



2026:UHC:2185

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND**  
**AT NAINITAL**

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR VERMA**

**27<sup>th</sup> MARCH, 2026**

**ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.1107 of 2025**

Ravi Kashyap

.....Applicant

Versus

State of Uttarakhand

....Respondent

Counsel for the Applicant : Mr. Mohd. Alauddin, Advocate  
through video conferencing.

Counsel for the Respondent : Mr. Pratiroop Pandey,  
Assistant Government  
Advocate.

**Hon'ble Alok Kumar Verma,J.**

This Application has been filed by the applicant Ravi Kashyap for anticipatory bail in Case Crime No.458 of 2025, registered at Police Station Jwalapur, District Haridwar under Sections 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340(2) and Section 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. Heard Mr. Mohd. Alauddin, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr. Pratiroop Pandey, learned Assistant Government Advocate for the respondent.

3. As per the respondent, one Machhla Devi was the owner of the property-in-question. The present applicant applied for a loan to purchase her property, but, the sale-deed dated 04.07.2025 was executed in favour of the present applicant on the forged document, submitted by the purchaser.



4. Mr. Mohd. Alauddin, Advocate contended that the allegations of the First Information Report are totally groundless. The alleged sale-deed was registered on 04.07.2025, whereas, the applicant was arrested on 06.06.2025 in the First Information Report No.607 of 2025 under Section 8 read with Section 22 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 and he was granted bail on 08.08.2025 by the Coordinate Bench of this Court. He was not present at the time of the execution of the alleged sale-deed. He is a permanent resident of District Haridwar, therefore, there is no possibility of his absconding, and, he was granted interim bail on 26.09.2025, and, the conditions of the interim bail have not been misused or violated by him.

5. Mr. Pratiroop Pandey, Assistant Government Advocate has opposed the anticipatory bail application.

6. Personal liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution of India is very precious fundamental right and it should be curtailed only when it becomes imperative according to the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case.

7. Having heard the submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view of the facts and circumstances of the case, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present Anticipatory Bail Application is allowed and the order dated 26.09.2025, granting interim



2026:UHC:2185

bail to the applicant, is made absolute. It is directed that in the event of arrest of the applicant Ravi Kashyap, he shall be released on anticipatory bail on executing a personal bond of Rs. 30,000/- and two reliable sureties, each of the like amount, to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer, subject to the following conditions:-

- (i) Applicant shall cooperate with the Investigating Agency and he shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;
- (ii) If the charge-sheet is filed, the applicant shall attend the trial court regularly and he shall not seek any unnecessary adjournment;
- (iii) Applicant shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person, acquainted with the facts of this case;
- (iv) Applicant shall not leave the country without the previous permission of the trial court.

**8.** It is made clear that if the applicant misuses or violates any of the conditions, imposed upon him, the prosecution agency will be free to move the Court for cancellation of the anticipatory bail granted to the applicant.

---

**ALOK KUMAR VERMA, J.**

Date: 27.03.2026  
Pant/