SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA1/1366/2026 Pramod Nautiyal --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Sandeep Tiwari and Mr. Vinod Nautiyal (through Video Conferencing), learned counsel for the applicant. 2. Ms. Meenkashi Sharma and Mr. Himanshu Sain, learned Brief Holder for the State. 3. Applicant-Pramod Nautiyal, who is in judicial custody in connection with Case Crime/F.I.R. No. 0006 of 2026 for the offences punishable under Sections 306, 316(5), 317(2) and 61(2) of B.N.S. registered at Police Station- Shri Badrinath, District Chamoli, 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 the applicant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case; that, the F.I.R. was lodged against the applicant on the basis of a preliminary enquiry, wherein it was alleged that the applicant was seen taking

			some money during the counting of the amount collected under the head of 'Thali Bhet Calculation'. He would further submit that during the course of investigation; that, the applicant was arrested and, after completion of the investigation, the charge-sheet has been submitted, wherein recovery of ₹5,000/- has been shown to have been made at the pointing out of the applicant from a room situated in a Dharamshala at Shri Badrinath Temple. 6. Learned counsel for the applicant would further submit that although the applicant was arrested on 12.07.2026, the alleged recovery of ₹5,000/- was effected on 28.07.2026, i.e., after a considerable delay of more than sixteen days from his arrest. It is further contended that the alleged recovery was made from a room situated in a Dharamshala, which was accessible to the public and devotees, and, therefore, the recovery is required to be considered in the aforesaid factual context. He would also submit that at the time of the applicant's arrest, a Shaligram was allegedly recovered from his house, but apart from the aforesaid articles, no other incriminating article was recovered from his possession or residence. 7. Learned counsel would also submit that the applicant is a permanent resident of District Dehradun and has deep roots in society; that, there is no likelihood of his absconding or fleeing from the process of law; and that there is no reasonable apprehension of his tampering with the

			prosecution evidence or influencing the witnesses. He would further submit that the investigation is complete and the charge-sheet has already been filed, whereas the trial is likely to take considerable time to reach its logical conclusion. On these grounds, learned counsel prays that the applicant may be enlarged on bail. 8. Per contra, learned State counsel would vehemently oppose the prayer for bail. However, he does not dispute the fact that the charge-sheet has been filed and the alleged recovery was effected after a considerable lapse of time from the arrest of the applicant. 9. 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 investigation has been completed and the charge-sheet has already been submitted. The alleged recovery of ₹5,000/- is stated to have been effected from a room situated in a Dharamshala, which, as per the submission of learned counsel for the applicant, was accessible to the public and devotees. It is also relevant to take note of the fact that the alleged recovery was made on 28.07.2026, whereas the applicant was arrested on 12.07.2026. Having regard to the nature of the allegations, the stage of the proceedings, the period of incarceration and the overall facts and circumstances of the case, 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.

10. Accordingly, the bail application is allowed.

11. Let the applicant be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond and two reliable sureties, each in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the court concerned, subject to the following conditions:

(i) The applicant shall not, directly or indirectly, threaten, induce or influence any person acquainted with the facts of the case.
(ii) the applicant shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence or influence any witness.
(iii) the applicant shall cooperate with the investigation and trial and regularly appear before the Trial Court, unless exempted.
(v) the applicant shall not leave India without prior permission of the Court concerned.
(vi) The applicant shall furnish his current residential addresses and mobile numbers to the Investigating Officer/Court concerned and promptly intimate any change therein.

11. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail granted to the applicant.

MAMTA RANI

(Alok Mahra, J.)
06.11.2026

Mamta

Digitally signed by MAMTA RANI
DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND, ou=HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND, 2.5.4.20=6a812005bebfcf46f244f3e584af1449e430ef900bf09a6d67ebbd642671329b, postalCode=263001, st=Uttarakhand, serialNumber=5de1751a4f1d9cabfd54852c9e68911ca8b66dd26690a191648ab5d8dd004ef0, cn=MAMTA RANI
Date: 2026.11.06 16:26:25 +05'30'