



2026:UHC:231

IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND
AT NAINITAL

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR VERMA

06th JANUARY, 2026

FIRST BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1445 of 2025

Parag Chaklaan alias Parikshit Sharma Applicant

Versus

State of Uttarakhand Respondent

Counsel for the Applicant : Mr. Arvind Vashisth, Senior Advocate assisted by Mr. Pankaj Kumar Kaushik, Advocate.

Counsel for the Respondent : Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, Brief Holder.

Counsel for the informant and the victim : Mr. Bhuwan Bhatt, Advocate.

Hon'ble Alok Kumar Verma, J.

Applicant Parag Chaklaan alias Parikshit Sharma is in judicial custody for the offence punishable under Section 109(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 3 read with Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 in Case Crime No.193 of 2025, registered at Kotwali Jwalapur, District Haridwar.

2. Heard Mr. Arvind Vashisth, learned Senior Advocate for the applicant, Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, learned Brief Holder for the respondent and Mr. Bhuwan Bhatt, learned counsel for the informant and the victim.

3. Smt. Sarita Shrotriya, the injured, is present through video conferencing. She is identified by Mr. Bhuwan Bhatt, Advocate.



2026:UHC:231

4. Mr. Arvind Vashisth, learned Senior Advocate, submitted that as per the prosecution case, on 01.05.2025, the applicant, the son-in-law of Smt. Sarita Shrotriya, the wife of the informant, and, Paras, the son of Smt. Sarita Shrotriya, went to the house of the applicant. An altercation took place between them and the applicant. Applicant opened fire on Smt. Sarita Shrotriya and Paras. Smt. Sarita Shrotriya sustained injuries on her cheek and Paras on his ear.

5. Mr. Arvind Vashisth, Senior Advocate, has contended that the said allegations are totally false and fabricated. Applicant has not committed any offence. As per the medical examination report, the alleged injuries were caused by hard and blunt object and the said injuries were simple in nature. Applicant is a permanent resident of District Haridwar, therefore, there is no possibility of his absconding. Charge-sheet has been filed, therefore, there is no chance of tampering with the evidence, and, the applicant is in custody since 02.05.2025.

6. Smt. Sarita Shrotriya, the victim, has submitted that she is not opposing the bail application.

7. Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, Brief Holder, has opposed the bail application.



2026:UHC:231

8. Bail is the rule and committal to jail is an exception. Refusal of bail is a restriction on the personal liberty of the individual, guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The object of keeping the accused in detention during the trial is not punishment. The main purpose is manifestly to secure the attendance of the accused.

9. Having considered the submissions of learned counsel for both the parties and in the facts and circumstances of the case, no reason is found to keep the applicant behind the bars for an indefinite period, therefore, without expressing any opinion as to the merits of the case, this Court is of the view that the applicant deserves bail at this stage.

10. The Bail Application is allowed.

11. Let the applicant- Parag Chaklaan alias Parikshit Sharma be released on bail on his executing a personal bond and furnishing two reliable sureties, each in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the court concerned.

ALOK KUMAR VERMA, J.

Dt: 06.01.2026
Shiv/