

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

In the matter of an application for Bail as under and in terms of Section 83(2) of the Poisons, Opium and Dangerous Drugs Ordinance as amended by section 04 of the Act No.41 of 2022.

Court of Appeal

The Officer-in-Charge

Application No:

Police Narcotics Bureau,

CA Bail/0414/2025

Colombo-01.

Vs.

MC Kaduwela case No.

Rev. Rangiri Ulpathe Premarathana

B/86775/2025

Thero

(In prison)

SUSPECT

AND NOW BETWEEN

Rev. Rangiri Ulpathe Premarathana

No. 252, Ganewatte Purana Viharaya,

Biyagama.

(In prison)

SUSPECT-PETITIONER

Vs.

1. Officer-in-Charge
Police Narcotics Bureau
Colombo-01.

COMPLAINANT-RESPONDENT

2. The Attorney General

Attorney General's Department

Colombo-12.

2ND-RESPONDENT

BEFORE : **P. Kumararatnam, J.**
R. P. Hettiarachchi, J.

COUNSEL : **Sahan Kulatunga instructed by Dilshan Mahayagoda for the Petitioner.**
Malik Azees, SC for the Respondents.

ARGUED ON : **27/03/2026.**

DECIDED ON : **18/05/2026.**

BAIL ORDER

P. Kumararatnam, J.

The Suspect-Petitioner (Hereinafter referred to as the Petitioner) filing this Application has invoked the jurisdiction of this Court to grant bail to him upon suitable conditions as this Court considers appropriate.

On 23.01.2025, the Petitioner was arrested by officers attached to the Police Narcotics Bureau, Colombo-01 while he was at his temple in Biyagama. Thero was arrested on the basis that he had added and abetted another person to store Methamphetamine. He was produced before the Magistrate Court of Kaduwela under case No. B 86775/25 and remanded to date.

The Petitioner was produced, and the facts were reported to the Homagama Magistrate under Section 54A(d) and 54A(b) of the Poisons Opium and Dangerous Drugs Ordinance as amended by the Act No.13 of 1984.

The production, which had been recovered from another person had been sent to the Government Analyst Department on 29/01/2025. After analysis, the Government Analyst had forwarded the report to Court on 21/03/2025. According to the Government Analyst Report, the Parcels marked S-1 to S-12 contained 3.92424 kilograms of pure Methamphetamine.

The contention of the prosecution is that the Petitioner was arrested upon an information for aiding and abetting another person who did possessed the contraband seized by the police.

The Petitioner has pleaded the following exceptional circumstances in support of the Bail Application.

1. The Petitioner has been in remand custody for nearly 16 months.
2. The Petitioner being a Buddhist Bhikku would never involve in illegal activities such a narcotic related activity.
3. He always lived a righteous life as a Bhikku and helped his temple and the community surrounding it.

In **Nasher v. Director of Public Prosecution [2020] VSCA 144** the court held that:

“a combination of delay, onerous custodial conditions, and the relative weakness of the prosecution case may, when considered with all relevant circumstances, compel the conclusion that exceptional circumstances have been established”.

The Counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner has been in remand for nearly 16 months. Considering the facts and the circumstances of this case, the prosecution will not be able to establish a prima facie case against the Petitioner.

Exceptional circumstances are not defined in the statute. Hence, what would constitute *an* exceptional circumstance must be considered on its own facts and circumstances on a case-by-case basis.

In **Ramu Thamothersampillai v. The Attorney General [2004] 3 SLR 180** the court held that:

“the decision must in each case depend on its own peculiar facts and circumstances”.

In **CA (PHC) APN 17/12 and CA(PHC) APN 16/12** the court observed the fact that the indictment was not served even after the lapse of one year from the date of producing the Government Analyst’s Report, was considered as exceptional circumstances.

In **CA(PHC)APN 107/2018** decided on 19.03.2019, it was held that remanding for a period of one year and five months without being served with the indictment was considered an exceptional circumstance inter alia in releasing the suspect on bail.

The Petitioner sates that he is a university student from the Bhikku University of Sri Lanka in Anuradhapura and that his incarceration is having significant impact on his education.

Due to his arrest, the Petitioner has been suffering from bouts of anxiety and depression and that at the time of his arrest he was taking medication to help in managing his condition.

The Section 83 of the Poison, Opium and Dangerous Drugs Act which was amended by Act No. 41 of 2022 states:

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.

The Counsel for the Petitioner urged this Court to consider that detaining a Suspect without the trial being commenced for an extended period of

time amounts to a violation of his fundamental rights, which can be considered as an exceptional ground.

Offences under Section 54A(d) and 54A(b) of the Poisons, Opium and Dangerous Drugs Ordinance as amended by the Act No.13 of 1984 are undoubtedly serious offences, however, the seriousness of the offence alone cannot form a ground to refuse bail. When considering these matters, the court must bear in mind the presumption of innocence.

At this stage, the learned State Counsel in keeping with the highest tradition of the Attorney General's Department did not object for bail considering the fact that the contraband was not recovered from his custody. He was arrested on the allegation that he had aided and abetted another person who was arrested along with 3.92424 kilograms of Methamphetamine.

Considering all these factors into account, I order bail to the Petitioner with the following strict bail conditions.

1. Cash bail of Rs.100,000/=.
2. To provide 03 sureties. They must sign a bond of one million each.
3. The Petitioner and the sureties must reside in the address given until conclusion of his case.
4. Not to approach any prosecution witnesses directly or indirectly or to interfere with them.
5. To surrender his passport, if any, to court and not to apply for a travel document. The Controller of the Immigration and Emigration is informed of the travel ban on the Petitioner.
6. To report to the Officer-in-Charge, Police Narcotics Bureau, Colombo-01 on the second and last Sundays of the month between 9am to 1pm.
7. Any breach of these conditions is likely to result in the cancellation of his bail.

The Learned Magistrate of Kaduwela is hereby directed to enlarge the Petitioner on the above bail conditions.

The Registrar of this Court is directed to send this bail order to the Magistrate Court of Kaduwela and the Officer-in-Charge, Police Narcotics Bureau, Colombo-01.

JUDGE OF THE COURT OF APPEAL

R. P. Hettiarachchi, J.

I agree.

JUDGE OF THE COURT OF APPEAL