

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND**  
**AT NAINITAL**

**Second Bail Application No. 74 of 2026**

Vinod Uniyal. .....Applicant.

**Versus**

State of Uttarakhand. .....Respondent.

Present:  
Mr. Navneet Kaushik and Ms. Divya Jain, learned counsel for the applicant.  
Mr. J.S. Virk, learned Addl. Advocate General with Mr. Tumul Nainwal, learned AGA for the State.  
Mr. Tajhar Qayyum, learned counsel for the complainant (through V.C.).

**With**  
**First Bail Application No. 780 of 2026**

Smt. Veena Sharma @ Beena. .....Applicant.

**Versus**

State of Uttarakhand. .....Respondent.

Present:  
Mr. Navneet Kaushik and Ms. Divya Jain, learned counsel for the applicant.  
Mr. J.S. Virk, learned Addl. Advocate General with Mr. Tumul Nainwal, learned AGA for the State.  
Mr. Tajhar Qayyum, learned counsel for the complainant (through V.C.).

**And**  
**First Bail Application No. 1074 of 2026**

Ajay Khanna. .....Applicant.

**Versus**

State of Uttarakhand. .....Respondent.

Present:  
Mr. Sandeep Tandon, learned counsel for the applicant.  
Mr. J.S. Virk, learned Addl. Advocate General with Mr. Tumul Nainwal, learned AGA for the State.  
Mr. Tajhar Qayyum, learned counsel for the complainant (through V.C.).

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rakesh Thapliyal, J.**

1. These three bail applications are moved on behalf of applicants - Veena Sharma @ Beena, Vinod Uniyal and Dr. Ajay Khanna, for seeking regular bail in reference to FIR dated 11.02.2026 bearing FIR No. 29 of 2026 wherein present applicants have been implicated and charge sheeted for the offences punishable under Section 103 (1) and 61 (2) BNS, 2023,

registered at Police Station – Dalanwala, District Dehradun. In this FIR, after investigation, in total 6 persons have been charge sheeted including present applicants and two others. The two others who are charge sheeted are Rajeev @ Raju and Pankaj Rana for the offences punishable 103 (1), 61 (2), 238 of the BNS, 2023.

2. The brief facts of the present case are that deceased Arjun Sharma, son of applicant – Veena Sharma, was killed on 11.02.2026 at about 10.23 AM to 10.24 AM near fruit vendor cart in front of Tibetan Market, Parade Ground, at Dehradun while he was returning after playing tennis. During investigation, two persons namely Pankaj Rana and his brother Rajeev @ Raju, both were arrested on 12.02.2026 in two separate police encounter at Doiwala and Rajpur and on their pointing out, countrymade pistols, which was used in the commission of crime and empty cartridges were also recovered on their pointing out, therefore, Section 238 BNS, 2023 was also added against both. After arrest both these two persons Pankaj Rana and Rajeev Rana @ Raju, have disclosed about the involvement of these applicants.

3. The investigation further reveals that Pankaj Rana is driver of applicant Vinod Uniyal, who was hired to kill the deceased Arjun Sharma on consideration of Rs. 12,00,000/- out of which Rs. 3,00,000/- was paid by Vinod Uniyal to Pankaj Rana about a month prior to the incident and after receiving this amount, Pankaj Rana associate his brother Rajeev Rana @ Raju for commission of crime. Both these two shooters Pankaj Rana and Rajeev Rana were identified through CCTV footages and after their arrest, one of the witness also disclosed that Veena Sharma, mother of the deceased, have some dispute with

his son and daughter in law with regard to property and she was aware about day to day movement of deceased Arjun Sharma, which she has disclosed to Vinod Uniyal. Investigation reveals that two shooters conducted recce of day to day movement of the deceased and stolen a two wheeler and on the fateful day, Rajeev Rana @ Raju fired on the deceased from a close range while he was purchasing fruits from vendor and thereafter, both assailants fled from the spot on the stolen scooter. Entire incident is duly corroborated by recording of CCTV footages recovered from 32 cameras installed, in and around Tibentan market and the incident is also corroborated by independent eye witnesses. Thereafter, accused Pankaj Rana and Rajeev Rana, both were arrested on 12.02.2026.

