SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA1/1429/2026 Raja Giri Alias Raja Goswami --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Harsh Vardhan Dhanik, learned counsel for the applicant. Mr. J.P. Kandpal, learned Brief Holder for the State of Uttarakhand. 2. The present bail application has been filed by the applicant, who is in judicial custody in connection with Case Crime No. 94 of 2026 (FIR No. 94 of 2026), dated 01.03.2026, registered at Police Station Rudrapur, District Udham Singh Nagar, for the offences punishable under Sections 109, 115(2), 118(1), 191(2), 191(3), 351(2) and 352 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. 3. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned State Counsel. Perused the material available on record. 4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and was not named in the FIR. It is further submitted that, after investigation, the charge-sheet has been filed against the applicant on the basis of the statements of the injured and the complainant, as well as upon perusal of the CCTV footage of the alleged incident. 5. On the previous occasion, learned State Counsel was directed to seek instructions as to whether the applicant was visible at the place of occurrence in the CCTV footage of the alleged incident and what specific role had been assigned to him. 6. In compliance with the aforesaid direction, learned State Counsel, on the basis of instructions received, submits that the

			applicant is not visible in the CCTV footage of the alleged incident. 7. Learned counsel for the applicant further submits that the statement of the injured was also recorded under Section 180 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, wherein the applicant was not named. It is further contended that the main accused, namely, Dr. Sachin Mandal, who was named in the FIR and to whom a specific role was assigned, has already been enlarged on bail. Therefore, the applicant is also entitled to be released on bail on the ground of parity. 8. Per contra, learned State Counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has opposed the prayer for grant of bail. 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 applicant has made out a case for grant of bail. It is pertinent to note that the applicant was not named in the FIR. Further, as submitted by learned counsel for the applicant, the applicant was also not named in the statement of the injured recorded during the course of investigation. Moreover, in response to the specific query raised by this Court on the previous occasion, learned State Counsel, on the basis of instructions received, has fairly submitted that the applicant is not visible in the CCTV footage of the alleged incident. It is also relevant to take note of the fact that the main accused, namely, Dr. Sachin Mandal, who was named in the FIR and against whom a specific role was attributed, has already been granted bail. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the nature of the allegations, the material collected during investigation and the principle of parity, this Court is of the considered view that the applicant deserves to

			be enlarged on bail. 10. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is inclined to enlarge the applicant on bail. The bail application is, accordingly, allowed. 11. Let the applicant be released on bail on executing a personal bond and furnishing two reliable sureties, each in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the Court concerned, subject to the following conditions: (i) The applicant shall regularly attend the proceedings before the learned Trial Court and shall not seek any unnecessary adjournment. (ii) The applicant shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade such person from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer. (iii) The applicant shall not leave the country without obtaining prior permission of the learned Trial Court. 12. It is clarified that, in the event of misuse of the liberty of bail or violation of any of the conditions imposed hereinabove, the complainant/informant shall be at liberty to move an appropriate application before the competent Court seeking cancellation of the applicant's bail. **(Alok Mahra, J.)** 26-11-2026 SB