SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA1/1046/2026 Sanjay Srivastava --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. M.K. Ray, Ms. Tijil Gangwar and Ms. Mahua Ray, Advocates for the applicant. Mr. Pramod Chandra Tewari, A.G.A. 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.206 of 2026, under Section 143(5) of B.N.S, Section 3, 4, 5, 6 of Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act, 1956 and Section 16/17 of POCSO Act, registered at Police Station Rudrapur, District Udham Singh Nagar. 3. As per the prosecution story, in the garb of SPA, prostitution racked was being conducted at a premise known as Beauty Queen Salon and Spa situated at Baba Chowk, Rudrapur, District U.S. Nagar and during the raid conducted by Anti Human Trafficking Unit, applicant was found present at the said premise. Some girls belonging to State of Mizoram were also present at the spot and upon being asked, allegations relating to immoral activities were levelled against the persons present at the spot. The Anti Human Trafficking Unit rescued those girls from there and

			recovered mobile phones and other articles from the spot and subsequently the F.I.R. 4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and has been languishing in judicial custody since 06.05.2026. It is contended that the applicant had visited the aforesaid premises merely for the purpose of repairing computers, as he had been called by the employer for the said work. He is neither an employee of the Spa nor concerned with its day-to-day activities and is merely a computer repair technician. It is further submitted that no specific role has been attributed to the applicant in the alleged immoral activities, except that he was found present at the premises at the time of the raid. Learned counsel further submits that the co-accused, namely, Deepak Singh, has already been enlarged on bail by this Court in BA1 No.1094 of 2026, vide order dated 03.11.2026. It is, therefore, contended that the applicant is also entitled to be released on bail on the ground of parity. 5. Per contra, learned State Counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail. 6. 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 was apprehended from the premises in question during the raid conducted by the Anti Human Trafficking Unit. However, the mere presence of the applicant at the premises, by itself, may not be sufficient to establish his involvement in the alleged activities,

			particularly when his specific defence is that he had visited the premises only for the purpose of repairing computers. The veracity of the said explanation is a matter to be examined during the course of trial. It is further relevant to note that the co-accused, namely, Deepak Singh, has already been enlarged on bail by this Court vide order dated 03.11.2026. The applicant has been in judicial custody since 06.05.2026. 7. In the facts and circumstances of the case, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the allegations and keeping in view the principle of parity, this Court is of the considered view that the applicant has made out a case for grant of bail. 8. Accordingly, the bail application is allowed. 9. 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.)** 17.11.2026 *Arpan*

ARPAN JAISWAL