

ITEM NO.4

COURT NO.12

Revised  
SECTION II-C

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s). 5520/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 07-01-2026 in CRLQP No. 35178/2025 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Madras]

LINGESHWARAN

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE

Respondent(s)

FOR ADMISSION

IA No. 94621/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 94618/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 02-04-2026 This matter was called for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. MAHADEVAN

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. B. Abishek, Adv.  
Mr. M. Y. Deshmukh, AOR  
Mr. D. Aswathaman, Adv.  
Mr. P. Sathyanathan, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Sabarish Subramanian, AOR  
Ms. Srishti, Adv.  
Mr. Vishnu Unnikrishnan, Adv.

O R D E R

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Crime. No. 564 of 2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 8(c), 22(b), 22(c), 25, 29(1) of the NDPS Act registered with the M1 Madhavaram Police Station, Chennai, Tamil Nadu.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody for almost seven months now, and even as per the

prosecution, the recovery is of 2.70 grams of methamphetamine which is marginally above the small quantity, which is 2 grams. It was contended that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and in fact, even the investigation reveals that the other accused have disclosed with regard to the source, but there is nobody forthcoming to indicate from where the petitioner got the drug. It was further contended that even otherwise, the basic safeguards in the statute have not been adhered to with regard to search and seizure and also sampling.

4. Learned counsel for the State submits that the recovery of the drug cannot be disputed as it was from an open public place and the question of complicity as also non-conformity with the statutory provisions are matters which needs to be considered at the trial stage.

5. Be that as it may, we find that, for the present, no case for bail is made out. Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed.

6. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(SACHIN KUMAR SRIVASTAVA)  
COURT MASTER (SH)

(ANJALI PANWAR)  
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s). 5520/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 07-01-2026 in CRLP No. 35178/2025 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Madras]

LINGESHWARAN

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE

Respondent(s)

FOR ADMISSION

IA No. 94621/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 94618/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL  
DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 02-04-2026 This matter was called for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. MAHADEVAN

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. B. Abhishek, Adv.  
Mr. M. Y. Deshmukh, AOR  
Mr. D. Aswathaman, Adv.  
Mr. P. Sathyanathan, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Sabarish Subramanian, AOR  
Ms. Srishti, Adv.  
Mr. Vishnu Unnikrishnan, Adv.

O R D E R

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Crime. No. 564 of 2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 8(c), 22(b), 22(c), 25, 29(1) of the NDPS Act registered with the M1 Madhavaram Police Station, Chennai, Tamil Nadu.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody for almost seven months now, and even as per the

prosecution, the recovery is of 2.70 grams of methamphetamine which is marginally above the small quantity, which is 2 grams. It was contended that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and in fact, even the investigation reveals that the other accused have disclosed with regard to the source, but there is nobody forthcoming to indicate from where the petitioner got the drug. It was further contended that even otherwise, the basic safeguards in the statute have not been adhered to with regard to search and seizure and also sampling.

4. Learned counsel for the State submits that the recovery of the drug cannot be disputed as it was from an open public place and the question of complicity as also non-conformity with the statutory provisions are matters which needs to be considered at the trial stage.

5. Be that as it may, we find that, for the present, no case for bail is made out. Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed.

6. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(SACHIN KUMAR SRIVASTAVA)  
COURT MASTER (SH)

(ANJALI PANWAR)  
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR