SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA1/1817/2026 Anurag Dobhal --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. D.C.S. Rawat, learned senior counsel assisted by Mr. Bharat Chaudhary, learned counsel for the applicant. 2. Mr. Pradeep Lohani, learned A.G.A. for the State. 3. Applicant – Anurag Dobhal, who is in judicial custody in connection with Case Crime/F.I.R. No. 411 of 2026, registered at Police Station Nehru Colony, District Dehradun, for the offence punishable under Sections 117(2), 191(2), 351(3), 140(1), 3(5) of B.N.S. has sought his release on bail. 4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record. 5. Learned senior counsel for the applicant would submit that the F.I.R. was lodged by the informant alleging that the applicant, along with 8–10

			other persons, assaulted him, attempted to kill him and tried to abduct him. He would further submit that the applicant is the brother-in-law of the informant, as the applicant's cousin sister is married to the informant; that, there was some matrimonial discord between the informant and the applicant's cousin sister; that, on the date of the alleged incident, the applicant called the informant to a cafe to discuss and resolve the matrimonial dispute concerning his cousin sister. 6. Learned senior counsel would further submit that the F.I.R. was initially registered under Sections 117(2), 191(2) and 351(3) of the B.N.S. however, during the course of investigation, Section 140(1) of the B.N.S. was also added. He would further submit that the essential ingredients of the offence under Section 140(1) of the B.N.S. are not attracted against the applicant, as there is no allegation to establish that the applicant compelled or forced the informant to accompany him against his will. He would further submit that, as recorded in the impugned bail rejection order, the injuries sustained by the informant/injured are simple in nature. It is further contended that the applicant has been implicated in the present case in the backdrop of a

			matrimonial dispute and that the co-accused has already been enlarged on bail. 7. Learned senior counsel would further submit that the applicant has been in judicial custody since 05.10.2026; that he is a permanent resident of District Dehradun and, therefore, there is no likelihood of his absconding; and that the trial is not likely to conclude in the near future. In view of the aforesaid submissions, learned senior counsel prays that the applicant be enlarged on bail. 8. Per contra, learned State counsel would vehemently oppose the prayer for bail. However, he does not dispute that the bail rejection order records the injuries sustained by the informant/injured to be simple in nature or that the applicant is in judicial custody. 9. Having considered the rival submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court takes note of the nature of the allegations, the submission that the injuries sustained by the informant/injured are simple in nature, the period of incarceration undergone by the applicant, the fact that the co-accused has already been enlarged on bail. These circumstances

			are relevant for consideration of the present bail application. 10. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the view that the applicant has made out a case for grant of bail. 11. Accordingly, the first bail application is allowed. 12. Let the applicant be released on bail upon furnishing a personal bond and two reliable sureties, each in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the court concerned. **(Alok Mahra J.)** 29.10.2026 Mamta