



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.32451 of 202



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 05.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K. RAJASEKAR

CRL OP NO.32451 of 2025

Sankar @ Gowrisankar

... Petitioner/ A6

Vs

The State Rep. By,
The Inspector of Police,
Paradarami Police Station,
Vellore District.
(Crime No.197 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, pleaded to enlarge the petitioner on
anticipatory bail in the event of arrest by the respondent in Crime No.197
of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr. Arul Prakash D

For Respondent : M/s. J.R. Archana
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent
police for the offences punishable under Sections 8(c), 20(b)(ii)(C), 25 and



29(1) of NDPS Act, 1985 in Crime No.197 of 2025 on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 19.11.2025, based on a specific information, the respondent police went near Bharath Petrol Bunk, Indra Nagar, Chittoor to Paradarami Road, intercepted a container lorry bearing Registration No.TN-88-H-7915 and found that A1 and A2 were found in possession of 40 kilograms of ganja; that on the basis of the statement recorded from the arrested accused, it is revealed that the petitioner herein is also involved in the aforesaid offence. Hence, this case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case only based on the confession of the arrested accused; that the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and there is no recovery of contraband from the petitioner herein; that the petitioner herein is the relative of A1 and A3 in this case and there were cash transactions taken place between them and the same does not form part of any of the transactions relating to trafficking ganja; and that the petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court, hence sought for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



WEB COPY

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent while opposing the anticipatory bail to the petitioner reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that there are totally 10 accused involved in this case and the petitioner herein is arrayed as A6; that the petitioner herein is a close relative of A1, who had procured ganja from Andhra Pradesh; that the role of the petitioner herein is that he had involved in monetary support, which were made for the purpose of purchasing the contraband; that on instruction of A1, A3 transferred the money to the petitioner's account through his associates from various accounts and the petitioner herein had captured the screenshots of each transactions and forward the same to A1 for collecting the commission amount; that further a sum of Rs.1,40,000/- was transferred by the petitioner to the A5/ Prakatnisha on various dates from 03.11.2025 to 12.11.2025 based on the instruction of A4 for the purpose of procuring ganja from Andhra Pradesh, thereby the petitioner had actively participated in the aforesaid offence and he has two previous cases; that the seized ganja in this case is of commercial quantity, hence the petitioner has to satisfy the twin condition of Section 37 of the NDPS Act; and that the investigation of this case is at preliminary stage.



5. I have considered the submissions made on both sides and perused the materials available on record. The specific allegation against the petitioner herein is that, he had involved in monetary transactions between the accused for procuring ganja from Andhra Pradesh and it is also stated that the petitioner herein, was in close contact with A1 in this case. Further, there is no proper explanation given for the transaction of Rs.1,40,000/- by the petitioner to A5's account on various dates.

6. Considering the above facts, this Court is of the view that the petitioner has not satisfied the twin conditions under Section 37 of the NDPS Act and also taking note of the fact that the investigation of this case is at preliminary stage, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this criminal original petition stands dismissed.

05.02.2026

stn

To



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.32451 of 202



1. The Inspector of Police,
Paradarami Police Station,
Vellore District.
(Crime No.197 of 2025)
2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

K. RAJASEKAR, J.

stn



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.32451 of 202



CRL OP NO.32451 of 2025

05.02.2026