

SL. No	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGES'S  2026:UHC:3768
			<u>BA1 No. 682 of 2026</u> Pradeep Dhiman Applicant Vs. State of Uttarakhand Respondent <u>Hon'ble Ashish Naithani, J.</u> Mr. Rajendra Singh Azad, learned counsel for the Applicant though 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—Pradeep Dhiman, S/o Shri Atmaram, R/o Village Dalluwala, Police Station SIDCUL, District Haridwar. The Applicant is in judicial custody in connection with Case Crime/FIR No. 502 of 2025, registered at Police Station Kotwali Manglaur, District Haridwar, for offences punishable under Section 103(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. 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 and has not committed the offences alleged in the FIR. It is further submitted that, on bare perusal of the arrest memo, it is evident that no grounds of arrest were provided to the Applicant in writing and that the guidelines relating to arrest were not strictly followed by the arresting police party, thereby violating the fundamental rights of the Applicant. It is also submitted that one eyewitness, namely Abhishek Kumar, has denied the allegations and stated that he had not witnessed any such incident. 6. Per contra, learned State Counsel vehemently opposed the bail application and submitted that the present matter pertains to an

honour killing and that there are three eyewitnesses supporting the prosecution case. It is further submitted that there existed a motive behind the murder, as the deceased was allegedly in a relationship with a boy belonging to a different caste. Learned State Counsel further submitted that the grounds of arrest were duly communicated to the Applicant.

7. 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 there are eyewitnesses supporting the prosecution version. The medical evidence on record also prima facie indicates that the deceased sustained serious injuries.

8. 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.

9. Accordingly, no case for grant of bail is made out and the Bail Application is rejected.

10. 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.

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

(Ashish Naithani, J.)

15.05.2026

Shiksha

--	--	--	--