



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. 21814 of 2025

Natarajan

...Petitioner/Accused-2

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. By,
The Inspector of Police,
Gudalur North Police Station,
Theni District.
(Crime No. 225 of 2024)

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Sathiyendran
Advocate.

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

PETITION FOR BAIL Under Sec.483 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Bail in Cr.No. 225 of 2024 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 28.10.2024 for the offences punishable under Sections 8(c) r/w 20(b)(ii)(C), 29(1), 27A and 25 of NDPS Act, 1985 in Crime No. 225 of 2024 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that based on the secret information, on 28.10.2024, at about 03.00 hours, the respondent police conducted raid at Gudalur PSC Theater behind Cumbum to Kumuli by-pass Road and found 3 persons came in a two wheeler bearing Reg.No.TN-60-X-4338. 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 1.100 kg of Hashish Extracts. 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 and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He



WEB COPY

would further submit that the quantity involved in this case is not a commercial quantity and even as per the prosecution, the accused No.1 to 10 were found in joint possession of contraband and the co-accused were already granted bail by this Court and no previous case is pending against the petitioner and he has been arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 28.10.2024. 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 3 accused persons, including the petitioner, travelled in a two-wheeler, and thereby, the petitioner was found to be in conscious possession and however, the petitioner has no previous case and the co-accused were already released on bail by this Court. 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.



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 quantity involved in this case is a commercial quantity, as per athatchi, there is no specific mention about the person from whom seized the property whereas in the seizure mahazar, it is stated that from all the accused commonly the contraband has been recovered and already the co-accused were granted bail and no previous case is pending against the petitioner and considering the period of incarceration undergone by the petitioner from 28.10.2024 onwards, 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 **Additional District and Sessions Judge/Principal Special Court for Trial of NDPS Act Cases, Madurai**, and on further conditions that:

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

[c] the petitioner shall not commit any offence similar to



WEB COPY

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



WEB COPY



P. DHANABAL, J

dss

To

- 1.The Additional District and Sessions Judge/Principal Special Court
for Trial of NDPS Act Cases, Madurai.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Gudalur North Police Station, Theni District.
3. The Superintendent, Central Prison,
Madurai.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 21814 of 2025

Date : 21.04.2026