

SL. No	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGES'S ORDERS  2026:UHC:2913
			<u>BA1 No. 498 of 2026</u> Ravindra Pal Singh Applicant Vs. State of Uttarakhand Respondent <u>Hon'ble Ashish Naithani, J.</u> Mr. Digvijay Singh Bisht, learned Legal Aid Counsel for the Applicant. 2. Mr. N.S. Kaniyal, learned A.G.A. for the State of Uttarakhand. 3. The present Bail Application has been moved by the Applicant—Ravindra Pal Singh, S/o Shri Balveer Singh, R/o Kalyan Singh Mohalla, Dhikola, P.S. Kotwali Mawana, District Meerut. The Applicant is in judicial custody in connection with FIR No. 0014 of 2025, registered at Police Station Gopeshwar, District Chamoli, for the offences punishable under Sections 419, 420, 467, 471, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860. 4. Heard Mr. Digvijay Singh Bisht, learned Legal Aid Counsel for the Applicant, and Mr. N.S. Kaniyal, learned A.G.A. for the State. Perused the record. 5. Learned counsel for the Applicant submits that the Applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and is in judicial custody since 18.06.2025. It is further submitted that <i>prima facie</i> no offence under the aforementioned Sections is made out against him. It is also submitted that the charge-sheet has already been filed and no further investigation is pending. Learned counsel further submits that the Applicant is the sole breadwinner of his family and has aged parents to look after. 6. Per contra, learned A.G.A. for the State has opposed the Bail Application and submitted that during the course of investigation, the Investigating Officer has collected cogent and credible evidence against the present Applicant. It is submitted that the Applicant had

fraudulently furnished sureties on the basis of forged documents to extend benefit to an accused namely Gulzar Malik @ Nitin. It is further submitted that the involvement of the Applicant stands established from the material collected during investigation and there is no reason for false implication. It is also submitted that the Applicant is a habitual offender and two criminal cases, including the present one, are registered against him. It is further argued that in case the Applicant is released on bail, he may misuse the liberty of bail.

7. This Court has given thoughtful consideration to the rival submissions and perused the material available on record. The allegations against the Applicant are serious in nature, involving offences of cheating, forgery and criminal conspiracy. The material collected during investigation *prima facie* indicates the involvement of the Applicant in furnishing forged documents for the purpose of securing benefit to a co-accused.

8. Considering the nature and gravity of the offence, the manner in which the alleged offence has been committed, the *prima facie* evidence available on record, and the possibility of misuse of liberty, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the Applicant at this stage.

9. Accordingly, the Bail Application is rejected.

10. However, it is clarified that any observation made hereinabove is only for the purpose of deciding the present Bail Application and shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case during trial.

11. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(Ashish Naithani, J.)

21.03.2026

Shiksha