



2025:UHC:9659

IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND
AT NAINITAL

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR VERMA

31st OCTOBER, 2025

FIRST BAIL APPLICATION NO. 933 of 2025

Rohit Dabral

.....Applicant

Versus

State of Uttarakhand

.....Respondent

Counsel for the Applicant : Mr. Lokendra Dobhal, Advocate.

Counsel for the Respondent : Mr. Chitrarth Kandpal, Brief Holder.

Hon'ble Alok Kumar Verma,J.

The applicant – Rohit Dabral is in judicial custody for the offence punishable under Section 69 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 3(2)(v) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 in Case Crime No. 203 of 2025, registered at Kotwali Haridwar, District Haridwar.

2. Mr. Chitrarth Kandpal, learned Brief Holder submitted that the informant-victim was communicated about this matter on 14.08.2025. The informant-victim is not present.

3. It is alleged in the First Information Report dated 06.04.2025 that the applicant by giving false assurance of marriage to the informant developed physical relations with the informant, aged about 30



years. She became pregnant.

4. Mr. Lokendra Dobhal, Advocate appearing for the applicant contended that the FIR is false and fabricated. The applicant, aged about 27 years and the informant-victim, aged about 30 years, were in love relationship. The informant had made physical relationship with the applicant with her free will. The applicant had not made any forcible physical relationship with her. Applicant had not made any promise to marry the informant. The informant had refused to undergo medical examination. The informant herself refused to marry the applicant (Annexure no.1 to the rejoinder affidavit dated 29.10.2025).

5. Mr. Lokendra Dobhal, Advocate further submitted that the applicant has no criminal antecedents. He is a permanent resident of District Tehri Garhwal, therefore, there is no possibility of his absconding. Charge-sheet has already been filed, therefore, there is no chance of tampering with the evidence, and, the applicant is in custody since 16.04.2025.

6. Mr. Chitrarth Kandpal, Brief Holder for the respondent has opposed the bail application.



7. As per the allegations in the FIR, applicant and the informant were in consensual relationship. Every consensual relationship cannot be given a color of a fake pretext to marry. A breach of a promise to marry only constitutes an offence if the accused had no intention of marrying from the beginning. Whether the applicant had made any promise of marriage with the informant and if he had made such a promise, the promise was genuine or false, it remains to be determined and it can be determined only at trial.

8. Bail is the rule and committal to jail is an exception. Refusal of bail is a restriction on the personal liberty of the individual, guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The object of keeping the accused in detention during the trial is not punishment. The main purpose is manifestly to secure the attendance of the accused.

9. Having considered the submissions of learned counsel for both the parties and in the facts and circumstances of the case, no reason is found to keep the applicant behind the bars for an indefinite period, therefore, without expressing any opinion as to the merits of the case, this Court is of the view that the applicant deserves bail at this stage.



2025:UHC:9659

10. The Bail Application is allowed.

11. Let the applicant-Rohit Dabral be released on bail on his executing a personal bond and furnishing two reliable sureties, each in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the court concerned.

ALOK KUMAR VERMA, J.

Dt: 31.10.2025
Shiv/