

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4254 OF 2026

DATE :26.03.2026

Between :

S. Narendra Goud

... Petitioner/A.6

And

The State of Telangana,
Rep., by the Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Telangana,
At Hyderabad.

... Respondent

: ORDER :

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 480 & 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Surakhsha Sanhita, 2023 praying this Court to enlarge the petitioner on bail who is arrayed as accused No.6 in Crime No.9 of 2025 of Hyderabad Narcotics Police Station, TG Anti-Narcotics Bureau. The offences alleged against the petitioner are under Sections 8(c), 22(c), 27A and 29 of the

Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short 'NDPS Act').

2. The brief facts of the case are that on receiving credible information that one Jaya Prakash Goud (A.1) was running an illegal Alprazolam manufacturing unit on the first floor of the Medha School premises bearing H.No.8-5-226/1, Syndicate Bank Colony, Old Bowenpally, Hyderabad, and was supplying the manufactured Alprazolam to toddy depots, the complainant along with his team reached the spot and confirmed the presence of the suspect, the team conducted a raid at about 4:00 p.m., on 13.09.2025 in the first-floor hall of the school building. A.1 was found present, and laboratory equipment, chemicals, and plastic containers resembling a drug manufacturing setup were noticed. During enquiry, the accused allegedly confessed that he had been manufacturing Alprazolam in the premises for the past several months and supplying it to toddy depots and other persons in Telangana. Pursuant to his confession, the police seized finished Alprazolam weighing about 3.302 kg, semi-finished substances of different stages, large quantities of precursor chemicals, laboratory apparatus used for manufacturing the drug, cash of Rs.21,40,000/- alleged to be sale proceeds, and two mobile phones in the presence of

mediators. Hence a case was registered against the accused for the above offences.

3. Heard Sri Rajagopallavan Tayi, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Sri M.Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent - State.

4. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner have been falsely implicated solely based on coerced and inadmissible confessional statements, without any recovery of contraband from their possession, as only their mobile phones were seized. It is contended that there is no “live link” between the petitioner and the alleged contraband seized from another accused, and the prosecution relied on neutral financial transactions and inadmissible statements, which cannot establish criminal liability in view of the law laid down in **Tofan Singh vs. State of Tamil Nadu**¹. The petitioner has no criminal antecedents, they are law-abiding citizens, and their custodial interrogation is unnecessary as the investigation is based on material already in possession of police. It is further submitted that the provisions of Sections 8(c), 22(c), 27A, and

¹ (2020) 12 S.C.C.583

29 of the NDPS Act are not attracted in the absence of possession, financing, or conspiracy supported by evidence, and therefore the bar under Section 37 is not applicable. The petitioner have been in custody since 05.11.2025, and their continued detention violates their right to personal liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, especially when there is no possibility of tampering with evidence, and they are willing to cooperate with the investigation. Hence prayed this Court to grant regular bail to the petitioner by allowing this criminal petition.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed bail contending that the allegations against the petitioner are for the offence punishable under the provisions of NDPS Act and that if petitioner is released on bail, he may influence or intimidate witnesses, tamper with evidence, destroy digital or physical records, or assist absconding accused, and therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to bail and prayed to dismiss this petition.

6. Considering the submissions made by both the counsel and the material on record, the petitioner are remanded to judicial custody on 05.11.2025 and the prime accused No.1 was granted mandatory bail. Considering the allegations against the

petitioner and their period of incarceration, this Court is inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioner subject to following conditions :

i. The petitioner shall execute a personal bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned II Additional Sessions Judge, Hyderabad.

ii. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned SHO between 09.00 a.m and 5.00 p.m., on every Wednesday for a period of eight (8) weeks or till filing of charge sheet whichever is earlier, for the purpose of investigation, and thereafter, as and when required.

iii. The petitioner shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 483(2) of the BNSS.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

Date: 26.03.2026

ss

K. SUJANA, J

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4254 OF 2026

Date: 26.03.2026

SS