

SL. No	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGES'S  2026:UHC:3825
			<u>BA1 No. 679 of 2026</u> Murad Ansari Applicant Vs. State of Uttarakhand Respondent <u>Hon'ble Ashish Naithani, J.</u> Mr. Bilal Ahmed, learned counsel for the Applicant through video conferencing. 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—Murad Ansari, S/o Mursalin, R/o Village Badsahpur, P.S. Pathri, Laksar, District Haridwar. The Applicant is in judicial custody in connection with Case Crime No. 48 of 2026, registered at Police Station Piran Kaliyar, District Haridwar, for offences punishable under Sections 109(1), 351(2), 351(3), and 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023 and under Section 3 read with Section 25 of the Arms Act. 4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record. 5. Learned counsel for the Applicant submitted that the Applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and has not committed any offence. It is also submitted that the Applicant was not involved in the commission of the present crime and that there is a delay of 13 days in lodging the FIR, for which no plausible explanation has been assigned. It is further contended that the Applicant has no connection or association with the co-accused and has been falsely named in the FIR due to previous enmity and with an intention to put pressure upon him. 6. It is also submitted that no injury has been caused in the alleged incident and that the prosecution has falsely developed the

			story merely to give colour to the case. Learned counsel further submitted that the Applicant has no criminal history, is in judicial custody since 09.03.2026, and that the co-accused has already been granted bail. Therefore, the case of the present Applicant stands on parity with the co-accused. 7. Per contra, learned State Counsel vehemently opposed the bail application and submitted that the Applicant is involved in a serious offence. The contention of false implication has been denied on the ground that there is clear CCTV footage showing the Applicant sitting on a motorcycle and firing towards the complainant's house. It is further contended that the Applicant has confessed that the attack was motivated by a personal grudge and obsession relating to the complainant's daughter. 8. Having heard rival submissions and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that the allegations against the Applicant are grave and serious in nature. The prosecution case prima facie discloses the involvement of the Applicant in the alleged offence and the material collected during investigation supports the prosecution version. 9. At this stage, this Court does not find any mitigating circumstance warranting exercise of discretion in favour of the Applicant. Considering the nature and gravity of the offence, the severity of punishment prescribed, and the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the Applicant on bail at this stage. Furthermore, the possibility of the Applicant influencing witnesses or absconding cannot be ruled out. 10. Accordingly, no case for grant of bail is made out and the Bail Application is rejected. 11. However, it is clarified that any observations made herein are only for the purpose of adjudication of the present bail application
--	--	--	---

			and shall not influence the trial on merits. 12. All pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of. (Ashish Naithani, J.) 18.05.2026 Shiksha
--	--	--	--