SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA1/1566/2026 Sumit Singh Dhami --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand -Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. D.S. Mehta, learned counsel for the applicant Mr. Pratiroop Pandey, learned A.G.A. along with Mr. J.P. Kandpal, learned Brief Holder for the State of Uttarakhand. 2. The present bail application has been moved by the applicant, who is in judicial custody in connection with FIR No. 0015 of 2026, registered at Police Station Kotwali Didihat, District Pithoragarh, for the offence punishable under Section 103(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. 3. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned State Counsel and perused the material available on record. 4. As per the prosecution case, a complaint was lodged by the mother of the deceased, alleging therein that the deceased was returning in a taxi vehicle owned and driven by the applicant. Subsequently, the dead body of the deceased was found, giving rise to the suspicion that the deceased had been murdered by the applicant. 5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that there is no eyewitness to the alleged incident and that the applicant has been implicated solely on the basis of the alleged confessional statement and the circumstance of last seen together. It is further submitted that no discovery or recovery was effected at the instance of the applicant during the course of investigation. Neither was any weapon

			allegedly used in the commission of the offence recovered, nor was any bloodstain found inside the taxi vehicle allegedly driven by the applicant. Thus, there is no direct evidence connecting the applicant with the alleged commission of the offence. 6. Learned counsel further submits that the applicant is in judicial custody since 15.07.2026. It is also contended that, as per the medical report, the doctor has opined that the injuries found on the body of the deceased could have been caused due to a fall or by striking against a hard surface. It is further pointed out that, as per the prosecution case itself, the deceased was in an intoxicated condition at the relevant time. On these grounds, learned counsel submits that the applicant deserves to be enlarged on bail. 7. Per contra, learned State Counsel has opposed the prayer for grant of bail. 8. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that the case rests primarily upon circumstantial evidence, particularly the alleged circumstance of last seen together. There is no eyewitness to the alleged incident. Further, no weapon allegedly used in the commission of the offence has been recovered, nor has any bloodstain been detected inside the taxi vehicle allegedly driven by the applicant. This Court has also taken into consideration the medical opinion regarding the possible manner in which the injuries could have been sustained, as well as the fact that the deceased was allegedly in an intoxicated condition. 9. Having regard to the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of the evidence collected during the investigation and the period of incarceration undergone by the applicant, this Court is of the

			considered view that the applicant has made out a case for grant of 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 upon 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 India 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.)** 06-11-2026 SB