SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			UKHC010072632026 **BA1/729/2026** Piyush Kumar --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. D.K. Sharma, Sr. Advocate, assisted by Mr. Nivesh Bahuguna, Advocate for the applicant. 2. Mr. Dinesh Chauhan, A.G.A. for the State. 3. Applicant, who is in judicial custody in connection with Case Crime/F.I.R. No. 25 of 2026 registered at Police Station-Dineshpur, District Udham Singh Nagar for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 109(1), 191(2) 3(5) of B.N.S. has sought his release on bail. 4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record. 5. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant has falsely been implicated in the present case; that, as per the prosecution case, a matrimonial dispute had been subsisting between the complainant and his wife for the last several years. It is alleged that, on 17.02.2026, co-accused Aman Saha called his family members to the complainant's house, pursuant to which his mother, sister, brother and other persons allegedly reached there. An altercation and assault are stated to

			have taken place at the spot, during which the complainant's mother sustained injuries and subsequently succumbed to her injuries. 6. Learned counsel would further submit that the applicant has not been named in the F.I.R. and has neither carried any weapon nor assaulted the complainant or his mother. It is contended that the CCTV cameras installed at the place of occurrence are likely to capture the incident and may substantiate the applicant's contention regarding his role; that, rather than participating in the alleged assault, the applicant attempted to persuade the parties to resolve their matrimonial dispute amicably. 7. It is further submitted that the applicant is neither a family member nor a relative of any of the parties to the matrimonial dispute and is merely a friend of co-accused Aman Saha; that, the co-accused informed the applicant that a dispute had arisen between his sister and her husband and requested him to accompany him with a view to resolving the dispute amicably; that believing the said representation in good faith and without knowledge of the actual facts and circumstances of the dispute, the applicant accompanied him to the complainant's house. It is, therefore, contended that the applicant's presence at the spot, by itself, would not establish his involvement in the alleged offence. The only role assigned to the applicant is that since Aman Saha and his family members did not know how to drive the car, therefore, they asked the present applicant to drive their car and accompany them. Besides this, no other role has been assigned to the present applicant; that applicant is in judicial custody since 18.02.2026; that the co-accused have already been granted bail by this Court, therefore, applicant deserves to be enlarged on bail. 8. Per contra, learned State counsel would

			vehemently oppose the prayer for bail. However, the fact that the applicant has been in judicial custody since 18.02.2026 is not disputed. 9. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that the applicant has not been named in the F.I.R. The contention of learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant neither participated in the alleged assault nor was armed with any weapon, and that the CCTV footage may throw light on his actual role in the incident, and furthermore, the only role assigned to the applicant is that since Aman Saha and his family members did not know how to drive the car, therefore, they asked the present applicant to drive their car and accompany them and as such, besides this, no other role has been assigned to the present applicant, requires consideration at this stage. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of the allegations, the role attributed to the applicant, the period of incarceration undergone by him and the other relevant factors governing the grant of bail, this Court is of the view that the applicant has made out a case for bail. 10. Accordingly, the bail application is allowed. 11. Let the applicant be released on bail upon furnishing a personal bond and two reliable sureties, each in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the court concerned. **(Alok Mahra J.)** 03.11.2026 Ujjwal