



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 2574 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 05-02-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL OP No. 2574 of 2026

Tejbir Singh Narula
S/o.Ajit Singh Narula,
Proprietor of M/s.Winergy INC Pharmaceutical
Company,
Property No.C-79, Third floor,
Dda Sheds,
Okhla Industrial Area,
Phase-I,
New Delhi-110020.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State rep.by, The Inspector of Police,
Vellore North Police Station,
Vellore District.
Cr.no.360 of 2025.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER: To grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners in the event of arrest in Cr.no.360 of 2025 now pending investigation on the file of the respondent on such terms and conditions as this Honble court.

For Petitioner(s):	Mr.P.V.Balasubramaniam, Senior Advocate for M/s.S.Dharani
For Respondent(s):	M/S.J.R.Archana Government Advocate (Crl.Side)



ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioner, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 111 & 123 of BNS and section 77 of Juvenile Justice Act, in Crime No.360 of 2025, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner is ranked as A1 in this case and it is alleged that the petitioner, who is a manufacturer, supplied 1,600 Tapentadol tablets in this case through courier. Hence, the petitioner is added as an accused in this case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is a licensed person to handle and sell Tapentadol tablets and A3 in this case is also one of the dealer, who is also having a license to deal with the same, and he purchased Tapentadol tablets from the petitioner and on proper documentation, the Tapentadol tablets were sent through courier to A3 in this case: now A3 has misused the same by colluding with other accused, and for that the petitioner is not held responsible. Therefore, he prays for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that there are statements recorded from A3 revealed that A3 used to purchase Tapentadol tablets by paying money to the petitioner through courier, and accordingly, the petitioner is also actively participated in the illegal handling of Tapentadol tablets. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. I have gone through the statements recorded from the other accused and documents filed along with the petition filed by the petitioner, and it shows that the petitioner is entitled to deal with Tapentadol tablets and, however, it has to be handled according to the rules and regulations. Further, it is also stated that A3 is also a licensed person to handle Schedule H1 drugs under the Drugs and Cosmetics Act. Since both A3 and A1 are having licenses to deal with the drugs, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of petitioner in this case is not necessary; hence this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with certain conditions.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the **learned Judicial Magistrate-IV, Vellore**, on condition that **the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of**



Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand only), with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned, and on further condition:

(a) If the petitioners fails to surrender before the concerned Magistrate within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, this order shall stand automatically cancelled;

(b) 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 identify proofs to ensure their identity;

(c) The petitioner shall report before the respondent police everyday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of one week and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;

(d) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate actions against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *P.K.Shaji v. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]*;

(e) If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS.

MPA

05-02-2026



To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate-IV, Vellore.
- 2.The State rep.by, The Inspector of Police,
Vellore North Police Station,
Vellore District.
Cr.no.360 of 2025.

- 3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 2574 of 2



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

MPA

CRL OP No. 2574 of 2026

05-02-2026