SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA1/764/2026 Gaurav Kumar Prajapati --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand -Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Pranav Singh, learned counsel for the applicant. Mr. Pratiroop Pandey, learned A.G.A. for the State of Uttarakhand. 2. The present bail application has been filed by the applicant, who is in judicial custody in connection with Case Crime No. 23 of 2026, registered at Police Station Bahadrabad, District Haridwar, for the offences punishable under Sections 8/22/60 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereinafter referred to as the "N.D.P.S. Act"). 3. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned State Counsel and perused the record. 4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and that no contraband has been recovered from his personal possession. It is further submitted that, as per the prosecution case, eight injections of 2 ml each of Leegesic Buprenorphine injection were allegedly recovered, having a total volume of 16 ml, which, according to learned counsel, does not constitute commercial quantity. It is contended that the small quantity of Buprenorphine is 1 gram, whereas the commercial quantity is 20 grams. It is further submitted that the alleged contraband was recovered from a scooter which does not belong to the applicant. Moreover, no independent witness was

			associated with the alleged recovery, despite the fact that the place of recovery is situated in a densely populated area. These circumstances, according to learned counsel, cast doubt on the prosecution version. It is also submitted that the applicant is an HIV-positive patient and has been languishing in judicial custody since 02.02.2026. 5. Learned counsel for the applicant further submits that, in the event of being enlarged on bail, the applicant shall not misuse the liberty so granted and shall furnish reliable sureties to the satisfaction of the Court concerned. 6. Per contra, learned State Counsel has opposed the prayer for bail. 7. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that the applicant has made out a case for grant of bail at this stage. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered view that the applicant deserves to be enlarged on bail. 8. The bail application is, accordingly, allowed. 9. 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, subject to the following conditions: (i) The applicant shall regularly attend the proceedings before the trial court and shall not seek any unnecessary adjournment. (ii) The applicant shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade such person from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer. (iii) The applicant shall not leave India without prior permission of the trial court.

			10. It is clarified that, in the event of misuse of the liberty of bail or violation of any of the conditions imposed hereinabove, the complainant/informant shall be at liberty to move an appropriate application before the competent court seeking cancellation of the applicant's bail. **(Alok Mahra, J.)** 02-11-2026 SB