4. During investigation, it was found that applicant Veena Sharma had disowned and disinherited his son (deceased Arjun Sharma) by publishing notice in the daily newspaper and also obtained license for firearm, since there was regular threat from her son and on such an apprehension she approached the High Court for seeking protection from the deceased.

5. After thorough investigation, in total six persons have been charge sheeted including present applicants, who are seeking bail. Investigation further reveals that there was long standing dispute in respect of property and there is transaction of huge amount in between co-accused Vinod Uniyal, Dr. Ajay Khanna and applicant Veena Sharma, mother of the deceased.

**1<sup>st</sup> Bail Application No. 780 of 2026 (Smt. Veena Sharma @ Beena Vs. State of Uttarkhand)**

6. Mr. Navneet Kaushik and Ms. Divya Jain, learned counsel for the applicants - Veena Sharma and Vinod Uniyal argued

that two shooters were arrested on 12.02.2026 Pankaj Rana was arrested in the intervening night of 11-12.02.2026 at about 03.30 a.m. from Dehradun - Haridwar Highway at Lal Tappar Chowki gate and Rajeev Rana @ Raju was arrested in the intervening night of 11-12.02.2026 at about 03.40 p.m. from Ladpur judgle and thereafter, Veena Sharma was arrested on 12.02.2026 at 05.00 p.m., Dr. Ajay Khanna was arrested on 06.10 p.m. and Vinod Uniyal was arrested on 06.20 p.m.

7. In reference to Veena Sharma, it is argued that entire investigation is faulty and no attempt was made by I.O. after the arrest of two shooters Pankaj Rana and Rajeev Rana to collect the evidence against Veena Sharma and immediately after their arrest almost after 11 hours, without any substance and material applicant Veena Sharma, who is mother of the deceased, was arrested. Similarly, in reference to Vinod Uniyal, other co-accused, they submits that after one hour from the arrest of Veena Sharma, this applicant was also arrested at about 06.20 p.m. without any concrete evidence.

8. It is further argued that remand of both the shooters Pankaj Rana and Rajeev Rana were taken after 4 - 5 days of their arrest which itself shows that without any substance and material both the applicants Veena Sharma and Vinod Uniyal were arrested.

9. Learned counsel further submits that Veena Sharma is mother of the deceased and no one can presume that a mother can conspire to kill his own son though as a matter of fact, Veena Sharma being a mother in the year 2008 gave power of attorney to her son Arjun Sharma (now deceased), who in turn, transferred all the properties in the name of his wife Abhilasha Sharma in the year 2025.

10. They further submit that in January, 2025, Veena Sharma approached to the High Court for seeking protection from her son, since her son Arjun Sharma beaten up her and thereafter, a lady constable Suhela Chauhan, was always remain with her for protection of her life and liberty. They also submits that not only this, after lodging in jail Veena Sharma gave authority letter of the Gas Agency to Abhilasha Sharma, wife of deceased Arjun Sharma, informant and her elder son Atul Sharma and the said authority letter is placed on record as Annexure No. 8. By giving reference to this letter, it is argued that even after lodging in jail, Veena Sharma has no enmity with her daughter in law, therefore, the I.O. without any substance and material filed the charge sheet.

11. They also pointed out that at one point of time, since Veena Sharma, returned Rs. Three Crore to Vinod Uniyal by crediting the amount in his bank on 16.10.2024 because of this transaction deceased Arjun Sharma was angry with her and that is the reason, she always used to live alone at her residence located at Vasant Vihar in Dehradun.

