HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

First Bail Application No.2047 of 2024

Shubham Soni .....Applicant

Versus

State of Uttarakhand .....Respondent

Present:-

Mr. Pankaj Tangwan, Advocate for the applicant.
Mr. S.C. Dumka, AGA for the State.

Hon'ble Ravindra Maithani, J. (Oral)

Applicant is in judicial custody in FIR No.0025 of 2024, under Sections 323, 326A, 504 & 506 IPC, Police Station Tharali, District Chamoli. He has sought his release on bail.

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

3. According to the FIR, on 26.06.2024 at 9:00 P.M., the applicant along with co-accused did *mar-peet* with the injured and poured acid on him, due to which, he sustained injuries. His stomach, groin area and peri-anal region sustained injuries.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the FIR is quite delayed; had the injuries been serious, the informant would not have settled the dispute with the applicant.

5. Learned State Counsel would submit that it is a case of acid attack. As per the surgeon opinion, the injuries are grievous in nature.

6. It is the stage of bail. Much of the discussion at this stage is not expected of. To the extent of appreciating the controversy, the matter may be examined with the caveat that any observation, made at this stage, shall have no bearing at any subsequent stage of the case.

7. According to the FIR, after the acid attack, the parties entered into the settlement with the assurance of the applicant that he will bear all the expenses. But when he did not bear the expenses, FIR was lodged. The victim and other witnesses have supported the prosecution case. According to the doctor, there were acid burns and the injuries were grievous in nature.

8. Having considered, this Court is of the view that there is no ground to enlarge the applicant on bail. Accordingly, the bail application deserves to be rejected.

9. The bail application is rejected.

(Ravindra Maithani, J)
31.12.2024

Ravi