

News

Three police officers are fined ₹10 lakh by the Madras High Court for providing misleading testimony in an NDPS case.



While acquitting a guy who had been found guilty by a special court of possessing 24 kilograms of ganja, the court issued the order.

Three police officials were recently fined ₹10 lakh by the Madurai Bench of the Madras High Court for falsifying testimony and creating evidence in a drug case.

According to the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (NDPS) Act, Justice KK

Ramakrishnan concluded that the police colluded to get an erroneous conviction.

While acquitting a guy who had been found guilty by a special court of possessing 24 kilograms of ganja, the court issued the order. He was fined ₹1 lakh and given a ten-year severe jail sentence.

The High Court ruled that the prosecution's story was untrue and lacked solid proof.

The police officers "**conspired together to get the conviction by hook or crook by giving false evidence before the trial court,**" according to Justice Ramakrishnan's findings. The Court claimed that the entire case was based on falsified records and inconsistencies in the investigating officers' statements.

The sub-inspector who obtained the classified material asserted that he had handwritten it, according to the ruling. But it was a typed version of the report that was presented in court. Although the evidence indicated that another officer had really signed the document, another officer claimed to have done so.

The judge stated, **"This shows that false evidence was presented before the trial court."**

The Court noted that the accused's fundamental right to a fair investigation and trial had been gravely violated by such behavior.

In addition to failing to demonstrate Section 42 compliance, the prosecution used deceptive evidence to gain a conviction, the ruling said.

The contradictions demonstrated a **"unholy alliance between witnesses to secure conviction based on false evidence,"** according to Justice Ramakrishnan. Within a month, he ordered the three officers to collectively compensate the accused with ₹10 lakh.

The Director General of Police in Chennai was also directed by the court to start disciplinary action against the officials.

It stated that the authority would carry out the investigation on its own, free from the effect of the conclusions in this ruling.

The DGP was instructed to finish the investigation in a month.

The appellant was represented by advocate G Karupasamy Pandian.

R Meenakshi Sundaram, an additional public prosecutor, represented the State.

Lawread