



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 20/02/2026

PRESENT

The HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

CRL OP(MD). Nos.9936 and 9957 of 2025

Karthikeyan,
S/o.Kannan,

Vignesh

... Petitioner/Accused
in CRL OP(MD). No.9936 of 2025
... Petitioner/Accused
in CRL OP(MD). No.9957 of 2025

Vs

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep by the Inspector of Police,
Kanyakumari Police Station,
Kanyakumari District
(In Crime No.194 of 2025).

... Respondent/Complainant
in both Crl.O.Ps

For Petitioner : Mr.Anand R.
(in CRL OP(MD). No.9936 of 2025)

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Micheal Heldon Kumar
(in CRL OP(MD). No.9957 of 2025)

For Respondent : Mr.T.Senthil Kumar,
(in both Crl.O.Ps) Additional Public Prosecutor



PETITION FOR BAIL Under Sec.483 of BNSS

WEB COPY

COMMON PRAYER :-

For Bail in Crime NO.194 of 2025 on the file of the Respondent Police.

COMMON ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners / Accused, who were arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 08.05.2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 8(C) r/w 20(b)(ii)(C), 25, 29(1) of NDPS Act, 123 BNS, in Crime No.194 of 2024 on the file of the respondent police, seek bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners along with other accused were in illegal possession of 29.900 KGS of ganja. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would strenuously contend that the petitioners were arrested from their house and their arrest was not communicated to the petitioners and he has also relied upon the judgment in the case of *Mihir Rajesh Shah Vs. State of Maharashtra and another*. He further submitted that the petitioners are



WEB COPY

ready and willing to abide by any conditions which may be imposed by this Court and they are in judicial custody from 14.02.2024. Hence, he seeks bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that this case involves seizure of 29.900 kgs of Ganja, which was seized only from the petitioners and the same is a commercial quantity of huge worth.

5. Considering the nature of the allegations, namely that the seizure involves a large quantity of 29.900 kilograms of Kanja and that the petitioners were arrested while in possession of the contraband, this is not a fit case for the grant of bail. The learned counsel for the petitioner relied on the judgment in *Mihir Rajesh Shah vs. State of Maharashtra and another*. The said judgment was pronounced subsequent to the filing of the bail petition. As regards the other ground raised by the petitioners, namely that they were arrested from their house and that their arrest was not communicated to their family, the same was not mentioned in the bail petition. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to entertain the said grounds.



6. Accordingly, this Criminal Petitions are dismissed with liberty

to file a fresh petition along with necessary grounds.

(S S Y J)
20.02.2026

tta

TO

1. The Inspector of Police,
Kanyakumari Police Station,
Kanyakumari District.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



S.SRIMATHY,J

tta

ORDER
CRL OP(MD). Nos.9936 and 9957 of 2025

Date : 20/02/2026