

SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	UKHC010104232026  2026:UHC:6107 COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>BA1/1058/2026</u> Meharban --Applicant Versus State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent <u>Hon'ble Rakesh Thapliyal, J.</u> Ms. Asmi, learned counsel holding the brief of Ms. Sadaf, learned counsel for the applicant. 2. Mr. Sandeep Sharma, learned AGA for the State. 3. Present applicant-Meharban, S/o Maksood is praying for bail in reference to First Information Report dated 07.02.2026 bearing FIR No.0033 of 2026, P.S. Roorkee, District Haridwar wherein the present applicant alongwith two others, namely, Imran and Saddam have been implicated for the offences punishable under Sections 123, 351(3) and 70(1) of BNS, 2023. 4. This FIR was investigated and the applicant and two others, namely, Imran and Saddam, have been charge sheeted for the offences punishable under Section 70(1), 123, 351(2) BNS, 2023 read with Section 67 of I.T. Act, P.S. Kotwali, Roorkee, District Haridwar. 5. It is argued by learned counsel for the applicant that applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated; he is languishing in jail since 19.02.2026 and the charge sheet has already been filed on 03.04.2026 and as such there is no need of further custodial

		interrogation and, therefore, the applicant be released on bail. She also submits that the applicant has no previous criminal antecedent. Apart from this, she submits that one another co-accused, namely, Saddam has been enlarged on regular bail by the Coordinate Bench on 20.04.2026 and so far as another co-accused, namely, Imran is concerned, he was granted interim protection in WPCRL No.326 of 2026 by this Court on 24.02.2026. She further submits that the applicant deserves for the benefit of parity of other co-accused Saddam, who have been enlarged on bail by the Coordinate Bench. 6. On the other side, Mr. Sandeep Sharma, learned AGA vehemently opposed the bail application by submitting that <i>prima facie</i>, it appears to be a case of gang rape, committed by three persons, the present applicant and two others, namely, Saddam and Imran. He further submits that Imran was not enlarged on bail rather he was granted interim protection during investigation since he was 60-70% handicapped and so far as other co-accused Saddam is concerned, present applicant does not deserve for the benefit of bail since the present applicant is the main person, who organized to commit this crime. Apart from this he submits that the present applicant got the video of obscene of the applicant with victim and other co-accused and got it to viral, which is evident from the statement of the witnesses, namely, Tamrej, S/o Mohabbat Singh, R/o village Jaurasi, Ahsan, S/o Kasim and Javed, S/o Iqbal and there are various other witnesses, who stated that the
--	--	--

			said video got viral and several persons of the village have also seen such video. 7. It has also been apprised that the present applicant was an accused also in the similar nature of allegation against another victim in FIR dated 07.02.2026 bearing FIR No.0031 of 2026, P.S. Kotwali Roorkee, District Haridwar wherein he alongwith two others Danish and Abdul Rehman @ Dulla were implicated for the offences punishable under Section 123, 351(3) and 64 of BNS, 2023 but subsequently on a compounding application, the proceeding has been dropped. 8. After hearing the submission of learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the FIR as well as the case diary, the statement of various witnesses and I have also gone through with the order of the Coordinate Bench granting bail to one of the co-accused Saddam and after taking into consideration the gravity of the offence, which appears to be heinous, this Court is of the view that the applicant does not deserve for bail. 9. Accordingly, bail application is rejected. (Rakesh Thapliyal, J.) 20.07.2026 Arti
--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--