SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA1/894/2026 Rajneesh Alias Ranu --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **With** **BA1/935/2026** Ankush --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Tejas Agarrwal, learned counsel for the applicant in BA1 No. 894 of 2023 and Mr. Tushar Prajapati, learned counsel (through video conferencing) for the applicant. Mr. Chitrarth Kandpal, learned Brief Holder for the State of Uttarakhand. 2. The present bail applications have been moved by the applicants, namely, Rajneesh alias Ranu and Ankush, who are in judicial custody in connection with Case Crime/FIR No. 201 of 2025, registered at Police Station Kotdwar, District Pauri Garhwal, for the offences punishable under Sections 61, 64(1), 137(2), 351 and 352 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and Sections 3/4 of the POCSO Act. 3. Heard learned counsel for the applicants and learned State Counsel and perused the material available on record. 4. As per the prosecution story, an FIR was lodged by the sister of the victim, alleging that the applicants had

			lured the victim to a hotel in Haridwar, where they plied her with alcohol and established physical relations with her. 5. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the applicants have been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that neither the FIR nor the statement of the victim recorded before the learned trial court specifies any particular date or place of the alleged incident, and only general allegations have been levelled against the applicants, thereby creating serious doubt regarding the veracity of the prosecution story. It is further submitted that the victim and the complainant have already been examined as PW-3 and PW-4, respectively, and, therefore, there is no likelihood of their being influenced or the evidence being tampered with. It is also pointed out that the applicants have been in judicial custody since 03.09.2025. 6. Per contra, learned State Counsel has opposed the prayer for grant of bail. 7. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, particularly the fact that the victim and the complainant have already been examined before the learned trial court, this Court is of the view that the apprehension of tampering with their testimony stands substantially obviated. In the aforesaid circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the applicants have made out a case for grant of bail. 8. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case or the ultimate outcome of the trial, this Court is inclined to enlarge the applicants on bail. 9. The bail applications are, accordingly, allowed.

			10. Let the applicants be released on bail upon their executing personal bonds and furnishing two reliable sureties each in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the Court concerned. **(Alok Mahra, J.)** 05-11-2026 SB