12. It is further argued that in fact, charge sheet has been filed against Veena Sharma without any link evidence and she has been implicated only because of the reason that her son Arjun Sharma has filed Civil Suit against Veena Sharma and Dr. Ajay Khanna with a cancellation of sale deed, which is pending for consideration. They submit that the said sale deeds were executed in favour of Dr. Ajay Khanna, for consideration of Rs. Fourteen Crore but Arjun Sharma challenged the sale deed with some vested interest though Veena Sharma was exclusive owner of the property, which was sold to Dr. Ajay Khanna. It is submitted that in fact, Veena Sharma was in acute financial

crisis and hardship and that was the reason, she sold the gas agency to Dr. Ajay Khanna, so that she could have liquid cash in her hand, since every time, she has to borrow money from Vinod Uniyal and other relatives and friends. It is argued that Veena Sharma is living separately since 2017 from her son Arjun Sharma and her residence is 7-8 kms. away from the residence of Arjun Sharma and merely on the ground that there is civil dispute in between them and Veena Sharma got protection to her life and liberty from the High Court it does not mean that she is involved in the commission of crime. They further submits that Veena Sharma has no motive at all to commit this crime, as she has already transferred her property to her daughter in law through her son and only on the basis of her confessional statement, she has been charge sheeted.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Bail Application No. 74 of 2026 (Vinod Uniyal Vs. State of Uttarkhand)**

13. In reference to applicant Vinod Uniyal, it is argued that his first bail application was dismissed as withdrawn and now instant second bail application is moved. It is argued that in fact, on the date of arrest, Vinod Uniyal was in STF office, Gandhi Road, Dehradun from 10.30 AM onwards and he was detained there and when the police received information about murder of Arjun Sharma, he was shown to be arrested on 12.02.2026 at 06.20 p.m. whereas he was already in police custody since 10.30 a.m. and in this regard, a complaint was also made to the Chief Judicial Magistrate.

14. He further submits that there is no link evidence to connect the applicant in commission of crime and even there is no conversion in between the applicant with Veena Sharma and Dr. Ajay Khanna. It is argued that the only motive, which is

shown by the prosecution is that an amount of Rs. 3 Crore was transferred in his account on 16.10.2024 though on the said amount he has already paid income tax. It is further submitted that there is no further transaction on or after 16.10.2024 in between Veena Sharma and the applicant.

15. Learned counsel further submits that Veena Sharma was given protection by the police and there is no question of any conversion by the present applicant with Veena Sharma and there is no CDR in order to establish that applicant was in direct touch with Veena Sharma. In reference to the sale deed executed in between Veena Sharma and Dr. Ajay Khanna it is submitted that the present applicant is neither the witness nor signatory in the sale deed and as a matter of fact, Dr. Ajay Khanna was introduced to Veena Sharma by one Amit Pundir, a practicing lawyer.

16. In addition to this, it is submitted that the present applicant resides in EC road near Welham School whereas deceased Arjun resides at Garhi Cantt., which is far away and Veena Sharma's residence is also far away from his residence i.e. about 10 - 12 kms. He also submits that there was no occasion to watch the day to day movement of the deceased and only on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused Pankaj Rana, alleged shooter, applicant has been implicated and charge sheeted though there is no evidence with regard to making of payment of Rs. 3 lakh in advance to the shooter Pankaj Rana and as per prosecution, an amount of Rs. 25,000/- was recovered from Pankaj Rana, after two month of the incident i.e. on 09.03.2025. It is submitted that chain to connect the applicant with the crime is incomplete and without any

evidence and substance, not only the applicant but his wife is also charge sheeted.

17. Finally, learned counsel concluded their arguments, by submitting that both the applicants Veena Sharma and Vinod Uniyal are innocent and have been falsely implicated there is no link evidence with regard to motive and even no TIP (Test Identification Parade) of the shooters was conducted till the filing of charge sheet. It is submitted that during investigation, no confrontation was done by the I.O. in between the shooter with the applicants and other co-accused persons across the table and furthermore arrest of the shooter are also doubtful, since they have been arrested from different place, which is far away from the place of incident and the applicants have been charge sheeted only on the basis of suspicion and since now both are in judicial custody for more than six months and investigation is already completed and charge sheet has already been filed, therefore, applicants Veena Sharma and Vinod Uniyal be enlarged on bail.

