

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE DEMOCRATIC SOCIALIST REPUBLIC**  
**OF SRI LANKA**

*In the matter of an application for bail made under section 83 (2) of Poisons, Opium and Dangerous Drugs (Amendment) Act No. 41 of 2022.*

**Court of Appeal No:**

**CA/BAL/0117/22**

The Officer in Charge,

Police Station,

Panadura - South.

**COMPLAINANT**

**Magistrate Court Panadura**

**Vs.**

**Case No:** BR 80952/21

Warsha Henedige Hashan Maduranga

Soysa

(Presently detained in Remand Prison)

**SUSPECT**

**AND NOW BETWEEN**

Thenuwara Arachchige Ranjani,

No. 32/21, Fonseka Road, Wekada,

Panadura.

**PETITIONER**

**Vs.**

1. The Officer in Charge,  
Police Station,  
Panadura - South.
2. The Attorney General  
Attorney General's Department  
Colombo 12

**RESPONDENTS**

Warsha Henedige Hashan Maduranga  
Soysa  
(Presently detained in Remand Prison)

**SUSPECT-RESPONDENT**

Before : Sampath B. Abayakoon, J.  
: P. Kumararatnam, J.

Counsel : Asla Anas for the petitioner instructed by Nipunika  
Karunathilake  
: Ridma Kuruwita, SC for the State

Supported on : 08-05-2023

Order on : 05-06-2023

**Sampath B. Abayakoon, J.**

This is an application by the petitioner seeking bail for her son namely, Warsha Henedige Hashan Maduranga Soysa (hereinafter referred to as the suspect) who is the suspect in the Magistrate Court of Panadura Case No. BR-80952/2021.

The suspect has been arrested by officers of Panadura police on 24-01-2021, for an alleged offence of possession and trafficking of Heroin. According to the B-report filed before the Magistrate of Panadura in that regard, at the time of his arrest, he was carrying 40 grams and 500 milligrams of a substance suspected to be Heroin. The suspect has been in remand since, and according to the Government Analyst Report, the substance produced before the Government Analyst had been identified as a substance having 19.09 grams of pure Heroin.

In her application for bail before this Court, the petitioner has denied that her son was arrested as the police claimed in the B-report or had any dangerous drug in his possession. In paragraph 10 of her application, the petitioner has pleaded several grounds for the consideration of the Court on the basis that the said grounds consist exceptional circumstances for this Court to grant bail on the suspect.

The previous section 83 of the Poisons, Opium and Dangerous Drugs Ordinance as amended by Act No. 13 of 1984 was repealed and replaced by a new section 83 by Poisons, Opium and Dangerous Drugs (Amendment) Act No. 41 of 2022 in the following manner.

**83. (1) Subject to the provisions of sections 84, 85 and subsection (2) of this section, a person suspected or accused of an offence under sections 54A and 54B of this Ordinance, shall not be released on bail by the High Court except in exceptional circumstances.**

**(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 84 and 85, a person suspected or accused of an offence under subsection (1) of section 54A and section 54B-**

**(a) of which the pure quantity of the dangerous drug, trafficked, imported, exported or possessed is ten grammes or above in terms of the report issued by the Government Analyst under section 77A ; and**

**(b) which is punishable with death or life imprisonment, shall not be released on bail except by the Court of Appeal in exceptional circumstances.**

**(3) For the purposes of this section “dangerous drug” means Morphine, Cocaine, Heroin and Methamphetamine.**

Although, section 83 that existed until the Amendment Act No. 41 of 2022 came into being had vested the power to grant bail for a person suspected or accused of an offence under section 54 A or 54 B of the Poisons, Opium and Dangerous Drugs Ordinance to the relevant High Court in exceptional circumstances, the amendment has provided for different jurisdictions to grant bail, however still under exceptional circumstances.

Under the provisions of section 83 (2) of the Amendment Act No. 41 of 2022, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 84 and 85, where it has been stipulated that a suspect or an accused shall not be detained in custody for a period exceeding 12 months from the date of arrest and up to another period of 12 months on an application made by the attorney General to the High Court, if the pure quantity of the dangerous drug trafficked, imported, exported or possessed is 10 grams or above in terms of the Government Analyst Report, it is the Court of Appeal that has the exclusive jurisdiction to grant bail in exceptional circumstances for a person accused or suspected of committing an offence in terms of section 54 A or 54 B of the Ordinance.

