



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16.12.2025

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. RAJASEKAR

CrI.O.P.No.34281 of 2025

Salma Fathima

... Petitioner

-Vs-

State Rep by,
The Inspector of Police,
Redhills Police Station,
Thiruvallur District.
(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.C.Balasubramaniam

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(c), r/w 22(b), 22(c) and 29(1) of NDPS Act, 1985 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 A4 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 she, along with A2, purchased 10 grams of Methamphetamine from A3, and that the petitioner has no previous criminal antecedents. It was also submitted that the quantity of contraband allegedly involved is only 10 grams of Methamphetamine. He further submitted that the petitioner was residing near the house of A3 and had accidentally been present at the time when the police visited the house of A3, and that he has been falsely implicated in the present case. He also submitted that no recovery was effected from the petitioner. Hence, he prayed to 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 the transportation of 65 grams of Methamphetamine. He further submitted that the investigation revealed that the petitioner had purchased the contraband from A3 and A4, and pursuant to the seizure of 65 grams of Methamphetamine, which constitutes a commercial quantity, the petitioner was also arrayed as an accused in the present case. He further submitted that though it is stated that no recovery was effected from the petitioner, the statements recorded from the arrested accused disclosed that the petitioner had contributed a sum of Rs.50,000/-, and that A3 had also contributed Rs.50,000/-, and by paying a sum of Rs.1,00,000/-, they procured 75 grams of Methamphetamine and started selling the contraband. He further submitted that while A4 was present in the house of A3, she was apprehended, and 65 grams of Methamphetamine were seized. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant bail to the petitioner..

5. Though it is stated that no recovery was effected from A4 in the present case, this Court had earlier dismissed the bail petition filed by the petitioner in CrI.O.P.No.30412 of 2025 dated 19.11.2025, on the ground that the case involves commercial quantity and that the rigours of Section 37 of the NDPS Act are attracted. Further, the prosecution has stated that the statements recorded from the arrested accused, namely A3 and A4, reveal that they each contributed a sum of Rs.50,000/- for the purchase of Methamphetamine and had started selling the same through the Zangi app. It is also stated by A1 that the



money was paid to the petitioner herein.

6. In view of the above, this Court finds no reason to revisit the earlier order. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

16.12.2025

drl

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Redhills Police Station,
Thiruvallur District.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

K. RAJASEKA



drl

Crl.O.P.No.34281 of 2025

16.12.2025