SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA1/1981/2026 Pradeep Saklani --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Ms. Divya Jain, learned counsel for the applicant. Mr. N.S. Kaniyal, learned A.G.A. for the State of Uttarakhand. 2. The present bail application has been filed by the applicant, who is in judicial custody in connection with FIR No. 326 of 2025, registered at Police Station Raipur, District Dehradun, for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340(2) and 61 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. 3. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned State Counsel and perused the material available on record. 4. As per the prosecution story, the applicant, along with two other co-accused, entered into an agreement to sell a piece of land and received a sum of ₹30,00,000/- from the complainant in that regard. It is further alleged that the complainant subsequently discovered that the land did not belong to Abhay Kumar, who had represented himself to be authorised by the bhumidhars of the land to execute the sale deed. It is alleged that when the complainant demanded the return of his money, the accused persons refused to refund the same and also extended threats to him. 5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the dispute in question is essentially civil in nature and that the complainant has given it a criminal colour. It is contended that the complainant, at best,

could have availed the civil remedy of instituting a suit for recovery of the amount allegedly paid by him, instead of invoking the criminal machinery. It is further submitted that the alleged agreement to sell was an unregistered document. Moreover, neither the applicant nor the other co-accused were recorded tenure-holders of the land in question, nor did they produce any power of attorney purportedly executed by the actual tenure-holders. It is, therefore, contended that the prosecution story, insofar as it implicates the applicant, is highly improbable. Learned counsel further submits that the applicant is in judicial custody since 22.05.2026.

6. Per contra, learned State Counsel has opposed the prayer for grant of bail.

7. Having considered the rival submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court is of the considered view that the applicant has made out a case for grant of bail.

8. 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.

9. Let the applicant be released on bail on his 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 the country

			without obtaining prior permission of the learned Trial Court. 10. 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.)** 19-11-2026 SB