SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA1/1522/2025 **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Karan Singh Dugtal, learned counsel for the applicant. 2. Mr. Askhay Latwal, learned A.G.A. for the State. 3. The present bail application has been filed seeking grant of regular bail in connection with F.I.R./Case Crime No. 94 of 2025, registered under Sections 64(2)(m), 351(3) of B.N.S. and Sections 5(j)(ii)/6 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, at Police Station Patnagar, District Udham Singh Nagar 4. Heard learned Senior Counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record. 5. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the F.I.R. has been lodged by the mother of the victim alleging that on 31.05.2025, her minor daughter complained of abdominal pain; that, upon being taken to the hospital, the doctor advised an ultrasound examination, which revealed that the victim was approximately 20 weeks pregnant; that, on being questioned, the victim allegedly disclosed that the present applicant, who used to visit her house for collection of installments, had established physical relations with her forcibly. 6. Learned counsel for the applicant would further submit that the applicant is innocent and has falsely been

			implicated in the present case; that, although the victim, in her statements recorded under Sections 181 and 183 of the B.N.S.S., supported the prosecution version, she resiled from her earlier statements when examined as PW-1 before the trial court and completely denied the allegations. She stated that she did not even know the identity of the person with whom she was allegedly in a relationship, resulting in the birth of a female child on 09.10.2025. It is further submitted that the statements recorded under Section 183 B.N.S.S. are materially contradictory; that, while the F.I.R. alleges that the applicant committed the act forcibly in the absence of the complainant, in subsequent statements the victim indicated that she had been in a consensual relationship over a period of time and shifted the blame onto the applicant only after he allegedly stopped communicating with her. 7. He would also submit that the applicant and the victim were known to each other for about one and a half years and were in a relationship; that, the victim at the time of incident, the victim was aged about 16 years and was sufficiently mature to understand the nature and consequences of her conduct; that, the applicant is in judicial custody since 09.06.2025; that, statements of the victim and the complainant have already been recorded and the charge-sheet has been filed; therefore, there is no likelihood of the applicant tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses; that, the bail application of the applicant was earlier rejected by the court below vide order dated 12.08.2025; that, the trial is likely

			to take considerable time to conclude, and hence the applicant deserves to be enlarged on bail. 8. Per contra, learned State Counsel would oppose the prayer for bail. However, he does not dispute that while the prosecutrix supported the prosecution case in her statements under Sections 181 and 183 B.N.S.S., she made contradictory statements during her deposition as PW-1, and that the applicant has remained in custody since 09.06.2025. 9. Having considered the rival submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties, and the overall facts and circumstances of the case, and without expressing any opinion on the merits, this Court is of the view that the applicant has made out a case for grant of bail. 10. Accordingly, the bail application is allowed. 11. Let the applicant, Sanjeev Kumar, be released on bail in the aforesaid case crime number upon furnishing a personal bond and two reliable sureties of the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned. **(Alok Mahra, J.)** 06.05.2026 Mamta