


SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	<p style="text-align: right;">COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS</p>  <p style="text-align: right;">2026:UHC:3850</p>
			<p><u>BA 1st No.308 of 2026</u> Vinay Kumar Maurya Vs. State of Uttarakhand</p> <p style="text-align: right;">.....Applicant ...Respondent</p> <p><u>Hon'ble Ashish Naithani, J.</u></p> <p>Mr. Vipul Sharma, Mr. Maneesh Bisht, learned counsel for the Applicant.</p> <p>2. Mr. Pradeep Lohani, learned AGA, for the State of Uttarakhand.</p> <p>3. In the High Court of Uttarakhand, the present case arises from Bail Application filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking regular bail for the Applicant – Vijay Kumar Maurya, who has been accused in FIR No.262 of 2025, under Sections 137 (2), 351 (2), 65 (1) and 352 of the Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023 and under Sections 3/4 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, at Police Station Transit Camp, District Udham Singh Nagar, Uttarakhand.</p> <p>4. The FIR has been lodged by the Complainant with the averments that one Vijay Maurya, was a frequent visitor to my neighbour's house. Vijay lured her 15-year-old daughter, Mehak, and took her with him. On the afternoon of 10.10.2024, Vijay took Mehak to his house on the pretext of introducing her to his sister-in-law. Then, under the pretext of showing her a room, Vijay took her inside a room on the roof. He closed the door of the room and, under threat, forcibly had sexual intercourse with Mehak. When Mehak told all these things to her grandmother and me, the Complainant, out of public concern, explained to Vijay at that time and complained to his parents, then Vijay stopped coming to the neighbour's house and started following her daughter Mehak</p>

while she was going to school and forcing her to come with him by threatening to defame her. On 28.08.2025, Vijay forcibly took the Complainant's daughter Mehak with him on his scooter to Jai Nagar. Mehak somehow managed to escape and returned home. Then Vijay abused the Complainant and her husband over the phone and threatened to kill them.

5. Learned counsel for the Applicant submits, for the consideration of the bail, that the Applicant has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that there is ten days' delay in lodging the FIR. It is also contended by the learned counsel for the Applicant that in the present matter Applicant and the Victim are the teenagers. He further submits that the Applicant has been languishing in jail since 12.09.2025.

6. The bail application of the Applicant has been vehemently opposed by the learned State Counsel on the ground that the age of the victim is 15 years, who is a minor, and the Applicant has committed sexual offence against a minor, and learned State Counsel prays that the Applicant may not be enlarged on bail.

7. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the Applicant has not made out a case for bail. Consequently, the bail application is **rejected** in connection with the FIR No.262 of 2025, under Sections 137 (2), 351 (2), 65 (1) and 352 of the Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023 and under Sections 3/4 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, at Police Station Transit Camp, District Udham Singh Nagar, Uttarakhand.

(Ashish Naithani, J.)

19.05.2026

--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--