SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA1/1232/2026 Sarfraj --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Gaurav Singh, learned counsel for the applicant. 2. Mr. Pramod Tiwari, learned A.G.A. for the State. 3. Applicant-Sarfraj, who is in judicial custody in connection with Case Crime/F.I.R. No. 111 of 2026 (F.I.R. dated 23.03.2026) registered at Police Station-SIDCUL, District Haridwar for the offences punishable under Sections 229(1), 318(4), 338, 340(2), 3(5) of the B.N.S. has sought his release on bail. 4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record. 5. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that, as per the prosecution case, the applicant, along with the other co-accused persons, is allegedly involved in a racket of professional sureties, wherein forged and fabricated documents are used for

			furnishing sureties before the learned Magistrate. It is alleged that, in furtherance of the said activity, the co-accused, namely, Satish, used a forged Khatauni purportedly prepared in the name of an Advocate. It is further alleged that the Aadhaar Card used by the said co-accused Satish contained the mobile number of the present applicant. 6. Learned counsel would further submit that the applicant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case; that, the applicant is not named in the F.I.R.; that he has neither forged any document nor furnished surety in any criminal case; that, he has never stood as a surety for any accused before any Court; and that, he has no association or connection with the other co-accused persons. It is further submitted that there is no call detail record or any other material to indicate that the applicant was in contact with the co-accused persons, who are residing at different places. 7. earned counsel would contend that the mere mention of the applicant's mobile number on the Aadhaar Card of co-accused Satish, in the absence of any other incriminating material connecting the applicant with the alleged offence, cannot, by itself, be sufficient to establish his involvement in the commission of the alleged crime

			He, therefore, submits that the implication of the applicant on such a solitary circumstance is unsustainable in law. 8. Learned counsel would also submit that the applicant is languishing in judicial custody since 26.03.2026; that, there is no likelihood of his absconding or tampering with the prosecution evidence, as he is a permanent resident of District Haridwar; and that, the trial is likely to take considerable time to reach its logical conclusion. On these grounds, learned counsel prays that the applicant be enlarged on bail. 9. Per contra, learned State counsel would vehemently oppose the prayer for bail. However, he does not dispute the fact that the applicant is in judicial custody since 26.03.2026. He also does not dispute that the applicant's alleged involvement in the present crime is primarily sought to be established on the basis of the mobile number of the applicant having been mentioned on the Aadhaar Card used by co-accused Satish. 10. 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 is not named in the F.I.R. and

			his alleged involvement is primarily sought to be attributed to the fact that his mobile number was mentioned on the Aadhaar Card used by co-accused Satish. There is no specific allegation that the applicant himself forged any document or furnished any false surety before the Court. Having regard to the nature of the allegations and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the view that the applicant has made out a case for grant of bail. 11. Accordingly, the bail application is allowed. 12. Let the applicant be released on bail, on his furnishing a personal bond and two reliable sureties, each in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the court concerned. **(Alok Mahra, J.)** 03.11.2026 Mamta