HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Anticipatory Bail Application No.1142 of 2024

Khalid ..... Applicant

Versus

State of Uttarakhand ....Respondent

With

Anticipatory Bail Application No.1160 of 2024

Sahud ..... Applicant

Versus

State of Uttarakhand ....Respondent

Present:-
Mr. Gaurav Singh, Advocate for the applicant.
Mr. Siddhartha Bisht, AGA for the State.

Hon'ble Ravindra Maithani, J. (Oral)

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

2. Applicant seeks anticipatory bail in FIR/Case Crime No.0786 of 2023, under Sections 420, 457, 380, 411, 465, 471, 120B & 427 IPC, Police Station Kotwali Roorkee, District Haridwar.

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

4. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant is not named in the FIR. The

co-accused have already been released on anticipatory bail. The persons from whose custody, articles were recovered, they have also been granted regular bail.

5. Learned State Counsel would submit that applicants have a long criminal history and they have been absconding.

6. The bail rejection order reveals that the applicants have been absconding and non bailable warrant as well as the proceeding under Section 82 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, have been proceeded against them. Charge-sheet has already been filed against the co-accused, but investigation is still pending against the applicants. The applicants have been absconding and they are not cooperating in the investigation.

7. Having considered the entirety of facts, this Court is of the view that there is no reason to grant the anticipatory bail to the applicant. Both the anticipatory bail applications deserve to be rejected.

8. Both these anticipatory bail applications are rejected.

(Ravindra Maithani, J.)
11.12.2024

Ravi