SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA2/75/2026 Juneja Dilawar --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Gaurav Singh, learned counsel for the applicant. Mr. Akshay Latwal and Mr. Prabhat Kandpal, learned A.G.A. assisted by Mr. Nikhil Bisht, learned counsel for the State of Uttarakhand. 2. This is the second Bail Application. The first Bail Application was rejected by this Court on 31.03.2026. 3. The present Bail Application has been moved by the Applicant, who is in judicial custody in connection with FIR/Case Crime No. 33 of 2025, registered at Chalani Police Station Almora, District Almora, for offences punishable under Sections 61(2), 308(5) and 318(4) of the B.N.S., 2023. 4. Learned counsel for the applicant, while pressing the second Bail Application, submits that the grounds of arrest were not communicated to the applicant in writing, which is a constitutional mandate under Article 22 of the Constitution of India. In support of his submission, he has placed reliance upon a judgment of a Coordinate Bench of this Court dated 20.11.2025, passed in Third Bail Application No. 63 of 2025, wherein, after referring to various judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, including Mahir Rajesh Shah vs. State of Maharastra and Another, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 2356, the legal position has been reiterated by the Coordinate Bench in paragraph 10, which reads as follows: "*10. It has further been reiterated by the Hon'ble Supreme*

court in the Case of Mihir Rajesh Shah (supra), wherein in paragraph 56, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has laid down the law as under:-

> *56. In conclusion, it is held that:*
> *(i) The constitutional mandate of informing the arrestee of the grounds of arrest is mandatory in all offences under all statutes, including offences under the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (now B.N.S., 2023);*
> *(ii) The grounds of arrest must be communicated in writing to the arrestee in the language he/she understands;*
> *(iii) In cases where the arresting officer/person is unable to communicate the grounds of arrest in writing on or soon after the arrest, the same may initially be communicated orally. The said grounds shall thereafter be communicated in writing within a reasonable time and, in any case, at least two hours prior to the production of the arrestee before the Magistrate for remand proceedings;*
> *(iv) In case of non-compliance with the above requirements, the arrest and subsequent remand would be rendered illegal, and the person concerned would be entitled to be set at liberty."*

5. Per contra, learned State Counsel opposed the Bail Application and submitted that the first Bail Application was rejected by this Court after due consideration of all the relevant facts and circumstances of the case. It is submitted that all material aspects have already been duly considered and dealt with while rejecting the first Bail Application, and that no new circumstance or substantial change in facts has been brought on record by the Applicant so as to warrant consideration of the present second Bail Application.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that, considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, and without expressing any opinion on the merits thereof, the Applicant has been able to make out a fit case for grant of bail.

7. Accordingly, the Second Bail Application is allowed.

8. Let the Applicant be released on bail upon furnishing a personal bond and two reliable sureties, each in the like

			amount, to the satisfaction of the Court concerned. 9. All pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of. **(Alok Mahra, J.)** 09-07-2026 SB