SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA1/818/2026 Vishal --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Lalit Sharma and Mr. Gaurav Singh, Advocate for the applicant. Mr. Chitrarth Kandpal, Brief Holder for the State of Uttarakhand. 2. This first bail application has been moved by the applicant seeking regular bail in F.I.R./ Case Crime No.21 of 2026, under Section 103(1), 3(5) of B.N.S., 2023, registered at Police Station Kotwali Haridwar, District Haridwar. 3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and has no criminal antecedents. He further submits that the applicant has been languishing in judicial custody since 11.01.2026. It is contended that, apart from the statement of the alleged eyewitness, there is no independent or corroborative evidence to substantiate the prosecution case. Learned counsel further submits that the allegation made by the eyewitness that the applicant deliberately crushed the deceased and ran over his body is not borne out from the medical evidence on record. In this regard, he has drawn the attention of the Court to the post-mortem report and the statement of the doctor, which indicate a fracture in the parieto-occipital region of the skull and opine that the cause of death was ante-mortem head injury accompanied by haemorrhagic shock. It is, thus, contended that the medical evidence does not, at this stage, conclusively support the specific manner of assault attributed to the

			applicant by the alleged eyewitness. It is further submitted that the co-accused have already been enlarged on bail and, therefore, the applicant is also entitled to the benefit of parity. He lastly submits that the investigation has been completed and the charge-sheet has already been submitted before the competent Court. Thus, no further custodial interrogation of the applicant is required. The applicant undertakes to abide by all the conditions imposed by this Court and shall regularly attend the trial. 4. Per contra, learned State Counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail. He submits that the offence alleged against the applicant is grave and serious in nature. He further submits that the applicant is a resident of a place outside the State of Uttarakhand and, therefore, in the event of his release on bail, appropriate and stringent conditions may be imposed to ensure his presence during the trial. 5. 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 no criminal antecedents and has been in judicial custody since 11.01.2026. The investigation has already been concluded and the charge-sheet has been filed. Therefore, his further detention does not appear to be necessary for the purpose of investigation. 6. It is also relevant to take note of the fact that the prosecution case, as projected, primarily rests upon the statement of an alleged eyewitness. The specific allegation regarding the manner in which the deceased was allegedly run over by the applicant requires consideration during the course of trial, particularly in the light of the medical evidence available on record. The post-mortem report and the statement of the doctor indicate a fracture in the parieto-occipital region of the skull and attribute the cause of death to ante-mortem head injury accompanied by haemorrhagic shock. 7. Considering the nature of the accusations, the material available on record, the period of incarceration undergone by the applicant, the fact that the investigation has been completed and the charge-sheet has been filed, the absence

			of criminal antecedents, as well as the fact that the co-accused have already been granted bail, this Court is of the considered view that further incarceration of the applicant is not warranted at this stage. 8. Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the allegations, this Court is of the considered view that the applicant has made out a case for grant of bail. 9. Accordingly, 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.)** 02.11.2026 *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=eabb6bc38f95e41937c266c23964c048553654465e3a20d8db739339ff0fe45ba3e, postalCode=263001, st=UTTARAKHAND, serialNumber=060FC17022BEAE9DE215D68D904545C5109CB9B7F44635114DF04AAD3AA2C2CEA66, cn=ARPAN JAISWAL Date: 2026.11.02 19:05:37 +05'30'