



CRL OP(MD). No.12275 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 27.03.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No.12275 of 2025

Rahim

...Petitioner/Accused

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Thalamuthu Nagar Police Station,
Thoothukudi District
(Crime No. 476 of 2025)

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Prabhu Rajadurai
for Mr. K.Vinoharan

For Respondent : Mr.B.Nambi Selvan
Additional Public Prosecutor

PETITION FOR BAIL Under Sec.483 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Bail in Cr.No. 476 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.



CRL OP(MD). No.12275 of 2025

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

WEB COPY

The petitioner / Accused, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 11.06.2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 8(c) and 22(c) of NDPS Act in Crime No.476 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 11.06.2025 at about 9.00 hrs based on the secret information received by the Sub Inspector of Police he along with police party and equipment went near Motaikopuram beach at Thalamuthu Nagar and mounted surveillance, at that time they saw the petitioner along with other accused coming in a two wheeler bearing Reg.No. TN 69 BB 8359 and respondent police stopped them and searched the vehicle at that time they found the accused person in joint possession of Tramadol Hydrochloride Injection 50 mg/ml = 800 . Hence the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the respondent police has registered a false case against the petitioner and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The petitioner has been arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 11.06.2025



CRL OP(MD). No.12275 of 2025

and no similar kind of previous cases are pending against the petitioner and also the fact that based on the confession statement given by the co-accused this petitioner has been implicated as an accused. Hence, he prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent would submit that petitioner along with other accused were found accused persons were found in joint possession of Tramadol Hydrochloride Injection 50 mg/ml = 800. Hence, he 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 and also the fact that the contraband involved in this case is not a commercial quantity and even according to the case of prosecution they recovered contraband of 50mg of 800 pieces (50X 800= 40000 mgs) and the total quantity involved in this case is 40gms which does not come under commercial quantity and the fact that the petitioner has no previous case



CRL OP(MD). No.12275 of 2025

for similar kind of offence and also considering the period of incarceration undergone by the petitioner and also the fact based on the confession statement given by the co-accused this petitioner has been implicated as an accused, 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 Judicial Magistrate No.II, Thoothukudi and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the trial Court on all working days at 10.30 a.m.,and 5.30 pm., until further orders.

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



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.12275 of 2025

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)
27.03.2026

aav

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Thoothukudi
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Thalamuthu Nagar Police Station,
Thoothukudi District
3. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Thoothukudi
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

5/6



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.12275 of 2025
P. DHANABAL, J

aav

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 12275 of 2025

Date : 27.03.2026