

TNMD010018182026



In the Court of the Principal Sessions Judge, Madurai.

Present : Thiru. S. SIVAKADATCHAM, B.Sc., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge, Madurai.

Wednesday, this the 18th day of March, 2026.

CrI.M.P.No.1102/2026

CNR No.TNMD010018182026

Manikandan, S/o.Raja

... Petitioner/Accused.

Vs

State through the Inspector of Police,
Jaihindpuram P.S. in Cr.No.87/2026

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition coming on today for hearing before me in the presence of Thiru.R.Ramar, Advocate for the petitioner and of Public Prosecutor for the State, this court passed the following:

Order

1. Bail application u/s 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS).

2. Heard both sides.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner/accused would submit that this is the 2nd petition and that the respondent police has registered a case against the petitioner in Crime No.87/2026 for the offences u/s 8(c), 20(b)(ii)(A) of NDPS Act and 77 of JJ Act. The petitioner was arrested by the respondent police and remanded to judicial custody on 15.02.2026 and is in custody for the past 32 days. The petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offences as alleged. Investigation is almost over. The petitioner has not filed similar petition before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court or any other court. The petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions that would be imposed by this Court and prayed to allow the petition.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that it is a case of single accused, who is the petitioner herein. As per the case of the prosecution, on 15.02.2026 at 03.45 a.m., at the vacant space on Bharathiar road, Jaihindpuram, Madurai, the defacto-complainant, who is the Sub Inspector of Police, Jaihindpuram P.S. arrested the petitioner for having possession of ganja. The petitioner has given confession statement that he used to purchase ganja and sell the same to labours and school students at higher price. The defacto-complainant recovered 150 gms. of ganja and sale proceeds Rs.1,010/- from the petitioner. Hence, the case. The petitioner has 4 previous cases of grave offences. Investigation is pending and objected to allow the petition.

5. Rival contentions are taken into consideration. The alleged offences against the petitioner/accused are u/s 8(c), 20(b)(ii)(A) of NDPS Act and 77 of JJ Act. The occurrence is said to have taken place on 15.02.2026. Case properties were recovered. The petitioner is in custody for 32 days. Material part of investigation ought to have been completed by this time. Further custodial interrogation of petitioner is not necessary. However, the learned Public Prosecutor strongly objected stating that the petitioner is involved in 4 previous cases, out of which, 2 cases are u/s 307 of IPC, one case is u/s 392 of IPC and that the petitioner is recently involved in Crime No.933/2025 under Arms Act and further contended that if the court considers the bail application, condition may be imposed far away from the respondent P.S. in order to deter the petitioner from involving in further criminal activities. This is the 2nd petition filed by the petitioner. Considering the above facts, the period of incarceration of petitioner, the changed circumstances and also the objections placed on the side of prosecution, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner on stringent conditions.

In the result, the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- along with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.IV, Madurai subject to the following conditions:-

(i) After release, the petitioner shall appear and sign before the Inspector of police, Tirupuvanam police station, Sivagangai District **daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.**

(ii) The petitioner shall co-operate with the investigation and shall not threaten the witnesses and shall not cause hindrance to the pending investigation.

(iii) That the petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused, or suspected, of the commission of which he is suspected and

(iv) If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is within his discretion to approach the Court of the learned Judicial Magistrate, concerned for cancellation of bail as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in **P.K.Shaji/Vs/State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W.5560.**

Pronounced by me in the Open Court on the 18th day of March, 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge,
Madurai

Copy to

1. The J.M.No.4. Madurai.
2. The Inspector of Police, Jaihindpuram P.S.
3. The Inspector of police, Tirupuvanam police station, Sivagangai District
4. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Madurai.
5. The Petitioner through his counsel.