SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			ABA/456/2026 Noor Begum Alias Nasima & others --Applicants **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand & another --Respondents **Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.** Ms. Swaleha Hussain, learned counsel for the applicants. 2. Mr. Tumul K. Nainwal, learned AGA for the State. 3. Applicants are seeking anticipatory bail in connection with FIR No.0228 of 2026 dated 14.09.2026, under Sections 109, 115(2), 123, 351(3), 352, & 85 of BNS, 2023 and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, registered at Police Station Kotwali Sahaspur, District Dehradun. 4. Applicants are seeking anticipatory bail in connection with FIR No. 0228 of 2026, dated 14.09.2026, under Sections 109, 115(2), 123, 351(3), 352 and 85 of the BNS, 2023, and Sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, registered at Police Station Kotwali Sahaspur, District Dehradun. 5. As per the allegations made in the FIR lodged by the brother of the victim, namely, Sahil, S/o Late Roshan, the sister of the informant was harassed by the applicants-accused persons. Her husband was allegedly drunk and committed marpeet with the victim-Nargis and pressured her to give him triple talaq. On 10.08.2026, in order to kill the victim, poison was administered to her by the accused

persons. She was first admitted to Subharti Hospital and subsequently, she was admitted by her brother to Mahant Indiresh Hospital, Dehradun, where she remained admitted for 25 days. It was further alleged in the FIR that she was harassed on account of demand of dowry and, for that reason, she was harassed and threatened with triple talaq by her husband.

6. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that there is a delay of 35 days in lodging the first information report. She further submits that victim consumed poison of her own will and poison was not administered to her by the applicants. She further submits that after the incident, on the very next day, a written agreement was given by the victim stating that she would not repeat the incident again.

7. Per contra, learned State counsel, on the basis of instructions supplied to him, which are taken on record, submits that the victim was rushed to the hospital on 10.08.2026. Her statement was recorded by the Tehsildar concerned, and in that statement, she categorically stated that poison was administered to her by her sister-in-law and mother-in-law, while her husband was sitting in the same room. It is for this reason the case was registered under Section 109 of the BNS, 2023, along with the other relevant sections.

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the FIR, this Court is of the view

that the allegations made in the FIR are very serious. Coupled with the statement given by the victim to the Tehsildar, Sahaspur, on the date of the incident, this Court is of the view that this is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is rejected.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)
05.11.2026

AK

AVNEET KAUR