

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT SRINAGAR

CrIM(1196/2024) IN CrIA(D) 56/2024

**UNION TERRITORY THROUGH ...Petitioner/Appellant(s)
POLICE STATION CHADOORA**

Through: Ms Maha Majeed, AC vice
Mr. Mohsin Qadri, Sr. AAG
Vs.

MOHAMMAD ALTAF BHAT AND ORS. ...Respondent(s)

Through: Mr. Wajid Haseeb, Advocate

CORAM:

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV KUMAR, JUDGE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PARIHAR, JUDGE**

ORDE R
21.04.2026

CrIM No. 1196/2024

1. This is an application seeking condonation of delay of 144 days in filing an appeal against an order and judgment dated 2nd March, 2024 passed by the Special Judge, NIA, Budgam ["the trial Court"] in a bail application titled "*Mohammad Altaf Bhat & Ors. Vs. Union Territory of Jammu & Kashmir*", whereby the trial court has granted the bail to the respondents in case FIR No. 183/2020 of Police Station Chadoora for offences under Sections 18 ULAP Act and 380 IPC.
2. The respondents, despite having availed opportunity, have chosen not to file objections.
3. In view of the aforesaid, the explanation tendered by the appellant is accepted as constituting 'sufficient cause' which prevented it from filing the appeal in time.
4. The application is thus allowed, and the delay in filing an appeal is condoned.

5. CrIM disposed of.

CrIA(D) No.56/2024

1. This is an appeal by the Union Territory of Jammu & Kashmir filed in terms of Section 21 of the NIA Act to throw challenge to an order dated 2nd March, 2024, whereby the trial court has granted bail to the respondents in case FIR No. 183/2020 of Police Station Chadoora for

offences under Sections 18 ULAP Act and 380 of IPC in case titled “*Mohamamd Altaf Bhat & Ors Vs. Union Territory of Jammu & Kashmir*”.

2. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material on record, we find that the impugned order of granting interim bail to the respondents was passed on 2nd March, 2024, and there is nothing on record to show as to whether this order was ever confirmed. However, learned appearing counsel for the respondents submits that the interim bail granted on 2nd March, 2024 in terms of impugned order, was subsequently confirmed.
3. Be that as it may, the fact remains that the respondents were enlarged on bail on 2nd March, 2024, and there is nothing pointed out by the prosecution to demonstrate that they have either jumped the bail or have failed to cooperate during the trial. That apart, as submitted by the learned counsel for the appellant, the prosecution has examined 14 out of total 16 witnesses, and therefore, the trial is almost at the verge of completion.
4. Having regard to the aforesaid facts and circumstances, we are of the view that the order impugned does not call for any interference at this stage, more particularly when the trial is nearing its completion.
5. For all these reasons, we are not inclined to entertain this appeal and interfere with the order impugned.
6. **Dismissed.**

(SANJAY PARIHAR)
JUDGE

(SANJEEV KUMAR)
JUDGE

SRINAGAR:

21.04.2026

“ARIF”