SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA 2nd No.49 of 2026 "Prakash Jain Vs. State of Uttarakhand" **Hon'ble Ashish Naithani, J.** Mr. Eshan Sachdeva, learned counsel for the Applicant through VC. 2. Mr. Pradeep Lohani, learned AGA with Mr. Chitrarth Kandpal, learned Brief Holder, for the State of Uttarakhand. 3. In the High Court of Uttarakhand, the present case arises from Bail Application filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking regular bail for the Applicant – Prakash Jain, who has been accused in FIR No.286 of 2025, under Sections 137 (2) and 65 (1) (charges not framed although mentioned in the bail rejection order) BNS and under Sections ¾ of the POCSO Act, at Police Station Raipur, District Dehradun. 4. The complainant in the present case has lodged an unnamed FIR with an averment that her daughter Veronica Gurung D/O Sanjay Gurung, aged 14 years, went somewhere from home yesterday on 8/9/2025 without informing anyone and has not returned home till now. Hence, I request you to kindly record the missing person report of my daughter. 5. The first bail application of the Applicant was withdrawn with a liberty to file afresh with better particulars vide order dated 26.02.2026 in BA 1st No.08/2026. This is the second bail application of the Applicant. 6. Learned counsel for the Applicant submits that the Applicant and the victim were old acquaintances and were in relationship. He further submits that he has not committed any

			offence of POCSO Act, and the Applicant is languishing in jail since 11.09.2025 and has no previous criminal history. Therefore, he prays that the Applicant may be enlarged on bail. 7. Bail application of the Applicant has been opposed by the learned State Counsel on the ground that the victim/prosecutrix is a minor girl and the consent of a minor is immaterial and does not admissible in the eyes of law, and therefore, prays that the Applicant may not be enlarged on bail. 8. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the victim/prosecutrix is 14 years of age, the Applicant has not made out a case for bail. 9. Consequently, the bail application of the Applicant – Prakash Jain S/o Shri Sharad Jain, is hereby rejected in connection with FIR No.286 of 2025, under Sections 137 (2) and 65 (1) (charges not framed although mentioned in the bail rejection order) BNS and under Sections ¾ of the POCSO Act, at Police Station Raipur, District Dehradun. **(Ashish Naithani, J.)** **29.04.2026** Nitesh/