

**HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL****First Bail Application No. 1277 of 2025**

Ramveer Singh

.....Applicant

Versus

State of Uttarakhand

.....Respondent

Present:-

Mr. D.K. Sharma, Senior Advocate assisted by Mr. Abhishek Anthwal.,
Advocate for the applicant.

Ms. Manisha Rana Singh, D.A.G. for the State.

Hon'ble Ravindra Maithani, J. (Oral)

Applicant is in judicial custody in FIR No.236 of 2024, under Sections 302, 307, 201, 120-B IPC and Section 3/25/27 of the Arms Act, 1959, Police Station Raipur, District Dehradun. He has sought his release on bail.

2. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

3. According to the FIR, on 16.06.2024, at about 10-11:00 p.m., injured Subhash Chetri along with the deceased Deepak Badola went to get their vehicle in the house of co-accused Devindra Kumar Sharma alias Sonu Bharadwaj and Monu Bhardwaj, which was parked there, but there, co-accused and the applicant opened indiscriminate firing on them, due to which Subhash Chetri and Manoj Negi sustained injuries. It is the case of the prosecution that in that firing, Deepak Badola also sustained injuries and he died.

4. Learned Senior Counsel appearing for the applicant submits that the applicant has not been assigned any role of killing; the role of killing the deceased Deepak Badola has been assigned to

co-accused Manish; it is not a conspiracy or premeditated offence; there was a dispute with regard to taking the vehicle of the deceased Deepak Badola, and in that sudden sequel, something happened; according to the prosecution, a country made pistol was recovered at the instance of the applicant, but it was never sent for forensic examination; the applicant is in jail for two years; there are many witnesses, and till date only one witness has been examined. Hence, it is argued that it is a case fit for bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State Counsel submits that the applicant has been assigned specific role of shooting Shubhash Chetri and Manoj Negi, due to which both of them sustained injuries, which has been corroborated by the medical evidence; the weapon of offence has been recovered at the instance of the applicant; the Digital Video Record containing the CCTV footages have also been obtained by the police, in which the applicant could be seen firing at the injured. She also submits that the applicant is a known criminal having 13 cases to his credit.

6. It is not a case of killing one person only. According to the FIR, there was indiscriminate firing, and by the firing made by the applicant, to persons namely Shubhash Chetri and Manoj Negi were injured. There were bullets in their bodies. One of the persons died in that firing, though the role of killing Deepak Badola is attributed to co-accused Manish.

7. According to the prosecution, there were 13 cases against the applicant. The list is given as Annexure No.9, which includes offence under Sections 302, 307, Arms Act, 1959, etc.

8. Having considered, this Court does not see any ground, which may entitle the applicant to bail. Accordingly, the bail application deserves to be rejected.

9. The bail application is rejected.

(Ravindra Maithani, J)
23.07.2026

Ravi Bisht