**1<sup>st</sup> Bail Application No. 1074 of 2026 (Ajay Khanna Vs. State of Uttarakhand)**

18. So far as bail application of Dr. Ajay Khanna is concerned, Mr. Sandeep Tandon argued that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated and there is no link evidence and without any substance and material, he has been arrested on 12.02.2026. Mr. Tandon submits that present applicant - Dr. Ajay Khanna, is implicated and now chargesheeted because he has purchased a piece of land from Veena Sharma on 09.01.2025 measuring 0.0849 hectare with the consideration of Rs. 14 Crore and Veena Sharma was exclusive owner of the said land. He further submits that the land, which he has purchased by virtue

of sale deed dated 09.01.2025 was purchased by Veena Sharma through a registered sale deed dated 06.04.1987, wherein, she was running a Gas Agency in the name and style of "Amardeep Gas Agency". He submits that since after selling out the land to the present applicant by virtue of the registered sale deed dated 09.01.2025. Veena Sharma want to shift gas agency and godown to another plot located at Mazra and Veena Sharma asked him to grant some time to vacate it as there are other formalities for shifting the gas godown and on her request same land was given to Veena Sharma on monthly rent of 4,50,000/- from 10.01.2025 to 31.05.2025, in support of which registered rent agreement is also enclosed.

19. Mr. Tandon submits that when this transfer of land came into the knowledge of Arjun Sharma (deceased), he filed a Civil Suit No. 31 of 2025 challenging the sale deed dated 09.01.2025 wherein application was moved by the present applicant under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC on which objection was filed by the deceased also.

20. Mr. Tandon submits that the the prosecution has wrongly linked the applicant - Dr. Ajay Khanna with the commission of crime. He submits that the present applicant has no concerned whatsoever with the other co-accused Veena Sharma, Vinod Uniyal and Sangeeta Uniyal as well as two shooters Pankaj Rana and Rajeev Rana @ Raju. So far as Veena Sharma is concerned, both of them known to each other only because of registered sale deed dated 09.01.2025.

He submits that without any substance and material, applicant was arrested and now charge sheeted and even at the time of arrest, no ground of arrest was provided to him and his custody is illegal. He submits that applicant is 65 years is old

and renowned practicing doctor by profession. In 2020, he undergone kidney transplant and now is admitted in Max Hospital since 01.07.2026. He submits that since investigation is already completed and charge sheet has been filed and there is no need of further custodial interrogation of the present applicant and he has no criminal antecedents, therefore, he may be enlarged on bail.

21. Per contra, Mr. J.S. Virk, learned Addl. Advocate General with Mr. Tumul Nainwal, learned AGA as well as learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the bail applications by submitting that the applicant Vinod Uniyal is the person, who actually engaged and hired the two assailants and one of the shooter is his own domestic driver. Mr. Virk submits that these two shooter were engaged to kill the deceased for which an advance payment of Rs. Three Lakh were given, which is also admitted by the shooter Pankaj Rana in his statement recorded under Section 180 BNSS.

22. Apart from this, Mr. Virk submits that applicant – Vinod Uniyal had long standing financial dealing with co-accused Veena Sharma and he has also received Rs. One Crore from Ayush Jain when earlier agreement to sell was executed by Veena Sharma for selling out a piece of land with the sale consideration of Rs. Three Crore.

He further argued that during investigation, it also reveals that Vinod Uniyal have illicit relation with the co-accused Veena Sharma and the deceased was the main obstacle since he always object for transferring huge amount to the applicant Vinod Uniyal due to which accused Vinod Uniyal was annoyed and prejudice with him and lodged a case against

him at Police Station – Nehru Colony, Dehradun in the year 2025, bearing case crime no. 143 of 2025.

23. Mr. Virk also submits that relation of Veena Sharma with her son were not cordial, which is evident from this fact that she also filed a petition before High Court for seeking protection. Mr. Virk argued that earlier, Veena Sharma executed an agreement to sell with one Ayush Jain in the year 2024 and received an amount of Rs. Three crore, as advance out of which, one crore was transferred to Vinod Uniyal, consequently, deceased Arjun Sharma filed a civil suit for cancellation of agreement to sell.

