SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			UKHC010171282026 **BA1/1624/2026** Shayam Shahu --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Gaurav Pawar, Advocate, holding brief of Ms. Prabha Naithani, Advocate for the applicant. 2. Mr. Dinesh Chauhan, A.G.A. for the State. 3. The applicant, who is in judicial custody in connection with FIR/Case Crime No. 84 of 2026, under Sections 351(1), 61(2) and 70(1) of BNS, registered at P.S.- Kotwali Haridwar, District Haridwar, has sought his release on bail. 4. As per the prosecution story, on 27.02.2026, complainant travelled from Palwal to Haridwar and reached Haridwar Bus Stand at about 06:00 PM. Thereafter, she boarded an auto-rickshaw for going to Raja Biscuit Chowk, but, instead of dropping her to her destination, the auto-driver, who is the present applicant, asked her to sit in a Taxi saying that the driver thereof would drop her to her destination. The said Taxi, which was being driven by co-accused Ankit Verma, allegedly took her to a hotel at Haridwar, which was situated nearby bus stand and thereafter the present applicant (auto-driver) also came there and both taxi driver as well as auto-driver committed rape

upon her and on the next day, dropped her at SIDCUL crossing.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that applicant has falsely been implicated in the case; that totally false and concocted story has been developed in the FIR; that the age of the complainant is 28 years and after lodging of the FIR, she was medically examined and as per the medical report, no sign of sexual assault was found; that there are material contradictions in the statement of the complainant recorded under Sections 180 and 183 of BNSS inasmuch as she was familiar with the names of both, taxi driver as well as auto driver and also of Manager of the Hotel, which she has clearly mentioned in her statements also and the story narrated by her appears to be highly improbable, that furthermore the complainant failed to raise any hue and cry when she was sexually assaulted, which makes the story highly doubtful.

6. Learned State Counsel, on the other hand, has vehemently opposed the bail application.

7. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the records.

8. Having considered the submissions, under the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the view that it is a case fit for bail and the applicant deserves to be enlarged on bail.

9. Accordingly, the bail application is allowed.

10. Let the applicant be released on bail on his executing a personal bond and furnishing two reliable sureties each of the like amount, to the satisfaction of the court concerned.

(Alok Mahra J.)
31.10.2026

Ujjwal