



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10743 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 23.06.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 10743 of 2026

K.Pasupathipandiyan

...Petitioner

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Kenikkarai Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.
(Crime No.491 of 2025)

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Murugan
Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.G.Ganesh Kumar
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

PETITION FOR BAIL Under Sec.483 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Bail in Cr.No. 491 of 2025 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 27.12.2025, for the offences punishable under Sections 8(c), 20(b) (ii)(C), 25 and 29(1) of NDPS Act, in Crime No.491 of 2025 on the file of the



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10743 of 2026

respondent police, seeks bail.

WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that on secret information on 24.12.2025, the respondent police went to scene of occurrence and found that the accused persons are in possession of 542 kgs. of ganja. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and he was falsely implicated in this case and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Though the quantity involved is commercial quantity, no contraband was recovered from this petitioner. It is alleged that the contraband was recovered from the house belongs to the petitioner. The petitioner was not present in the scene of occurrence. But, the house is in dilapidated condition and not used by the petitioner or his family members. The petitioner is working in Madurai. Hence, he prayed bail for the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (crl. Side) appearing for the respondent would submit that the offence are grave in nature. The entire contraband has been recovered this petitioner's house. The petitioner has one previous case under IPC offence. Hence, he opposed the grant of bail to the



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10743 of 2026

petitioner.

WEB COPY

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, considering the nature of charges levelled against the petitioner, the quantity involved in this case is commercial quantity, no contraband was recovered from this petitioner, the entire contraband was recovered from a building allegedly belongs to the petitioner, but perusal of records shows that the building is a old and in dilapidated condition, it is not fit for residence and thereby merely because the property belongs to the petitioner, it cannot be told that the petitioner only stored the contraband, anybody can stored the contraband in that place and no records also present to show the usage of the building for his own purpose, he is not present in that place on the date of occurrence, though the petitioner has one previous case, it is not similar in nature and the petitioner was already granted bail in that case 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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10743 of 2026

WEB COPY

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 **Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram**, and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the **respondent police**, at **10.30 a.m., and 05.00 p.m., on all working days, until further orders:**

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10743 of 2026

Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 51730].

[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 BNS.

(P D B J)
23.06.2026

TM

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Ramanathapuram.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Kenikkarai Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District. (Crime No.491 of 2025)
- 3.The Superintendent, District Prison, Pudukkottai.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10743 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J.

TM

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 10743 of 2026

Date : 23.06.2026