SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			UKHC010156902026 **BA1/1518/2026** Mahendra Singh --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Parikshit Saini, Advocate for the applicant. 2. Mr. Manoj Bhatt, Brief Holder for the State. 3. The present bail application has been filed by the applicant, who is in judicial custody in connection with FIR No. 135 of 2026, registered at Police Station Kotwali Bhagwanpur, District Haridwar, for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340(2) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (B.N.S.). 4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record. 5. As per the prosecution case, one Dushyant Kumar is the Manager of the Committee of Management of Dayanand Anglo Vedic Shiksha Samaj Educational Society, Bhagwanpur, Haridwar, which runs and manages the affairs of B.D. Inter College, Bhagwanpur. It is alleged that the Dushyant Kumar, in connivance with certain other members of the society, executed a sale deed in favour of one Vinay Saini in respect of land belonging to the society without obtaining prior permission from the competent authority, namely, the Registrar under the Societies Registration Act. It is further alleged that, instead

			of depositing the sale consideration in the bank account of the society, they deposited the same in their personal accounts. According to the prosecution, the market value of the land was more than Rs.3.5 crores, whereas the sale deed was executed for a consideration of only Rs.1 crore, thereby causing loss to the society. 6. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that, prior to the execution of the sale deed, permission had been sought from the Registrar and that the Deputy Registrar had recommended the same and forwarded the relevant report to the Registrar. It is contended that the applicant was under a bona fide misconception of law and believed that the recommendation made by the Deputy Registrar amounted to permission for executing the sale deed. It is further submitted that the charge-sheet has already been filed and cognizance has also been taken in the matter. As per the charge-sheet, there are 30 prosecution witnesses; however, not a single prosecution witness has been examined till date. Learned counsel further submits that the applicant is a senior citizen and is suffering from a various health ailments. The applicant has been in judicial custody since 21.07.2026. It is also contended that the evidence in the case is documentary in nature and, therefore, there is no likelihood of the applicant tampering with the evidence. Furthermore, he has placed reliance upon paragraphs 10 and 11 of the judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Mahesh Chandra Joshi vs. State of Rajasthan, 2026 SCC OnLine 2197, in support of his submissions. It is also submitted by learned counsel for the applicant that the main accused, who is the beneficiary, has already been granted bail by this Court. 7. Per contra, learned State counsel and learned counsel for the complainant have opposed the bail application. 8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties

			and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that, having regard to the overall facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the fact that the applicant is a senior citizen suffering from various health ailments and requires continuous medical supervision, as well as the fact that not a single prosecution witness has been examined despite cognizance having been taken, the applicant's prayer for bail merits consideration. This Court also takes note of the submission that the evidence in the case is primarily documentary in nature. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the view that the applicant deserves to be enlarged on bail. 9. Accordingly, the bail application is allowed. 10. Let the applicant be released on bail upon furnishing a personal bond and two reliable sureties, each in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the court concerned. 11. It is made clear that any observation made hereinabove is confined to the adjudication of the present bail application and shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. **(Alok Mahra J.)** 29.10.2026 Ujjwal