For purposes of this section, a dangerous drug means Morphine, Cocaine, Heroin and Methamphetamine. Since it has been established that the substance alleged to have been found in the possession of the suspect was Heroin and the pure quantity of 19.09 grams, this is a matter which comes within the purview of this Court to consider bail under exceptional circumstances for the suspect.

What constitutes exceptional circumstances have not been defined in the Statute.

Our superior Courts have considered various situations at various times as exceptional in deciding to grant bail for suspects in terms of the Poisons, Opium and Dangerous Drugs Ordinance.

In the case of **CA (PHC) APN No.16-12 decided on 14-06-2012**, the Court of Appeal considered failing to file an indictment even one year after the receipt of the Government Analyst Report as relevant in granting bail for a suspect.

However, it needs to be noted that there are several other instances where the Court of Appeal did not consider the time period a suspect person has been incarcerated as relevant exceptional circumstances in order to grant bail.

In the case of **CA (PHC) APN No. 9-2010 decided on 19-07-2010**, the Court of Appeal considered the facts reported by police in the B-report as relevant to consider whether there are exceptional circumstances to grant bail to a suspect.

Similarly, there are judgements, which say that facts cannot be considered as exceptional circumstances.

The above varied decisions by our Superior Courts clearly establish the fact that whether a certain situation amounts to exceptional circumstances or not, has to be considered on a case-by-case basis unique to each application before the Court. It is the view of this Court that if the relevant B-report and other material placed before the Court, provides a sufficient basis to consider granting bail to a suspect, there exists no impediment for this Court to consider them as relevant in determining whether exceptional circumstances exist under a given situation.

In the matter under consideration, the suspect had been arrested and produced on 25-01-2021 and the Government Analyst Report dated 10-06-2021 has been received by the Magistrate Court according to the journal entry dated 16-07-2021.

It appears from the Magistrate Court case record that the police had repeatedly taken dates after dates to forward the relevant dossier to the Hon. Attorney General for the relevant instructions. The Magistrate Court case record bears

testimony that the learned Magistrate being frustrated by the lethargic attitude of the police had repeatedly questioned as to the progress of this matter. It appears that the said dossier had been passing through various officials of the Police department without being sent to the Hon. Attorney General. At one stage, the learned Magistrate had even issued notices through the relevant Deputy Inspector General of Police in this regard.

The police have filed the relevant reference number given by the Attorney General Department in the Magistrate Court only on 03-10-2022, which was more than one year and five months after the Government Analyst Report was made available.

This Court is of the view that the alleged offence committed by the suspect as mentioned in the B-report provides no basis to consider that this is a complicated matter where investigations have to be conducted extensively.

Although it is reported that the Hon. Attorney General has now sent the indictment to the relevant High Court to be served on the accused, I am of the view that it would not compensate for the unnecessary delay in filing an indictment due to the attitudes of the investigating agencies. I am of the view that the investigating agencies have an additional responsibility of making sure that no person is kept in remand unnecessarily without being charged in a competent Court of law, enabling that person to plead to the charge to seek redress from the Court. I am also of the view that a suspected or accused person, especially in cases where the sentence would be either capital punishment or life imprisonment should not be allowed to languish in remand custody without bail being considered and determining whether a suspect or an accused should be released on bail or not.

I am of the view that when it comes to the circumstances of this case, the delay in filing an indictment provides a sufficient exceptional circumstance to grant bail to the suspect. Accordingly, the suspect is ordered to be released on the following bail conditions.

1. Cash bail Rs. 50,000/=
2. Two sureties with Rs. 250,000/= each surety bail. One of the sureties should be the petitioner.
3. The suspect is ordered to report to the Officer in Charge of Panadura-South Police Station on every last Sunday of the month between 9.00 a.m. and 12 noon.
4. The suspect is prevented from traveling overseas until the conclusion of the trial against him. If he is possessed of a passport, he shall surrender the passport to the Registrar of the Magistrate Court of Panadura. If he has not obtained a passport, he shall file an affidavit in that regard.
5. The Registrar of the Magistrate Court of Panadura is directed to inform the Controller of Immigration and Emigration that a travel ban has been imposed on the suspect until the conclusion of this case and is also ordered to provide the necessary details in this regard to the Controller.

Registrar of this Court is directed to communicate this bail order to the Magistrate Court of Panadura for necessary implementation.

Judge of the Court of Appeal

**P. Kumararatnam, J.**

I agree.

Judge of the Court of Appeal