


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 JUDGES'S</p>  <p style="text-align: right;">2026:UHC:3870</p>
			<p><b><u>BA1 No 819 of 2026</u></b>  Amjad <span style="float: right;">....Applicant</span>  <span style="display: block; text-align: center;">Vs.</span> State of Uttarakhand <span style="float: right;">.....Respondent</span>  <b><u>Hon'ble Ashish Naithani, J.</u></b>  Mr. Gaurav Singh, learned counsel for the Applicant.  2. Mr. Vikash Uniyal, learned A.G.A. for the State of Uttarakhand.  3. The present Bail Application has been moved by the Applicant—Amjad, S/o Sharafat, R/o Village Khelpur Nasrullapur, Police Station Bhagwanpur, District Haridwar, who is in judicial custody in connection with FIR/Case Crime No. 165 of 2026, registered at Police Station Bhagwanpur, District Haridwar, for offences punishable under Sections 3/5/11 of the Uttarakhand Protection of Cow Progeny Act, 2007.  4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.  5. Learned counsel for the Applicant, while pressing the bail application, submitted that the Applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and is in judicial custody since 08.05.2026. It is further submitted that the Applicant is not named in the FIR, as the FIR was lodged against one named accused person and one unknown person. Learned counsel for the Applicant contended that only on the basis of hearsay allegations and suspicion, the present Applicant has been implicated in the matter. It is also submitted that the name of the present Applicant does not find place in the FIR as a person allegedly seen at the spot and even as per the prosecution story, only co-accused Arshad was allegedly identified by the witnesses. It is further contended that the public witnesses cited in the FIR are interested witnesses and no independent local public</p>

witness of the alleged incident or recovery has been associated by the Investigating Agency.

6. Per contra, learned State Counsel opposed the bail application.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that the Applicant is not named in the FIR and the case against him appears to be based primarily on suspicion and subsequent implication during investigation. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the view that the Applicant has been able to make out a fit case for grant of bail.

8. Accordingly, the Bail Application is allowed.

9. 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.

10. It is made clear that any observation made hereinabove is only for the purpose of adjudication of the present bail application and shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

11. All pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

**(Ashish Naithani, J.)**

19.05.2026

Shiksha

--	--	--	--