents. He further submitted that the quantity of contraband allegedly recovered from the petitioner is only 10 grams of Methamphetamine. Therefore, it was contended that the rigours of Section 37 of the NDPS Act are not attracted, and accordingly, the learned counsel prayed for grant of bail to the petitioner.

4. Learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the petitioner is alleged to have actively participated in transportation of 10 grams of Methamphetamine, and investigation revealed that this petitioner purchased the contraband from A3



and A4, hence, after seizure of 65 grams of Methamphetamine, which commercial quantity, they have also been included in this case, and since it is a case of commercial quantity. Hence, he opposed for grant of bail to the petitioner.

5. This Court, while considering the bail application of the petitioner in CrI.O.P.No.29059 of 2025 dated 14.11.2025, who was arrayed as A2, observed as follows:

“5. I have considered the submissions made on both sides and perused the records. On perusal of the statement of A3, it is revealed that she has purchased some contraband from her source, and by using an app called Zangi app, used to sell the contraband, and accordingly, A1 in this case contacted her and by paying money collected 10 grams of Methamphetamine from her. Except this averment made by A3 regarding A1, she has not uttered anything about A2 in this case. Further, there is no recovery effected from A2 in this case. Further, the statement recorded from A3 also reveals that A2 was not having knowledge or any link with the possession of 65 grams of Methamphetamine with A3. Under the said circumstances, I am of the view that accused No.2 could not be considered to be a part of the trafficking of commercial quantity recovered from A3. Hence, I am inclined to grant bail to the petitioner, subject to certain conditions”.

6. I have carefully perused the FIR and the other connected records for the purpose of considering the bail application of the petitioner (A1).

7. Admittedly, the case is still under investigation. The allegation against the petitioner is that 10 grams of Methamphetamine were recovered



from him, which were allegedly purchased from A3 and A4. It is further all

that the petitioner contacted A3 through an application known as the “Zangi” app and procured the contraband. It is also alleged that the petitioner is in the habit of selling various contraband substances to different persons. Since the investigation is pending and the contraband seized in the present case is stated to be of commercial quantity, this Court is of the view that granting bail to A1 at this stage would hamper the investigation. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

16.12.2025

drl

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
M-4, Redhills Police Station,
Chennai.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

K. RAJASEKA



drl

Crl.O.P.No.31796 of 2025

16.12.2025