

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.3103 OF 2026

DATE :25.03.2026

Between :

Miniganti Lakshman Goud

... Petitioner/A.26

And

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

Through P.S.Hyderabad Narcotics (TGANB)

... Respondent/Complainant

: 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.26 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 R. Balraj Goud, 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 herein is A.26 and he has been falsely implicated nearly five months after the alleged incident solely on the basis of inadmissible confessional statements of a co-accused and uncorroborated circumstantial hearsay. It is contended that, as per the remand case diary, the allegation that the petitioner was involved in the toddy business and procured Alprazolam from A.5 is entirely fabricated and based on coerced statements recorded in custody, no contraband was recovered from his possession or premises; only his mobile phone was seized. There is no material linking the petitioner to the alleged commercial quantity seized at a different location, and the prosecution relied solely on inadmissible confessional statements and neutral financial transactions, without any independent corroboration or "live link" to the alleged offence. It is further

submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents, is a law-abiding citizen, and is the sole breadwinner of his family, and his continued custody would cause severe hardship to his dependents. The learned counsel further contended that mere confessional statements, particularly in view of the law laid down in **Tofan Singh vs. State of Tamil Nadu**¹, are not admissible in evidence and cannot form the basis for implicating the petitioner, especially in the absence of any recovery. It is also contended that the alleged offences under NDPS Act are not attracted in the absence of possession or evidence, and that financial transactions, without proof of illegality, cannot be criminalized based on inadmissible statements. Therefore, in the absence of any prima facie material or “live link,” the bar under Section 37 of the NDPS Act does not apply. The petitioner has been in judicial custody since 04.02.2026 despite not being named in the FIR and undertakes to cooperate with the investigation and abide by any conditions imposed by this Court. Hence, prayed this Court to grant regular bail to the petitioner.

¹ (2020) 12 S.C.C.583

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed bail contending that there is prima facie material showing that the petitioner herein who holds a TFT licence is engaged in the toddy business, came into contact with A.5, Krishnaiah Goud, and began procuring Alprazolam for mixing it with toddy to earn higher profits. It is alleged that the petitioner regularly purchased Alprazolam from A.5 @ of Rs.3,000/- to Rs.4,000/- per gram, receiving about 10 grams every week, and made payments through PhonePe and cash. The prosecution submits that the petitioner is part of a larger drug syndicate and was apprehended on 03.02.2026 at his village. It is further contended that if petitioner is released on bail, he may influence or intimidate witnesses, tamper with evidence, destroy material records, or assist other absconding accused, and there is a likelihood of him repeating similar offences. As such, 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 allegations against the petitioner is that he used to purchase 10 grams of Alprazolam every week and according to the prosecution there are many transactions between the petitioner and A.5. Considering the allegations against the petitioner that he used to purchase 10 grams of

Alprazolam, as it amounts to intermediate quantity, this Court deems it appropriate 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 Special Judicial Magistrate of First Class for Excise Cases, 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: 25.03.2026

Rds

K. SUJANA, J

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.3103 OF 2026

Date: 25.03.2026

Rds