

SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>ABA/ 1281/ 2024</u> <u>Hon'ble Rakesh Thapliyal, J.</u> (Through Video Conferencing) 1. Mr. Mohd. Safdar, learned counsel for the appellant. 2. Mr. V.S. Rawat, learned A.G.A. for the State. 3. The present applicant Sonu @ Suhaib seeking anticipatory bail in relation to Case Crime No. 178 of 2016 arising out of FIR lodged on 12.06.2023 at P.S. Manglaur District Haridwar whereby 23 persons were implicated for the offences punishable under sections 147, 148, 149, 332, 333, 336, 353, 504, 436, 506, 307 IPC read with Section 3 and 5 of Public Property Damage Act and 7 of Criminal Law (Amendment) Act 1934. 4. As per the allegations, as alleged in the FIR, which was lodged by S.I. Suresh Balodi on 11.06.2016 at P.S. Kotwali Manglaur, District Haridwar when the complainant was in the shop located at Bus Stand in Landhaur about 100-150 persons were gathered outside the police chawki and attacked on the police official and damaged the government vehicle and property including private vehicles and some of the police persons were badly injured and were taken to the hospital for treatment. After thorough investigation charge sheet was filed. 5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the present applicant was not present at the time of the incident and is innocent, and has been falsely implicated, and not only this even the applicant is not named in the FIR. He

		submits that the applicant has no previous criminal history and he approached Addl. Session Judge, Roorkee, District Haridwar seeking anticipatory bail but the same has been rejected on 05.12.2024. 6. Mr. V.S. Rawat, learned A.G.A. for the State vehemently opposed the anticipatory bail application and submits that the allegations, as alleged in the FIR, appears to be serious in nature since mob of 100-150 persons attacked on the police station, damaged the property and private vehicles and brutally beaten the police official. He further submits that after thorough investigation charge sheet was filed, therefore, the arguments as advanced by the learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated and he was not present at the time of the incident are thoroughly misconceived. 7. Learned State Counsel also submits that the FIR was lodged in the year 2016 and after 8 years, the applicant is approaching this Court seeking anticipatory bail, and, since after thorough investigation and after collecting credible and material evidence charge sheet has been filed, therefore, there is no question to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant. He further submits that if the applicant has any grievance he can challenge the charge sheet but instant of challenging the charge sheet he approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail. He also submits that since charge sheet has already been filed, therefore, at this stage no ground is available to the applicant for grant of anticipatory bail particularly when FIR was lodged in the year 2016.
--	--	---

			8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, and after gone through the FIR, prima facie, allegation appears to be serious in nature, and furthermore, charge sheet has already been filed, therefore, I do not find any merit in the instant anticipatory bail application. 9. Accordingly, anticipatory bail application is dismissed. (Rakesh Thapliyal, J.) 23.12.2024 Parul
--	--	--	---

--	--	--	--