

SL. No	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGES'S  2026:UHC:3162
			<u>BA1 No. 552 of 2026</u> Ramswaroop Nautiyal alias Rabbu Applicant Vs. State of Uttarakhand Respondent <u>Hon'ble Ashish Naithani, J.</u> Mr. Ravindra S Rawat, learned counsel for the Applicant. 2. Mr. Chitrarth Kandpal, learned Brief Holder for the State of Uttarakhand. 3. The present Bail Application has been moved by the Applicant—Ramswaroop Nautiyal alias Rabbu, S/o Shri Jagdish Chandra Nautiyal, R/o Village Sarson, Post Office Saraikhet, Tehsil Syalde, Police Station Maulekhal, District Almora. The Applicant is in judicial custody in connection with Case Crime/FIR No. 04 of 2026, registered at Police Station Lansdowne, District Pauri Garhwal, for the offences punishable under Sections 8, 20, 29 and 60 of the NDPS Act and Sections 111(2)(ii), 111(3) and 111(4) of the B.N.S., 2023. 4. Heard Mr. Ravindra S. Rawat, learned counsel for the Applicant, and Mr. Chitrarth Kandpal, learned Brief Holder for the State. Perused the record. 5. The prosecution case, as set out in the FIR, is that on 12.03.2026, during police checking, the police team intercepted a Swift Dzire car bearing Registration No. UK07-AP-3513, in which two persons, including the driver, were found travelling. From the boot of the said car, contraband described as <i>ganja</i> weighing 89.81 kilograms was recovered. It is alleged that the recovered contraband included cannabis, leaves, seeds and stems of the said plant, stated to be <i>ganja</i>. 6. Learned counsel for the Applicant submits, for consideration

of bail, that the Applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and is languishing in jail since 24.03.2026. It is contended that the Applicant has been implicated solely on the basis of conversation records between the owner of the said vehicle and the Applicant. It is pleaded that the Applicant has no nexus with the present crime in any manner whatsoever; he is not named in the FIR, there is no recovery from his possession, and there are no specific allegations against him.

7. Per contra, learned State Counsel has opposed the Bail Application contending that the name of the Applicant has surfaced through one of the co-accused, who has alleged the Applicant to be the main supplier of the contraband, namely *ganja*.

8. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the record, this Court finds sufficient grounds to allow the bail application. At this stage, *prima facie* the Applicant cannot be linked with the present crime; he is not named in the FIR and there is no recovery from his possession. Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the matter, this Court is of the view that the present case is fit for grant of bail at this stage.

9. Accordingly, the Bail Application is allowed.

10. Let the Applicant be released on bail upon executing a personal bond and furnishing two reliable sureties, each in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the Court concerned.

11. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(Ashish Naithani, J.)

27.04.2026

Shiksha