SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA1/1034/2026 Kranta Nath --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. M.K. Goyal, learned counsel for the applicant. Mr. Pratiroop Pandey, 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. 0120 of 2026, registered at Police Station Doiwala, District Dehradun, for the offences punishable under Sections 3 and 25 of the Arms Act and Section 109 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. 3. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned State Counsel and perused the record. 4. As per the prosecution case, on 16.04.2026, while the police team was conducting routine vehicle checking near Chauk Hara Wala, Haridwar, on the basis of prior information regarding a suspicious white Swift Dzire car bearing registration No. UK08TA-9193, the said vehicle was signalled to stop. However, the driver allegedly attempted to flee and, after abandoning the vehicle, ran towards the nearby forest. When the police team chased him and asked him to surrender, he allegedly opened fire at the police party with the intention of killing its members. In self-defence, the police personnel also opened fire from their respective pistols, resulting in a gunshot injury to the right leg of the accused. The injured accused was apprehended and identified as Kranta Nath. During the course

			of investigation, one country-made pistol of .315 bore, along with live and empty cartridges, was allegedly recovered from his possession. 5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that the applicant was taken away from his house at about 6:30 a.m., whereas the alleged incident has subsequently been shown to have taken place after 1:00 p.m. It is further submitted that the State, deliberately, has not placed the medical report of the applicant on record along with the counter affidavit. However, learned counsel for the applicant has filed the medical report along with the rejoinder affidavit, which records the following injury: "Injury No. 1: A wound with inverted edges, red in colour, with slightly blackened edges, measuring approximately 1 cm × 0.9 cm, present on the medial aspect of the right leg, about 15 cm from the patella." 6. On the basis of the aforesaid medical report, learned counsel for the applicant submits that the presence of blackening around the margins of the gunshot wound indicates that the firearm was discharged from a very close range, allegedly within a distance of approximately three feet. It is, therefore, contended that the medical evidence creates doubt regarding the prosecution version of the incident. It is further submitted that the applicant has been in judicial custody since 17.04.2026. 7. Per contra, learned State Counsel has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that the applicant has a criminal history. In response, learned counsel for the applicant submits that the cases constituting the alleged criminal history relate to theft and that the applicant was not named in those cases. 8. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties

			and upon perusal of the material available on record, particularly the nature of the injury sustained by the applicant, as reflected in the medical report, which records the presence of slightly blackened margins around the wound, coupled with the submission that the applicant allegedly sustained the gunshot injury from a close range, whereas the prosecution attributes the injury to firing by the police personnel in the course of the alleged encounter, this Court finds that the medical evidence raises a *prima facie* question regarding the manner in which the incident occurred. Having regard to the aforesaid facts and circumstances and the overall material available on record, this Court is of the 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 upon furnishing a personal bond and two reliable sureties, each in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the court concerned. 11. It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove are confined to the adjudication of the present bail application and shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. 12. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of accordingly. **(Alok Mahra, J.)** 30-10-2026 SB
