



SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>BA1/971/2026</u> Ramvilas Kumar --Applicant Versus State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent <u>Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.</u> Mr. Pragya Prakash Upadhyay, learned counsel for the applicant. 2. Mr. Rangoli Purohit, learned Brief Holder for the State. 3. Applicant – Ramvilas Kumar, who is in judicial custody in connection with FIR/Case Crime No. 390 of 2025 (Special Sessions Case No.194 of 2025) under Section 5(1) and 6 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 and Section 64(2)(m) of B.N.S. registered at P.S.- Rishikesh, District Dehradun, has sought her release on bail. 4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the records. 5. It is alleged in the impugned F.I.R. that about three months prior to the lodging of the F.I.R., when the informant/victim was working along with her mother at a construction site at Rishikesh, the present applicant allegedly established forcible physical relations with her. It is further alleged that, as a consequence thereof, the victim became



		pregnant and subsequently procured certain medicines from a medical shop for termination of the pregnancy and thereafter, when she went to Sagar, Madhya Pradesh, she allegedly buried the foetus in a field. 6. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case; that, the statement of the victim/prosecutrix, examined as P.W.1 before the Trial Court, is of considerable significance inasmuch as, during her examination; that, she did not support the prosecution case against the present applicant. It is submitted that she specifically stated that the person alleged to have sexually assaulted her was not the present applicant, but some other person. 7. Learned counsel would further submit that the victim was aged about 17 years and 7 months at the time of the alleged incident; that, the medical evidence does not support the allegations levelled in the F.I.R.; that, no injury or other medical evidence suggestive of forcible sexual intercourse was found during the medical examination of the victim. It is further submitted that the ultrasound examination did not reveal any sign of a recent or previous pregnancy or abortion; that, according to the medical report, the uterus was empty and the bilateral adnexa were normal, and there was no finding suggestive of a recent abortion, incomplete evacuation, or any residual or sequelae of pregnancy.
--	--	--



		8. Learned counsel would further submit that the aforesaid medical evidence is further corroborated by the testimony of the prosecutrix herself, who, during her cross-examination before the Trial Court, did not support the prosecution case and stated that the applicant had never established physical relations with her. It is further submitted that she admitted having falsely implicated the applicant in order to protect some other person. 9. Learned counsel for the applicant would further submit that the applicant is in judicial custody since 12.10.2025 and has no criminal antecedents; that, the bail application of the applicant was rejected by the court below vide order dated 07.05.2026; that, the victim/prosecutrix has already been examined and has not supported the prosecution case against the applicant, therefore, there is no reasonable likelihood of the applicant tampering with the evidence of the prosecutrix or influencing her testimony. It is further submitted that the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude, therefore, the applicant deserves to be enlarged on bail during the pendency of the trial. 10. Per contra, learned State Counsel would oppose the bail application and submits that serious allegations have been levelled against the applicant in the impugned F.I.R. However, learned State Counsel fairly concedes that the victim/prosecutrix, during her
--	--	--



			examination before the Trial Court, has not supported the prosecution case against the applicant. It is also admitted that the bail application of the applicant was rejected by the Court below vide order dated 07.05.2026. 11. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon consideration of the material available on record, this Court finds that the victim/prosecutrix has already been examined before the Trial Court and, prima facie, her testimony does not support the prosecution case against the applicant. The medical and ultrasound reports, as relied upon by the learned counsel for the applicant, are also matters to be considered during the course of trial. 12. In the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered view that the applicant has made out a fit case for grant of bail during the pendency of the trial. 13. Accordingly, the bail application is allowed. 14. Let the applicant be released on bail, subject to his furnishing a personal bond and two reliable sureties, each in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the Court concerned. MAMTA RANI (Alok Mahra, J.) 10.08.2026
--	--	--	---

Mamta

Digitally signed by MAMTA RANI
 DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND,
 ou=HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND,
 2.5.4.20=6a812005bebfc46f244f3e584af144
 9e430ef900bf09a6d67ebbd642671329b,
 postalCode=263001, st=Uttarakhand,
 serialNumber=Sde1751a4f1d9cabfd54852c9
 e68911ca8b66dd26690a191648ab5d8dd004
 ef0, cn=MAMTA RANI
 Date: 2026.08.11 18:27:37 +05'30'