Thereafter, Veena Sharma again executed a fresh agreement to sell with Dr. Ajay Khanna for consideration of Rs. 14 crore and out of which, Rs. 7 crore was taken as advance, consequently, deceased filed another suit and also obtained interim injunction due to which, Dr. Ajay Khanna, could not obtain possession, he was pressurizing Veena Sharma either to give possession or refund the amount with interest, failing which he is giving threatening. Consequently, she sought help from Vinod Uniyal and his wife with whom, she has long standing personal business relation, which she has disclosed in her confessional statement and then conspired and then Vinod Uniyal engaged his driver Pankaj Rana to kill Arjun Sharma on a consideration of Rs. 12 lakh.

24. Mr. Virk argued that Veena Sharma apprise about day to day routine of the deceased and on such disclosure the conducted recce of the route on the stolen two wheeler for several days and then on the fateful day, Rajeev Rana @ Raju fired at the deceased from a very close range and then ran away and in an encounter both the shooters were arrested. Mr. Virk

further submits that Veena Sharma disowned and disinherited deceased (Ajay Sharma) through publishing a notice in the newspaper and there was strong motive to eliminate the deceased. He submits that in addition to the confessional statement of the accused persons there are CCTV footages, call details record as well as bank transactions reflected flow of money and since the deceased was main hurdle, who filed Civil Suit in reference to the property of high value of rupees several crores. Consequently, with common object and intention they conspired and hired two shooters to kill Ajay Sharma.

25. In reference to accused Dr. Ajay Khanna, it is argued that this applicant also has strong motive to eliminate the deceased due to investment of Rs. 14 crore, as he purchased a piece of land from Veena Sharma through registered sale deed, which was challenged by the deceased in civil suit and with this strong motive he conspired with other co-accused persons to eliminate the deceased.

26. In addition to this, Mr. J.S. Virk, learned Addl. Advocate General, also pointed out that Vinod Uniyal has criminal antecedents of four cases and he is indulged in criminal activities since 2017. Criminal antecedents of Vinod Uniyal are as follows:

Case Crime No. 19 of 2025, under Section 420, 120B, 465, 468, 471, 506 IPC, Police Station – Basant Vihar, Dehradun.

ii. Case Crime No. 43 of 2017, under Section 420, 120B IPC, Police Station – Basant Vihar, Dehradun.

iii. Case Crime No. 140 of 2022, under Section 318 (4), 316 (2), 351 (2), 61 (2) BNS, Police Station –

Transport Nagar, Meerut.

iv. Case Crime No. 140 of 2022, under Section 2 / 3 U.P. Gangsters and Anti Social Activities (Prevention) Act, Police Station – Rajpur, Dehradun.

27. It is submitted that Vinod Uniyal is main person, who conspired and hired two assailants to commit the crime and he is the principal financier and organizer of the contract killing. He engaged and paid the amount to the assailants and he has direct role and operative link in the chain of conspiracy and there is cogent material and evidence against all the accused. The entire incident caused in a well planned manner and if at this juncture, applicants are enlarged on bail, there is all possibilities that they will temper with the evidence or to frustrate the ongoing trial.

28. Heard learned counsel for the applicants as well as learned Addl. Advocate General and AGA for the State and learned counsel for the complainant at length and perused the entire record.

29. Now, by this common order, this Court shall dispose of all the three bail applications moved on behalf of applicants namely Veena Sharma @ Beena, Vinod Uniyal and Dr. Ajay Khanna, who are currently in judicial custody since 12.02.2026 in connection with the primary offence of murder and criminal conspiracy.

30. The genesis of the entire case rest upon first information report dated 11.02.2026 lodged at 14.14 p.m. by the informant – Abhilasha Sharma, alleging that her husband Arjun Sharma deceased was shot dead by unknown assailants at about 10.00

a.m. in Dehradun and she expressed her strong suspicion against the present applicant due to financial and civil disputes.

