



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 21.04.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 2609 of 2026

1. Shyam Singh

2. Vikash

...Petitioners/Accused No.2&3

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
PEW Madurai City Police Station,
Madurai City.
(Crime No. 4 of 2026)

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners : Mr. Arun Ramnath
Advocate. For Mr. Backiyaraj
For Respondent : Mr. B. Nambi Selvan
Additional Public Prosecutor

PETITION FOR BAIL Under Sec.483 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Bail in Cr.No. 4 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.



ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners / Accused, who were arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 08.01.2026 for the offences punishable under Sections 8(c) r/w 20(b)(ii)(A), 22(c), 25 & 29(1) of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 in Crime No. 4 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that based on the secret information, on 08.01.2026, at about 5.30 p.m, the respondent police went to Kodai Nagar Perumal Temple Teppakulam at Town Hall Road and mounted surveillance. At that time, 4 persons came in a car bearing Reg.No.TN-59-BF-7525 and a two wheeler bearing Reg.No.TN-64-AE-4577. On seeing the police party, they tried to escape from the scene of occurrence. However, the respondent police nabbed them. On searching, the accused were found in illegal joint possession of 58 grams of Methamphatamine and 20 grams of ganja oil. Hence, this case.



WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent and they were falsely implicated in this case and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He would further submit that the quantity involved in this case is not a commercial quantity and no recovery was made from these petitioners and Methampahtamine was recovered only from A1 and no previous case is pending against the petitioners and they have been arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 08.01.2026. Therefore, prayed to grant bail for the petitioners.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent would submit that the quantity involved in this case is a commercial quantity and the petitioners were found in illegal joint possession of ganja. However, they have no previous case. He would further submit that the offences are grave in nature and hence, he strongly opposed to grant bail to the petitioners.

5. This Court heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.



WEB COPY

6. Considering the rival submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, nature of offence, and though the prosecution stated that the contraband involved in this case is a commercial quantity, no contraband was recovered from these petitioners and the petitioners were arrayed as accused only based on the confession made by the co-accused and the alleged quantity of contraband was recovered only from A1 and though a car was recovered from the first petitioner and a cell phone was recovered from the second petitioner, no previous case is pending against them and considering the period of incarceration undergone by the petitioners, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners subject to the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on condition to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) each with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned **Principal Special Court for Trial of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act Cases, Madurai, Madurai District**, and on further conditions that:

[b] **the petitioners shall report before the respondent police, daily at 10.30 a.m until further orders;**



WEB COPY

[c] the petitioners shall not commit any offence similar to the offence of which she is accused, or suspected, or of the commission of which she is suspected;

[d] the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

[e] the petitioners shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence;

[f] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Judicial Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action 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 vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560].



[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can

WEB COPY be registered under Section 269 BNS.

(P D B J)
21.04.2026

dss

To

- 1.The Principal Special Court for Trial of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act Cases, Madurai, Madurai District.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
PEW Madurai City Police Station, Madurai City.
3. The Superintendent, Madurai Central Prison in Madurai District.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



P. DHANABAL, J

dss

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 2609 of 2026

Date : 21.04.2026