SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA1/1200/2026 Harish Singh Lamgariya --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Karan Singh Dugtal, learned counsel for the applicant. Mr. Akshay Latwal, 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 FIR No. 0264 of 2025, registered at Police Station Transit Camp, District Udham Singh Nagar, for offences punishable under Sections 8 and 20 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereinafter referred to as the "NDPS Act"). 3. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned State Counsel and perused the material available on record. 4. As per the prosecution case, the applicant was apprehended by the raiding party while carrying the alleged contraband in his hand. Upon weighing, the recovered substance was found to be 2 kilograms and 13 grams of *charas*. 5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that the alleged contraband was in the form of rods, but samples were not drawn separately from each rod. It is further submitted that, as per the recovery memo, the applicant was arrested at 16:20 hours, and the inventory as well as the arrest memo was also prepared at the spot, whereas the F.I.R. was lodged at 23:57 hours, i.e., after a delay of approximately eight hours. Learned

			counsel further submits that the inventory and arrest memo already contained the F.I.R. number, and there is no corresponding G.D. entry explaining the incorporation of the F.I.R. number in the said documents, which creates serious doubt regarding the prosecution version. It is further submitted that the applicant has no criminal antecedents and has been in judicial custody since 02.09.2025. 6. Per contra, learned State Counsel has opposed the prayer for grant of bail, contending that the recovered contraband falls within the category of commercial quantity and that the recovery was a chance recovery; therefore, compliance with the provisions of Section 50 of the N.D.P.S. Act was not mandatory. 7. Having considered the rival submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court is of the considered view that the applicant has made out a case for grant of bail. 8. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is inclined to enlarge the applicant on bail. The bail application is, accordingly, allowed. 9. Let the applicant be released on bail on 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 learned 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 the country

			without obtaining prior permission of the learned 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.)** 21-11-2026 SHIKSHA SB