31. Admittedly, during investigation, on 12.02.2026, the Police apprehended two shooters namely Rajeev Rana @ Raju and his brother Pankaj Rana and from them local firearm was also recovered and during their custody, they disclosed the involvement of all these three applicants Veena Sharma, Vinod Uniyal and Dr. Ajay Khanna and thereafter, investigation was concluded and charge sheet has been filed on 30.04.2026. After carefully gone through with the record, this Court discuss the role of each of the applicants, which are as follows:

32. Regarding, Veena Sharma, this Court finds her case on different footing. She is 70 years old and mother of the deceased and entitled to get privilege in terms of proviso to Section 480 BNSS. The investigation reveals that she was living separately from her son since 2017 and she has also provided a Constable in order to save her life and liberty and record further reveals that she transferred major portion of her property to her daughter in law through power of attorney i.e. his son Arjun Sharma and even after came into judicial custody, she also gave authority to run gas agency to her daughter in law. Therefore, looking into the fact that she is mother of deceased, therefore, there is a little chance that she conspired with others to eliminate her own son. Further, she is in judicial custody since 12.02.2026 and investigation is already completed and charge sheet has been filed, therefore, this Court is of the view that her further custody is unwarranted, therefore, she deserves for bail.

33. So far as, the applicant - Dr. Ajay Khanna is concerned, admittedly, he is medical professional and paid a huge amount

of Rs. 14 crore in respect of a land which he purchased through registered sale deed from Veena Sharma though said sale deed is now under challenged in a civil proceeding, which was instituted by the deceased Arjun Sharma and merely on the ground that he purchased a piece of land from Veena Sharma, mother of the deceased, it cannot be presumed that he has some personal animosity with the deceased and furthermore, he has no criminal antecedents and investigation reveals that there is no electronic evidence to link him with the shooters. Further, the investigation is already complete and charge sheet has been filed, therefore, at this juncture, his further detention is no more required and hence, this Court is of the view that this applicant namely "Dr. Ajay Khanna" also deserves for bail.

34. So far as applicant "Vinod Uniyal" is concerned, admittedly, this applicant has criminal background and he was involved in the Gangster Act and more particularly, in the present case, one of the shooter was his own driver, who in association with his brother to commit this crime. Furthermore, there is no doubt that this applicant has long business relations with Veena Sharma and there was frequent transfer of huge amount in between both of them. His own driver, who was hired by him to kill deceased, disclosed about the involvement of the present applicant, therefore, his involvement cannot be ruled out, particularly, when there is no dispute that one of the shooter is his own driver. Now, taking into consideration his past history and the fact that one of the shooter is his own driver, this Court is of the view that if at this stage, he is enlarged on bail there are all possibilities that he may temper with the evidences or frustrate the ongoing trial. Consequently, this Court is of the view that the applicant Vinod Uniyal does not deserve for bail.

35. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, Bail Application No. 780 of 2026 moved on behalf of Veena Sharma @ Beena and Bail Application No. 1074 of 2026 moved on behalf of Dr. Ajay Khanna are allowed. So far as the second Bail Application No. 74 of 2026 moved on behalf of Vinod Uniyal is concerned, the same is hereby rejected.

36. Let the applicants - “Veena Sharma @ Beena, wife of late Col. Ramesh Chandra Sharma” and “Dr. Ajay Khanna, son of late Jagdish Prashad” be released on bail, on furnishing their personal bonds and two sureties, each of the like amount, by each of the applicant, subject to the following conditions:-

- i. After being released on bail, they shall join the trial court proceedings on each and every date, without seeking any unnecessary adjournment.
- ii. After being released on bail, both the applicants shall surrender their passport, if any, within a week and shall not leave the country without prior permission of the court.
- iii. The applicants shall not give any threatening to the informant or witnesses and will not make any attempt to temper with the evidence
- iv. It is made clear that trial court may proceed with the trial without being influenced with the observations, as above.

**(Rakesh Thapliyal, J.)**

24.08.2026

SKS