

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

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

**Court of Appeal No:**

**CA/BAL/0239/23**

The Officer in Charge,

Police Station,

Biyagama.

**COMPLAINANT**

**Magistrate Court Mahara**

**Vs.**

**Case No:** B 2226/21

Metaramba Kanththagamage Milani

Lasanthika

(Currently in Remand Prison)

**SUSPECT**

**AND NOW**

Welathanthrage Amila Sampath Botheju

No. 891/D,

Obawatte Road,

Heiyanthuduwa.

**PETITIONER**

**Vs.**

1. The Officer in Charge,  
Police Station,  
Biyagama.

**COMPLAINANT-RESPONDENT**

2. The Attorney General,  
Attorney General's Department,  
Colombo 12.

**RESPONDENT**

Before : Sampath B. Abayakoon, J.

: P. Kumararatnam, J.

Counsel : I. B. S. Harshana for the Petitioner

: Jayalakshi de Silva, S.C. for the Respondent

Inquiry on : 05-07-2023

Order on : 26-09-2023

**Sampath B. Abayakoon, J.**

This is an application by the petitioner seeking bail for his wife, namely, Metaramba Kanththagamage Malini Lasanthika (hereinafter referred to as the suspect) who is the suspect in the Magistrate's Court of Mahara Case No. 2226/21.

The suspect has been arrested by the officers of the Biyagama Police on 18-07-2021, for an alleged offence of possession and trafficking of Heroin.

According to the B-report filed before the Magistrate of Mahara by the Officer-in-Charge of the Biyagama police in that regard, at the time of his arrest, she was having in her possession one Kilogram and 132 milligrams of a substance suspected to be of Heroin, which is an offence punishable in terms section 54A of the Poisons, Opium and Dangerous Drugs Ordinance as amended.

The suspect has been in remand since, and according to the Government Analyst Report dated 19-11-2021 the substance produced before the Government Analyst had been identified as a substance having 702.0 grams of Diacetylmorphine, namely, Heroin.

The petitioner has denied that the suspect was arrested with any drug in her possession. He had admitted that several police officers came to his house on the night of the day of the arrest, but has claimed that they could not find any drug in the house. It is claimed that one of the police officers later came into the house claiming that a parcel was found in a toilet outside of a house and arrested the suspect and subsequently introduced Heroin on the suspect at the police station.

In his application for bail before this Court, the petitioner has claimed that the fact that the suspect being in remand since July 2021, without being charged before a competent Court as exceptional circumstances, among other grounds for this Court to consider granting of bail for the suspect.

The learned Counsel for the petitioner also contended in his submissions before this Court that the police have failed to disclose the details of alleged possession of the drug by the suspect in the B report filed before the Magistrate's Court and that fact should also be regarded as an exceptional ground in a matter of this nature.

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 became operative had vested the power to grant bail for a person suspected or accused of an offence committed under section 54A or 54B 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 under mentioned circumstances.

Under the provisions of section 83 (2) of the Amendment Act No. 41 of 2022, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 84 and 85, 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, in such circumstances only the Court of Appeal which has the exclusive jurisdiction to grant bail in exceptional

circumstances for a person accused or suspected of committing an offence in terms of section 54A or 54B of the Ordinance.

For the purposes of this section, a dangerous drug has been defined as Morphine, Cocaine, Heroin and Methamphetamine.

Section 84 and 85 are the provisions 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.

Since it has been established that the substance alleged to have been found in the possession of the suspect was Heroin, and had a pure quantity of 702.0 grams, this is a matter which comes within the purview of this Court to consider bail for the suspect under exceptional circumstances.

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 **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 the 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 by the relevant investigation authority, 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 this matter, the suspect had been allegedly arrested with one Kilogram of Heroin, out of which 702 grams have been identified by the Government Analyst as pure Heroin. It appears from the Magistrate's Court record that the police have conducted extensive investigations because of the quantity recovered.

According to the submission made before the Court by the learned State Counsel, the relevant extracts have now been received by the Hon. Attorney General on 23-05-2023, and an indictment is under consideration, although the indictment has not yet been dispatched to the relevant High Court.

Under the circumstances, and having considered the nature of the investigations that had been carried out by the police, although there had been a delay in sending the relevant extracts to the Attorney General by the police, I am not in a position to conclude that there exists an unnecessary delay in the part of the investigators and the prosecuting authority in filing charges against the suspect in this matter.

I am also of the view that the alleged failure by the police to mention in more detail of the possession of the drug by the suspect has no relevance now as the

relevant extracts are now with the Hon. Attorney General, and a matter that will draw the attention when considering the indictment.

For the reasons as considered above, I find no basis to release the suspect on bail under exceptional circumstances.

Accordingly, the application for bail is dismissed for want of merit.

Judge of the Court of Appeal

**P. Kumararatnam, J.**

I agree.

Judge of the Court of Appeal