



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. 2593 of 2026

V.Gopal Singh @ Mahendra Singh ...Petitioner/Accused-4

Vs

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

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.Arun Ramnath
Advocate. For M/s.P.Subha Rani
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 petitioner / Accused, who was 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 NDPS Act, in Crime No. 4 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks 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 Kodal 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.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and he was falsely implicated in this case



WEB COPY

and he has 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 Methampahtamine was recovered only from A1 and no previous case is pending against the petitioner and he has been arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 08.01.2026. Therefore, prayed to grant bail for the petitioner.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent would submit that the quantity involved in this case is a commercial quantity and recovery was made from this petitioner. However, he has no previous case. He would further submit that the offences are grave in nature and hence, he strongly opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

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

6. Considering the rival submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, nature of offence, and the quantity involved in this case is



WEB COPY

not a commercial quantity and though the prosecution has stated that the contraband involved in this case is a commercial quantity, 58 grams of Methampahtamine was recovered from A1 and the properties have been recovered separately from different individuals and as far as the petitioner is concerned, 20 grams of ganja oil was recovered, which is not a commercial quantity and no previous case is pending against him and considering the period of incarceration undergone by the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on condition to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) 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 petitioner shall report before the respondent police, daily at 10.30 a.m until further orders;**

[c] the petitioner 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 petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

[e] the petitioner 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 petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner 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 be registered under Section 269 BNS.

(P D B J)
21.04.2026

dss

5/6



WEB COPY



P. DHANABAL, J

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 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.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 2593 of 2026

Date : 21.04.2026