SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA1/962/2026 Pravesh --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Deep Chandra Joshi, learned counsel for the applicant. Mr. Prabhat Kandpal, learned A.G.A. for the State of Uttarakhand. 2. The present bail application has been filed by the applicant, who is in judicial custody in connection with FIR No. 517 of 2024, in SST No. 52 of 2025, registered at Police Station Rishikesh, District Dehradun, for the offences punishable under Sections 137(2), 351(3) and 64(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and Sections 5(j)(ii) read with Section 6 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (POCSO Act). 3. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned State Counsel and perused the material available on record. 4. The present case was initiated on the basis of a complaint lodged by the father of the victim. The victim was subsequently recovered from the company of the applicant. 5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant and the victim were in a love relationship and belonged to the same village. They had known each other since their childhood. It is further submitted that, in her statements recorded under Section 180 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, as well as before the Doctor at the time of her medical examination, the victim stated that she was in a love relationship with the applicant and had left her house because her family members had scolded her. However, the victim subsequently took a completely

			contradictory stand in her deposition before the Court while being examined as PW-1. Learned counsel further submits that the victim was above 17 years of age at the time of the alleged incident, whereas the applicant was about 20 years old. It is contended that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and has been in judicial custody since 02.03.2025. On these grounds, learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is entitled to be enlarged on bail. 6. Per contra, learned State Counsel has opposed the prayer for grant of bail. 7. Having considered the rival submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that the applicant has been in judicial custody since 02.03.2025. It further appears that there are material contradictions in the statements made by the victim at different stages of the proceedings. Having regard to the period of incarceration undergone by the applicant and the aforesaid circumstances, this Court is of the considered view that the applicant has made out a case for grant of bail. 8. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is inclined to enlarge the applicant on bail. The bail application is, accordingly, allowed. 9. Let the applicant be released on bail on his executing a personal bond and furnishing two reliable sureties, each in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the Court concerned, subject to the following conditions: (i) The applicant shall regularly attend the proceedings before the learned Trial Court and shall not seek any unnecessary adjournment. (ii) The applicant shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade such person from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer. (iii) The applicant shall not leave the country

			without obtaining prior permission of the learned Trial Court. 10. It is clarified that, in the event of misuse of the liberty of bail or violation of any of the conditions imposed hereinabove, the complainant/informant shall be at liberty to move an appropriate application before the competent Court seeking cancellation of the applicant's bail. **(Alok Mahra, J.)** 19-11-2026 SB