SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA1/1722/2025 Ravi Kumar Alias Gautam Kumar --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.** Mr. G.C. Lakhchaura, learned counsel for the applicant. 2. Mr. Baskar Chandra Joshi, learned AGA for the State. 3. Applicant-Ravi Kumar @ Gautam Kumar is facing incarceration pursuant to Case Crime/FIR No.14 of 2025 under Sections 3/4 of the POCSO Act and Section 65(1) of the BNS, 2023 (Challani P.S. Salt, Distt. Almora). 4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that applicant has falsely been implicated in the alleged offence and is innocent. He further submits that there is material variation in the prosecution's version and that even the identity of the applicant was not ascertained by the Police. He also submits that the medical evidence does not corroborate the prosecution's case. 5. Per contra, learned State Counsel submits that applicant was identified in the dock and during investigation, elder sister of the applicant showed the applicant's photograph on her mobile phone to the victim, who identified him. This fact was also narrated by the victim during trial when she was examined as PW2. He further submits that the prosecution's case

has remained consistent throughout and, therefore, no case is made out for bail.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having perused the record of the bail application, including the medical evidence, the statement recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS, 2023, the statement of PW1-Sushila Devi, and the statement of the Doctor who examined the victim immediately after the incident, this Court has also taken on record the evidence of PW2 for the prosecution, as provided by learned counsel for the applicant.

7. Having perused all these documents, this Court is of the view that, at no point of time, did the victim depart from the version she stated to the Doctor, to the Magistrate under Section 183 of the BNSS, 2023, or in her evidence before the trial court. The victim was 12 years of age on the date of the incident and was studying in Class-IX. During her examination before the trial court as PW2, she was pursuing her high school education. Applicant was 28 years of age at he time of occurrence.

8. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, no case is made out for releasing the applicant on bail. Accordingly, the bail application is rejected.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)
26.10.2026

AK