SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA1/1616/2026 Neelam --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Prashant Khanna, learned counsel for the applicant through video conferencing. 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/Case Crime No. 148 of 2026, registered at Police Station Rajpur, District Dehradun, for the offences punishable under Sections 64 read with Section 3(5), 87 and 143 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and Sections 16/17 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012. 3. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned State Counsel and perused the material available on record. 4. The complainant lodged a missing report on 05.07.2026, alleging therein that her minor daughter, aged about 15½ years, had been missing since 04.07.2026. Upon investigation, the victim was recovered on 01.08.2026. During the course of investigation, it emerged that the victim had left her house and gone along with co-accused Pinky and Lavi to Muzaffarnagar, where they allegedly forced her to marry one Manish. It further came to light during the investigation that the victim was

			allegedly sold by co-accused Pinky and Lavi to Manish for a sum of ₹1,50,000/-. 5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant, who is also the mother of the victim and the complainant in the present case, has been implicated in the matter on the basis of the alleged confessional statement of the co-accused, according to which, out of the total amount of Rs.1,50,000/-, a sum of ₹80,000/- was allegedly paid to the applicant. It is contended that there is no independent evidence on record to establish that any such amount was paid to the applicant by the co-accused. It is further submitted that the alleged statement of the co-accused, insofar as it relates to the payment of money to the applicant, is not corroborated by any other material collected during the investigation. 6. Learned counsel further submits that even in her statement recorded under Section 183 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, the victim has categorically stated that she had left her house and thereafter went along with co-accused Pinky and Lavi, who allegedly forced her to marry Manish. It is also submitted that co-accused Pinky and Lavi have already been enlarged on bail by the learned Trial Court. In the absence of any independent evidence establishing the alleged payment of ₹80,000/- to the present applicant, 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 allegation against the applicant

			regarding receipt of ₹80,000/- out of the alleged sale consideration of ₹1,50,000/- is primarily based on the statement of the co-accused. No independent material or evidence has been brought to the notice of this Court to substantiate the alleged payment of the said amount to the applicant. Further, this Court has also taken into consideration the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, as well as the fact that co-accused Pinky and Lavi have already been enlarged on bail by the learned Trial Court. Having regard to the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered view that the applicant has made out a case for grant of bail. 9. 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. 10. 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. 11. 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