| SL. No. | Date | Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures | COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **BA1/279/2026**<br>Tavinder<br>--Applicant<br>**Versus**<br>State Of Uttarakhand<br>--Respondent<br>**Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.**<br>Ms. Ketki Chaudhary, learned counsel for the applicant.<br>Mr. Dinesh Chauhan, learned A.G.A. for the State of Uttarakhand.<br>2. The present bail application has been filed by the applicant, who is in judicial custody in connection with FIR No. 0071 of 2026, registered at Police Station Cantt, District Dehradun, for the offences punishable under Section 65(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and Sections 3/4 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (hereinafter referred to as the "POCSO Act").<br>3. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned State Counsel and perused the record.<br>4. As per the prosecution case, the applicant is alleged to have sexually assaulted the victim, who was approximately 13 years of age at the time of the alleged incident, whereas the applicant is stated to be 51 years of age.<br>5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that the victim was medically examined on the day following the registration of the FIR, and the medical examination report records that no external or internal injuries were found on her and no spermatozoa were detected. Learned counsel contends that |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | the prosecution case is riddled with material contradictions.<br>6. Per contra, learned State Counsel has opposed the bail application, contending that the victim has supported the prosecution case in her statements recorded under Sections 180 and 184 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, as well as in her statement recorded before the Court. It is further submitted that the alleged offence is heinous in nature and has serious societal implications.<br>7. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, particularly the statements of the victim recorded during the course of investigation and before the Court, this Court is of the view that the applicant has not made out a case for grant of bail.<br>8. Accordingly, the bail application is rejected.<br><br>**(Alok Mahra, J.)**<br>31-10-2026<br><br>SB |