

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE T. MADHAVI DEVI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.7925 of 2026

DATE: 21.05.2026

BETWEEN:

Vijay Shanthi Duriya

.....Petitioner/Accused No.1

And

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

.....Respondent/Complainant

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed praying this Court to enlarge the petitioner on bail who is arrayed as accused No.1 in Crime No.1134 of 2025 before the Chandanagar Police Station, Cyberabad Commissionerate, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 8c read with 20(b)(ii)(C) and 29 of NDPS Act.

2. The brief facts of the case are that on 07.10.2025 at about 08:00 hours, the police received credible information that three persons were allegedly transporting dry ganja from Visakhapatnam to Mumbai through train and would change trains at Lingampally Railway Station.

Basing upon the said information, the police along with mediators proceeded to the spot and found Accused Nos.2, 3 and 5 waiting at Platform No.1 along with seven bags and upon search, contraband was seized from them. Basing on the confessional statements of Accused Nos.2 and 3, the petitioner herein was arrayed as Accused No.1 in Crime No.1134 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 8(c) read with 20(b)(ii)(c) and 29 of the NDPS Act.

3. Heard Sri T.P. Acharya, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner as well as Sri M. Vivekananda Reddy, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent – State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case solely on the basis of the alleged confessional statements of the co-accused and that no contraband was seized from her possession and that the petitioner was not present at the scene of offence and was subsequently arrested on 20.04.2026 and remanded to judicial custody. He contended that accused Nos.2, 3 and 5, from whom the alleged contraband was seized, were already enlarged on bail and therefore the petitioner is also entitled to bail on the ground of parity. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant bail to the petitioner by allowing this Criminal Petition.

5. Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor opposed the bail application contending that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature involving offences under the NDPS Act and that the petitioner was arrayed as Accused No.1 based on the statements of the co-accused disclosing her involvement in the transportation of contraband. He contended that the offence involves commercial quantity of ganja and therefore the rigour under Section 37 of the NDPS Act is attracted. Therefore, he prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. On considering the submissions made by both the learned counsel and on perusing the material available on record, this Court is of the view that the quantity involved in the present case is 47.1 kgs of Ganja, which is commercial quantity as per Section 37 of the NDPS Act. In view of rigor of Section 37 of NDPS Act, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Therefore, the criminal petition lacks merit and the same is liable to be dismissed.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is dismissed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any, pending in this petition, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE T. MADHAVI DEVI

Date: 21.05.2026
SAI/DA