SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			UKHC010097152026 **BA1/994/2026** Jayesh Kumar Nandwal --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. D.C.S. Rawat, Sr. Advocate, assisted by Mr. Abhishek Verma and Mr. Rajendra Kumar Chauhan, Advocates for the applicant. 2. Mr. Dinesh Chauhan, A.G.A. for the State. 3. The applicant, who is in judicial custody in connection with FIR/Case Crime No. 289 of 2026, under Sections 109(1) and 352 of BNS, registered at P.S.-Patel Nagar, District Dehradun, has sought his release on bail. 4. As per the prosecution story, the applicant, who is the resident of State of Rajasthan, was interested in marrying the sister of the complainant and used to visit their house and was known to family of the complainant. On the fateful day, he visited complainant's house, whereby applicant informed that his marriage has been fixed somewhere; thereafter, he requested the complainant to drop him to I.S.B.T., and on the way, when they were consuming beer,

			applicant pulled out a fruit knife and threatened the complainant to take the car back to his house and as the complainant took the car back to his colony, in the courtyard of the colony, where mother of the complainant was also present, applicant assaulted the complainant as well as mother of the complainant in which mother of the applicant got injured. 5. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that applicant has falsely been implicated in the case; that though scuffle took place between applicant and the complainant, but, the applicant also sustained injuries in the incident; that there was no prior motive on the part of the applicant to commit the act, therefore, ingredients of Section 109(1) of BNS are not *prima facie* made out in the case and that the applicant is languishing in jail since 12.05.2026. 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 applicant also sustained injuries in the incident and as such there was no prior motive on the part of the applicant to commit the act, this Court is of the view that it is a case fit for bail and the applicant deserves to be enlarged on bail. 9. Accordingly, the bail application is allowed.

			10. Let the applicant be released on bail on his executing a personal bond and furnishing two reliable sureties each of the like amount, to the satisfaction of the court concerned. **(Alok Mahra J.)** 31.10.2026 Ujjwal