

IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

IA No.1 of 2025 For Bail Application
In
Criminal Appeal No. 674 of 2025

Sukhwinder Singh alias Chinder Appellant

Vs.

State of Uttarakhand and Another Respondents

IA No.1 of 2025 For Bail Application
In
Criminal Appeal No. 668 of 2025

Balvinder Singh Chandel Appellant

Vs.

State of Uttarakhand and Another Respondents

IA No.1 of 2025 For Bail Application
In
Criminal Appeal No. 682 of 2025

Satnam Singh alias Satta Appellant

Vs.

State of Uttarakhand and Another Respondents

Present:

Mr. Abhishek Verma, Advocate for the appellants.

Mr. Pankaj Joshi, A.G.A. for the State of Uttarakhand.

Mr. Rajendra Singh Negi, Advocate for the informant.

Hon'ble Ravindra Maithani, J. (Oral)

Since all these criminal appeals arise from the same FIR, they are heard together and are being decided by this common judgment.

2. The instant appeals have been preferred against order dated 06.11.2025, passed by the Sessions Judge, Udham Singh Nagar, in Bail Application No. 1265 of 2025, Sukhvinder Singh alias Chindar and Others Vs. State, by which the bail application of the appellants has been rejected in FIR No.225 of

2025, under Sections 103(1), 61(2) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and Section 3(2)(V) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, Police Station Kunda, District Udham Singh Nagar.

2. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

3. According to the FIR, the deceased was supporting one Gurtaj Singh Bhullar in BDC election. The opponent Pragat Singh Pannu and his father Kashmir Singh were unhappy with it. On 19.07.2025, in the morning at about 7:30 a.m., the deceased telephoned his brother Sanjay and told him that Pragat Singh Pannu and Kashmir Singh have called him at their residence. The brother of the deceased, Sanjay, denied the deceased to go there, but the deceased visited them. Subsequently, one Harkeval Singh told it to the wife of the deceased and his brother Sanjay that Rahul had an attack in the house of Kashmir Singh. When Sanjay Singh reached there, he found that the deceased Rahul was lying on a sofa in the house of Kashmir Singh and Pragat Singh Pannu. Blood was oozing out from his mouth, and all the articles were spread around. When the deceased was taken to hospital, he died.

4. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the appellants have been falsely implicated; the named accused have not been arrested by the Investigating Officer; the appellants were supporting Gurtaj Singh Bhullar, to whom the deceased was also supporting. Therefore, the appellants have no occasion to kill him; there is no evidence against the appellants; the inquest reveals that the deceased was found in an unconscious state in the house of Kashmir Singh and Pragat Singh Pannu, when blood was oozing out from his mouth; the appellants have no role.

5. Learned State Counsel submits that appellants Satnam Singh alias Satta and Sukhvinder Singh alias Chinder run a *Nasha Mukti Kendra*. On 19.07.2025, they visited the *Nasha Mukti Kendra* at 6:30 a.m. and closed the CCTV cameras. Thereafter, the deceased, along with the appellant Balvinder Singh Chandel also entered there. From there, the deceased made a call to his brother Sanjay, and, subsequently, he was found dead. He submits that the Doctor has opined that, perhaps, it is the case of death was poison.

6. Learned counsel for the informant submits that the informant has only lodged FIR against Kashmir Singh and Pragat Singh Pannu.

7. Admittedly, there has been no injury on the person of the deceased. The post mortem report also does not indicate any injury; the cause of death could not be ascertained and viscera preserved. The report viscera is yet to be received.

8. The deceased was found in unconscious state in the house of Kashmir Singh and Pragat Singh Pannu, and when he was taken to hospital, he was declared brought dead.

9. Merely because the appellants had visited the *Nasha Mukti Kendra* run by the appellants Satnam Singh alias Satta and Sukhvinder Singh alias Chinder, at this stage, they may not be detained. It is a case fit for bail.

10. Therefore, while allowing the appeals, the appellants are entitled to be released on bail.

11. The appeals are allowed.

12. Let the appellants be released on bail on their executing a personal bond and furnishing two reliable sureties,

each of the like amount, by each one of them, to the satisfaction of the court concerned.

(Ravindra Maithani, J.)
19.12.2025

Ravi Bisht