Sl. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signature	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			ABA/372/2026 Pargat Singh Pannu & another --Applicants **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.** Mr. Shariq Khurshid, learned counsel for the applicants. 2. Ms. Rangoli Purohit, learned AGA for the State. 3. This anticipatory bail application has been moved by the applicants in connection with FIR No.0213 of 2026 dated 04.06.2026 registered with Police Station Kashipur, District Udham Singh Nagar, under Sections 111, 3(5), 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340 & 61(2) of BNS, 2023. 4. The allegations in the FIR against the accused persons are that they managed to procure forged gun licences from Shahjahanpur, Uttar Pradesh, and, on that basis, purchased guns from Kashipur Gun House. Upon inquiry, it was found that the licences had never been issued by the Office of the District Magistrate, Shahjahanpur, Uttar Pradesh. 5. Learned counsel for the applicants contends that both the applicants are not named in the FIR, therefore, they apprehend arrest during the pendency of the investigation and trial pursuant to the aforesaid FIR. 6. Counter affidavit was called from the State. 7. The State has filed its counter affidavit along with a delay condonation application (IA No. 1/2026). For the reasons stated therein, the delay condonation application is allowed. The delay in filing the counter affidavit is condoned. The counter affidavit is taken on record. 8. In the counter affidavit, it has been stated that names

of the applicants cropped up during the investigation. Learned State counsel submits that names of the applicants were disclosed by the owner of Kashipur Gun House, i.e., Saubhagya Tandon, who stated that these gun licences were made available by the applicants. She further submits that co-accused Saurabh Agrawal also named the applicants and stated that they had even offered him to get licence issued from the office of the District Magistrate, Shahjahanpur, Uttar Pradesh. Thus, she submits that there is ample material against the applicants and they indulged in a very serious and heinous offence, therefore, they do not deserve anticipatory bail.

9. Despite being given an opportunity, no rejoinder affidavit has been filed by the applicants.

10. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having perused the first information report along with the counter affidavit filed by the State, this Court is of the opinion that the allegations levelled against the applicants are very serious in nature and do not warrant any kind of protection for the applicants. Applicants have been named by co-accused-Saurabh Agrawal and the owner of the gun house-Saubhagya Tandon, from where the guns were purchased on the basis of forged licences.

11. In view of the aforesaid, no case is made out for the grant of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is dismissed.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)
17.11.2026

AK