SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA1/1112/2026 Rahul Arya --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Deepak Joshi, learned counsel for the applicant. Mr. Deepak Bisht, learned Deputy Advocate General for the State of Uttarakhand. 2. The present bail application has been moved by the applicant, who is in judicial custody in connection with Special Sessions Trial No. 51 of 2025, *State vs. Rahul Arya*, arising out of FIR No. 128 of 2025, dated 24.05.2025, registered under Sections 65(1) and 64(2)(m) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and Sections 5(l), 5(j)(ii)/6 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, at Police Station Mukhani, District Nainital. The trial is pending before the Court of learned Special Judge, POCSO Act, Haldwani, District Nainital. 3. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned State Counsel and perused the material available on record. 4. As per the prosecution case, the complaint was lodged by the mother of the victim, alleging that the victim complained of stomach pain and was taken to the hospital, whereupon it came to light that she was approximately six months pregnant. On being questioned, the victim allegedly disclosed that the applicant was responsible for the pregnancy. After completion of the investigation, the charge-sheet was

			submitted against the applicant. The statements of the victim, her mother and her father have been recorded before the trial court. The victim, whose age is stated to be 17 years, has admitted that she had been in a relationship with the applicant for more than four years. She has further stated that the applicant never forced her and that there were no physical relations between them. 5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and that the victim, her mother and her father have not supported the prosecution case in their statements recorded before the trial court. It is further submitted that the applicant is in judicial custody since 25.05.2025. Since the victim and the complainant have already been examined before the trial court, there is no likelihood of the applicant tampering with the evidence or influencing the witnesses. 6. Per contra, learned State Counsel has opposed the prayer for bail. 7. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, particularly the statements of the victim and her parents recorded before the trial court, the period of incarceration undergone by the applicant and the stage of the trial, 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 or the ultimate outcome of the trial, this Court is inclined to enlarge the applicant on bail. 9. The bail application is, accordingly, allowed. 10. Let the applicant be released on

			bail upon executing a personal bond and furnishing two reliable sureties, each in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the Court concerned. **(Alok Mahra, J.)** 04-11-2026 SNB SNBERA BHUDELA