

HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

First Bail Application No.960 of 2024

Rahul Chaudhary alias Rahul KannojiyaApplicant

Versus

State of UttarakhandRespondent

Present:-

Mr. Kishore Kumar, Advocate, holding brief of Mr. N.K.
Papnoi, Advocate for the applicant.
Mr. V.S. Rawat, A.G.A. for the State.

With

First Bail Application No.921 of 2024

Deepak Raj SharmaApplicant

Versus

State of UttarakhandRespondent

Present:-

Mr. Kishore Kumar, Advocate, holding brief of Mr. N.K.
Papnoi, Advocate for the applicant.
Mr. V.S. Rawat, A.G.A. for the State.

And

First Bail Application No.955 of 2024

Siddharth Alias Siddhant ChauhanApplicant

Versus

State of UttarakhandRespondent

Present:-

Mr. Kishore Kumar, Advocate, holding brief of Mr. N.K.
Papnoi, Advocate for the applicant.
Mr. V.S. Rawat, A.G.A. for the State.

Hon'ble Ravindra Maithani, J. (Oral)

Since all these bail applications arise from one
and the same FIR, they are decided by this common order.

2. Applicants are in judicial custody in FIR No. 22 of 2024, under Sections 201, 34, 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC and Section 66D of the Information Technology Act, 2000, Police Station Cyber, District Dehradun. He has sought his release on bail.

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

4. According to the FIR, on 18.03.2023, STF received an information that in the name Pradhan Mantri Mudra Loan Yojna cheating is done by someone from Prem Nagar, District Dehradun. Police raided a premises and arrested applicants Rahul Chaudhary and Siddharth alias Siddhant Chauhan. These two applicants revealed that it is the applicant Deepak Raj Sharma, who had planned this design and act. According to the prosecution, various ATMs, passbooks, notebooks, mobile phones etc. were recovered from the applicants.

5. Learned counsel for the applicants would submit that it is no evidence case. Merely, certain articles were recovered and on assumptions, the applicants have been arrested. There is no person as such victim, who has been cheated by the applicants.

6. Learned State counsel would submit that the applicants were running a racket of cheating the people. He

would submit that till date, no victim has been located because most of the victims are from the Southern state, where the Investigating Officer is facing language barrier.

7. Having considered the entirety of facts, this Court is of the view that the applicants deserve to be enlarged on bail.

8. The bail applications are allowed.

9. Let the applicants be released on bail, on their executing a personal bond and furnishing two reliable sureties by each one of them, each of the like amount, to the satisfaction of the Court concerned.

(Ravindra Maithani, J)
31.07.2024

Jitendra