

SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	 COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS 2026:UHC:2007
			BA1 No.138 of 2026 Sarvjeet Singh Vs. State of Uttarakhand With BA1 No.140 of 2026 Amarpal Singh Vs. State of Uttarakhand <u>Hon'ble Ashish Naithani, J.</u> Mr. M.K. Ray and Mr. Harsh Taneja, learned counsel for the Applicants. 2. Mr. N.S. Kanyal, learned AGA for the State. 3. Mr. Vikas Kumar Guglani, learned counsel for the complainant. 4. Present bail applications have been filed by the applicants, who are in judicial custody in connection with FIR No.338 of 2015 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC, registered at P.S. Kichha, District Udham Singh Nagar. 5. Heard learned counsel for the parties. 6. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the grounds advanced for consideration of bail on behalf of the applicants are that applicant-Sarvjeet Singh is not named in the FIR and during the course of trial names of the applicants came into the picture; they have been falsely roped in in the present matter. He submits that present matter relates to forgery whereby the offence under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC are said to have been involved and the applicants charged therein but there is no evidence that they are the beneficiary or have been the beneficiary for the proceed of the crime in the said matter. He further submits that two persons have been enlarged on interim

			bail by this Court. 7. On the other hand the bail applications have been opposed by the complainant as well as by the State counsel. It is contended that with reference to the statement of Vinod Giri and the Gram Pradhan Surjeet Singh and also Pratap Singh all of whom are said to have stated that Sarvjeet Singh-applicant is the main person, who committed the forgery and created sale deed thereby committed the present crime. It is further stated that the matter involves heinous offence wherein public documents are forged in conspiracy with the co-accused/applicant-Amar Pal Singh and behind all that applicant-Sarvjeet Singh is the main person. He submits that their bail applications are liable to be rejected. 8. Considering the contention for consideration of bail, as advanced by learned counsel for the applicants; firstly that they does not appear to be the beneficiary of the said proceed of the crime and secondly one applicant was not named in the FIR and thirdly the co-accused person have been enlarged on interim bail. Rest the matter is to be dealt with during the course of merits. 9. Without expression any opinion on the final merits of the case and considering the facts and circumstance of the case, this Court is of the view that applicants deserve bail. 10. Accordingly, the bail applications are allowed. Let the applicants-Sarvjeet Singh and Amarpal Singh be released on bail on their executing a personal bond and furnishing two reliable sureties by each of them of the like amount to the satisfaction of court concerned. (Ashish Naithani, J.) 20.03.2026
--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--