SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA1/1802/2026 Manojeet --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Shubham Pandey, learned legal aid counsel for the applicant. 2. Mr. Rakesh Joshi, learned A.G.A. along with Mr. Manoj Bhatt, learned Brief Holder for the State. 3. Applicant-Manojeet, who is in judicial custody in connection with F.I.R./Case Crime No.295 of 2025, under Sections 137(2), 87, 65(1) of B.N.S. and 5/6 of POCSO Act registered at Police Station Khatima, District Udham Singh Nagar has sought his release on bail. 4. Learned legal aid counsel for the applicant would submit that, as per the prosecution case, an F.I.R. has been registered against the applicant alleging that he lured and induced his 12-year-old daughter. He would further submit that the applicant and the complainant are neighbours and, owing to certain personal enmity, the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present

			case; that, the applicant is innocent and that the allegations levelled against him are false and fabricated. 5. Learned legal aid counsel would further submit that, prima facie, the essential ingredients of the alleged offences are not attracted against the applicant; that, the applicant was arrested on 15.10.2025 and that there is no clinching evidence establishing his involvement in the alleged offence. He would further contended that there is no likelihood of the applicant absconding or tampering with the prosecution evidence, as the charge-sheet has already been filed and the applicant is a permanent resident of District Udham Singh Nagar; that, the trial is likely to take considerable time to reach its logical conclusion. Thus, the applicant be enlarged on bail. 6. Per contra, learned State counsel would vehemently oppose the prayer for bail and submit that, in her statements recorded under Sections 180 and 183 of the B.N.S.S., the minor victim has specifically stated that the applicant took her to Sitarganj on the pretext of taking her to a fair and thereafter took her to Rudrapur and Delhi, where he allegedly established physical relations with her on two or three occasions. He would further submit that the victim has consistently supported the prosecution case in her statements and

			that the medical report also support to the prosecution version. It is contended that, having regard to the nature and gravity of the allegations involving a minor child, the applicant does not deserve the concession of bail. 7. 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 victim is stated to be 12 years of age; that, the allegations against the applicant are serious in nature and involve the alleged sexual exploitation of a minor child. The victim, in her statements recorded under Sections 180 and 183 of the B.N.S.S., has specifically attributed the alleged acts to the applicant and has supported the prosecution version. Accordingly, no case for grant of bail is made out. 8. Accordingly, the bail application is rejected. **(Alok Mahra, J.)** 23.11.2026 Mamta