

SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>SABA No. 13 of 2026</u> <u>Hon'ble Rakesh Thapliyal, J.</u> 1. Mr. Aryan Dev Uniyal, learned counsel for the applicant. 2. Mr. Tumul Nainwal, learned A.G.A. for the State. 3. Mr. Parikshit Saini, learned counsel for the complainant. 4. This is the second anticipatory bail application moved by the present applicant Faranis S/o Mohd. Nazim praying for anticipatory bail in reference to First Information Report dated 24.01.2026 bearing FIR No. 0013 of 2026 P.S. Jhabreda, District Haridwar, wherein, as many as six persons were implicated for the offences punishable under section 109(1), 190, 191(2), 191(3) and 352 of BNSS, 2023. 5. Earlier to the instant second anticipatory bail application, the applicant moved ABA No. 81 of 2026, which was dismissed as withdrawn on 08.04.2026. 6. Mr. Parikshit Saini and Mr. Tumul Nainwal pointed out that when ABA No. 81 of 2026 was dismissed as withdrawn this fact was apprised to this Court that Non Bailable Warrant was issued against the present applicant and not only this even the proceeding under Section 84 of BNSS 2023 was also initiated but this fact has been suppressed by the present applicant in the instant anticipatory bail application. They also pointed out that the order of issuing Non Bailable Warrant and proceeding under Section against 84 of Cr.P.C. are challenged in C528 No. 1126 of 2026 which has also been suppressed. 7. On this, learned counsel for the applicant submits that the instant second anticipatory bail

		application as well as the C528 petition was filed on the same date this is the reason this fact could not be disclosed in the instant anticipatory bail application. 8. Be that as it may, when the earlier anticipatory bail application was dismissed as withdrawn the applicant was fully aware about the issuance of Non Bailable Warrant as well as process under Section of 84 of BNSS, therefore, he has to disclose this fact in the instant anticipatory bail application but it appears that deliberately he has suppressed this fact and even otherwise since now the Non Bailable Warrant has been issued against the present applicant and furthermore proceeding under Section of 84 of BNSS also been initiated against the applicant, on this account alone the applicant does not deserve for anticipatory bail, according the same is rejected. 9. After dictation of the judgment, the learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is ready to surrender before the court concerned positively within 10 days from today. On such submission learned counsel for the respondent and State have no objection. 10. In such view of the matter, if the applicant surrenders before the court concerned on or before 06.06.2026 from today, only till then, no coercive action shall be taken against him provided he cooperates with the investigation. 11. It is made clear that if the applicant fails to surrender within the aforesaid period before the court concerned then the concerned Investigating Officer shall take him in custody forthwith. (Rakesh Thapliyal, J.) 27.05.2026 Nahid
--	--	---