

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND
SESSIONS JUDGE, CHENGALPATTU**

Present : Thiru.T.Chandrasekaran, M.L.,
Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

Date: Tuesday, the 07th day of July 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.1897 of 2026
(CNR No. TNCG01-003878-2026)

Arun.M, aged 25 years, S/o.Munusamy,

.. Petitioner/Accused.

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Chengalpattu Taluk Police Station,
Cr. No.390 of 2026

.. Respondent/Complainant

U/s.8(c), 20(b)(ii)(A) of NDPS Act r/w. Sec.25(1A) of ARMS Act

This petition for bail coming on this day for hearing before me, M/s.R.Syed Nazeer, the learned counsel is appearing for the petitioner/accused and M/s.P.Rajinikanth, the learned Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent/complainant, upon hearing both sides and upon perusal of case records, this Court made the following

O R D E R

This petition is filed U/s.483 of BNSS 2023, seeking to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

2. The petitioner/accused has been charged for the alleged offences U/s.8(c), 20(b)(ii)(A) of NDPS Act r/w. Sec.25(1A) of ARMS Act.

3. Notice given to the Public Prosecutor for the State and the oral reply received. Heard both sides; records perused.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case; he was arrested and remanded on 07.06.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 31 days;

moreover, the petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions to be imposed upon him and he is ready to offer substantial sureties before the court, thereby prayed for enlargement on bail.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, would submit that though necessary instructions given to the respondent police, neither the investigating officer appear before the court nor filed his reply. However, he made his formal objection.

6. Cursory perusal of records it is alleged that the petitioner along with other accused have found in possession of 57 grams of *ganja*, in order to sell others. The occurrence alleged to have taken place on 06.06.2026 and the accused is in judicial custody from 07.06.2026. Total number of custody exceeds 31 days. The prosecution has not chosen to raise any valid objection to object the bail application. Since the witnesses are seemed to be the police officials, there is no possibility of tampering the witnesses. Taking into consideration of the duration of custody, the prosecution has not raised any valid objection, nature of allegations made against the petitioner and the facts and circumstances of the case, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. In the result, this petition is allowed; The petitioner/accused is ordered to be released on bail on his execution of bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Chengalpattu, with further conditions that;

1. The sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression (LTI) in the surety bond and the sureties shall produce any one of identity proof before the learned Magistrate to ensure their identity.

2. The petitioner/accused is directed to report before the respondent police station daily at 10.30 A.M. for 30 days;
3. The petitioner/accused shall not tamper the evidence either during investigation or trial;
4. The petitioner/accused shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;
5. If there is any breach of conditions, the Investigation Officer shall report to the learned Magistrate and the learned Magistrate shall take appropriate action as if the conditions have been imposed by the Magistrate himself/herself in accordance with the decision in ***AIR 2006 SC 100 - P.K. Shaji Vs State of Kerala.***

Pronounced by me in the open Court, on this the 07th day of July 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Chengalpattu.

The Inspector of Police, Chengalpattu Taluk Police Station.

The Superintendent, District Jail, Chengalpattu.