SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA1/554/2026 Sonu --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Vaibhav Singh Chauhan, Advocate for the applicant. Mr. Dinesh Chauhan, A.G.A. for the State of Uttarakhand. Mr. Gaurav Singh, Advocate for the complainant. 2. This first bail application has been moved by the applicant seeking regular bail in F.I.R./ Case Crime No.550 of 2025, under Section 108 of B.N.S., 2023, registered at Police Station Pathri, District Haridwar. 3. The prosecution case, as emerging from the F.I.R. lodged by the husband of the deceased, is that the applicant had developed intimacy with the deceased and had allegedly taken her photographs and videos. It is further alleged that the applicant used to harass and blackmail the deceased by threatening her to leave her matrimonial home and come to him for marriage. It is alleged that, owing to such harassment, the deceased consumed poison on 29.09.2025, whereafter she was admitted to the hospital, where she passed away on 01.10.2025. 4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and has been languishing in judicial custody since 14.10.2025. He further submits that, according to the prosecution case itself, the alleged harassment was on account of certain photographs and videos of the deceased, which the applicant purportedly possessed and

			used to blackmail her. However, during the course of investigation, the mobile phone of the applicant was recovered by the Investigating Officer, but no incriminating material, much less any photograph or video of the deceased, was recovered therefrom. He, therefore, submits that the aforesaid circumstance prima facie casts doubt on the allegation of blackmailing the deceased. Learned counsel further contends that there is no cogent material on record, at this stage, to establish any intentional act or positive conduct on the part of the applicant with the requisite mens rea to instigate, aid or abet the deceased to commit suicide. On these grounds, learned counsel prays that the applicant be enlarged on bail. 5. Per contra, learned State Counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail. He submits that while the deceased was being taken to the hospital, she made a statement, which was recorded by one of her relatives, wherein she specifically stated that the applicant had been continuously harassing her. He, therefore, submits that the allegations against the applicant are serious in nature and the statement of the deceased lends support to the prosecution case. 6. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that the applicant has been in judicial custody since 14.10.2025. It is also evident that the mobile phone of the applicant was recovered during the course of investigation; however, no photograph or video of the deceased, as allegedly used by the applicant for blackmailing her, is stated to have been recovered therefrom. Though the prosecution relies upon the statement allegedly made by the deceased while she was being taken to the hospital, the evidentiary value and effect of the said statement, as well as the precise nature and extent of the alleged harassment, would be matters for consideration during trial. At this stage, the Court cannot lose sight of the fact that the mere allegation of harassment, by itself, would not be sufficient to establish the offence of abetment of suicide unless the requisite ingredients thereof are prima facie established from the material on record.

			7. Having regard to the nature of the accusations, the circumstances emerging from the material collected during investigation, the absence of the alleged photographs or videos from the mobile phone recovered from the applicant, the period of incarceration already undergone by him and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered view that the applicant has made out a case for grant of bail. 8. Accordingly, the bail application is allowed. 9. Let the applicant be released on bail, on executing personal bond and furnishing two reliable sureties, each of like amount, to the satisfaction of Court concerned. **(Alok Mahra, J.)** 03.11.2026 *Arpan* ARPAN JAISWAL Digitally signed by ARPAN JAISWAL DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND, ou=HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND, 2.5.4.20=aabb68a3895e41937c266c23964c0485b5544f3e3a2566dfb73935989ffe493a3e, postalCode=263001, st=UTTARAKHAND, serialNumber=5E0FC1702283EAE3DE215D68D9D454C5199CB987446351E4DF04AADAA2C2CEA0G, cn=ARPAN JAISWAL Date: 2026.11.03 19:35:02 +05'30'

Digitally signed by ARPAN JAISWAL
DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND, ou=HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND, 2.5.4.20=aabb68a3895e41937c266c23964c0485b5544f3e3a2566dfb73935989ffe493a3e, postalCode=263001, st=UTTARAKHAND, serialNumber=5E0FC1702283EAE3DE215D68D9D454C5199CB987446351E4DF04AADAA2C2CEA0G, cn=ARPAN JAISWAL
Date: 2026.11.03 19:35:02 +05'30'