SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			UKHC010066862026 **BA1/668/2026** Vinay Saini --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Ms. Medha Pande, Advocate for the applicant. 2. Mr. Manoj Bhatt, Brief Holder for the State. 3. The applicant, who is in judicial custody in connection with FIR/Case Crime No. 48 of 2026, under Sections 351(2), 351(3), 352, 308(4) of BNS and Section 67 of I.T. Act, registered at P.S.-Kotwali Kotdwar, District Pauri Garhwal, has sought his release on bail. 4. Initially an FIR was lodged by the complainant alleging therein that the applicant has created a fake I.D. of the complainant in a social media platform and is posting obscene comments on the said I.D. of the complainant and is threatening and blackmailing the complainant. 5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that admittedly applicant and the complainant were in relationship and only after the break-up of their relationship, this concocted story has been developed by the complainant; that the applicant gave some friendly loan to the complainant and when the applicant asked for

			the said amount, the complainant refused to pay the same and lodged the FIR-in-question totally based on false and concocted story; that the phone of the applicant was taken into custody and was sent for forensic examination, but, therein, no such videos or messages were discovered, as has been narrated in the prosecution story; that applicant has falsely been implicated in the case and he is in judicial custody since 13.03.2026, therefore, the applicant deserves to be enlarged on bail. 6. Learned State Counsel, on the other hand, has vehemently opposed the bail application. 7. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the records. 8. Having considered the submissions, under the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the fact that admittedly applicant and the complainant were in relationship and all this dispute arose after their break-up and, in fact, phone of the applicant was also taken into custody and was sent for forensic examination, but, therein, no such videos or messages were discovered, as has been narrated in the prosecution story, this Court is of the view that it is a case fit for bail and the applicant deserves to be enlarged on bail. 9. The bail application is allowed. 10. 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 Ujjwal