

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:3845
			<u>BA 1st No.268 of 2026</u> Rohit Saudai Applicant Vs. State of Uttarakhand ..Respondent <u>Hon'ble Ashish Naithani, J.</u> Ms. Reema Rana, learned Amicus Curiae, for the Applicant. 2. Mr. Pradeep Lohani, learned AGA, for the State of Uttarakhand. 3. In the High Court of Uttarakhand, the present case arises from Bail Application filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking regular bail for the Applicant – Rohit Saudai, who has been accused in Case Crime No.687 of 2024, under Sections 137 (2), 65 (1) of the BNS, and under Sections 3 (ka)/4(2) and 5 (tha)/6 of the POCSO Act, at Police Station Bhagwanpur, District Haridwar. 4. As per the FIR, which has been lodged by the Complainant with the averments that he is a resident of Village Sarthedi, Shahjahanpur, Police Station and Tehsil Bhagwanpur, District Haridwar, and he supports himself and his family by working hard. The incident is dated 19.08.2024 and the Complainant's daughter Khushi, aged 13 years, was taken away by the Applicant - Rohit, currently resident of Saliyar Salhapur, Police Station Tehsil, District Haridwar, who had taken a room on rent from his maternal uncle Vinod, and used to do cleaning work in the company and other places, and absconded on 19.08.2024 at around 01:00 pm. The Applicant – Rohit, is already married and is also the father of two children, despite this, Rohit has absconded with the

Complainant's daughter, who is a minor. Despite extensive searches by him, daughter Khushi has not been found anywhere.

5. Learned Amicus Curiae for the Applicant submits, for the consideration of the bail, that the Applicant has falsely been implicated in the present case, and has not committed any offence. He further submits that there is a delay in lodging the FIR, and no justification has been given by the prosecution; there is no independent eye witness. It is also contended by the learned counsel for the Applicant that the victim has not supported the prosecution version before the learned Magistrate and the concerned Police, and there are contradictions in her statements. He further submits that the Applicant has no previous criminal history.

6. The bail application of the Applicant has been vehemently opposed by the learned State Counsel on the ground that the age of the victim is 15 years, and the Applicant has committed penetrative sexual offence against the minor, and learned State Counsel prays that the Applicant may not be enlarged on bail.

7. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the Applicant has not made out a case for bail. Consequently, the bail application is **rejected** in connection with the Case Crime No.687 of 2024, under Sections 137 (2), 65 (1) of the BNS, and under Sections 3 (ka)/4(2) and 5 (tha)/6 of the POCSO Act, at Police Station Bhagwanpur, District Hardwar.

(Ashish Naithani, J.)

19.05.2026

Nitesh/

--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--