SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA2/149/2026 Aman Khan --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Ms. Surraiya Naaz, learned counsel for the applicant. 2. Ms. Meenakshi Sharma and Mr. Himanshu Sain, learned Brief Holder for the State. 3. Applicant- Aman Khan, who is in judicial custody in connection with FIR/Case Crime No. 358 of 2026 under Sections 64, 351(2) and 352 of B.N.S. registered at Police Station Patel Nagar, District Dehradun has sought his release on bail. 4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record. 5. This is second bail application. 1st Bail Application was dismissed as withdrawn. 6. Initially, an F.I.R. was lodged by the victim alleging that the applicant, who was known to her for about one year and resided in her neighbourhood, had established forcible physical relations with her by extending threats of dire consequences. 7. Learned counsel for the applicant

			would submit that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present matter; that, the F.I.R. has been lodged after an unexplained delay, as the alleged incident took place in April, 2026, whereas the F.I.R. was registered on 08.06.2026; that, the applicant and the complainant are residents of the same locality and have known each other for about one year; and that minor disputes used to take place from time to time between the applicant and the husband of the complainant, owing to which the present F.I.R. has been lodged with an ulterior motive. 8. She would further submit that the victim is a 28-year-old married woman having two children, whereas the applicant is a young man aged about 25 years; that, in her statements recorded under Sections 180 and 183 of the B.N.S.S., the victim has given contradictory versions regarding the period of her acquaintance with the applicant, as at one place she stated that she had known him for more than one year, whereas at another place she stated that she had known him for only about two months. 9. She has also drawn the attention of the Court to the statement of the complainant's husband recorded under Section 180 of the B.N.S.S., wherein he stated that the brother of the complainant had seen the complainant with the applicant while he (the husband) was away at work. She would further submit that the applicant is languishing in jail since 11.06.2026;

			that he is a permanent resident of District Dehradun and there is no likelihood of his absconding or tampering with the prosecution evidence; and that the trial is not likely to conclude in the near future. Accordingly, she prays that the applicant be enlarged on bail. 10. Per contra, learned State counsel would vehemently oppose the prayer for bail. However, he does not dispute the fact that there are certain contradictions in the statements of the complainant. 11. Having considered the nature and gravity of the allegations, the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties, the contradictions appearing in the statements of the complainant, the period of incarceration undergone by the applicant, the applicant has made out a case for grant of bail. 12. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the bail application is allowed. The applicant shall be released on bail upon executing a personal bond and furnishing two reliable sureties of the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned. Mamta MAMTA RANI Digitally signed by MAMTA RANI DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND, ou=HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND, 2.5.4.20=6a81205bebfcf46f244f3e584af1449e430ef900bf09a6d67ebbd642671329b, postalCode=263001, st=Uttarakhand, serialNumber=5de1751a4f1d9ca0fd5485c9e6897fca8b66dd266 90a191648ab5d8dd004ef0, cn=MAMTA RANI Date: 2026.11.03 11:26:59 +05'30' **(Alok Mahra, J.)** 31.10.2026
