Sl. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			SABA/36/2026 Shahnazar --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.** Mr. Raj Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the applicant. 2. Ms. Sweta Badola Dobhal, learned Brief Holder for the State. 3. This is the second anticipatory bail application filed by the applicant. The first application was filed before this Court and was registered as ABA No. 351 of 2026, *Shahnazar vs. State of Uttarakhand*, but the same was withdrawn by the applicant for filing an application for anticipatory bail before the Court of the Special Sessions Judge (NDPS). The order was passed on 22.09.2026. Thereafter, the applicant moved ABA No.186 of 2026, *Shahnazar vs. State of Uttarakhand*, before the Special Sessions Judge (NDPS), Haridwar, which was rejected by the said Court vide order dated 15.10.2026. 4. In the opinion of this Court, since, after withdrawal of the earlier ABA, applicant has availed the remedy of filing an ABA before the Court of the Special Sessions Judge (NDPS), Haridwar, in view of the aforesaid circumstances, instead of listing this case as a 'second anticipatory bail application', it should be listed as an 'anticipatory bail application'. However, a disclosure of the earlier ABA shall be made in the subsequent ABA.

5. Office is directed that, in such a situation, the anticipatory bail application should not termed as a second anticipatory bail application (SABA).

6. Applicant is seeking anticipatory bail in connection with the FIR dated 19.08.2025, relating to Case Crime No.429 of 2025, under Section 8/29 of the NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Kotwali Jwalapur, District Haridwar.

7. It is contended by learned counsel for the applicant that, as per the case of the prosecution, 15 Buprenorphine injections each were allegedly recovered from the co-accused were taken by them from the medical shop of the applicant situated at Jwalapur, District Haridwar. Both the co-accused, from whom the recovery was made, have been released on bail by this Court vide order dated 29.09.2026. He further contended that there was no money transaction/money trail with regard to the purchase of the aforesaid contraband, Shahid is the cousin maternal uncle of the applicant, therefore, there were some talks between them, and it is only on the basis of the CDR, the applicant has been roped in the offence. He also contended that applicant runs a medical shop and there is no apprehension of his fleeing from justice; the charge-sheet has been filed, and he is ready to participate in the criminal trial.

8. Per contra, learned State Counsel admits that, on the basis of CDR record, which shows that the applicant had a conversation with Shahid, one of the

co-accused, and on the basis of the statements of the co-accused, who have also stated that the injections were purchased from the applicant's shop, applicant was implicated.

9. Having considered the rival submissions and having perused the contents of the FIR, this Court is of the view that no concrete evidence, except the statement of the co-accused, is available against the applicant. Since the co-accused-Shahid, is the cousin maternal uncle of the applicant, in such a situation, it cannot be ruled out that there were conversations between them out of relations. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, this Court is of the view that applicant is entitled to be released on anticipatory bail.

10. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is allowed, and the applicant-Shahnazar, is granted anticipatory bail.

11. In the event of his arrest, applicant shall be released forthwith, without any unnecessary delay, by the police upon executing a personal bond and furnishing two reliable sureties, each of the like amount of Rs. 30,000/-, to the satisfaction of the court concerned.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)
30.10.2026

AK

AVNEET KAUR