

SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<p><b><u>CRJA No. 52 of 2024</u></b></p> <p>Gufram <span style="float: right;">--Appellant</span></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Versus</b></p> <p>State of Uttarakhand <span style="float: right;">--Respondent</span></p> <p><b><u>Hon'ble Ashish Naithani, J.,</u></b></p> <p>Mr. Mohd. Safdar, learned counsel for the Appellant.</p> <p>2. Mr. S.S. Chauhan, learned Deputy Advocate General assisted by Mr. Vikash Uniyal, learned A.G.A. for the State of Uttarakhand.</p> <p>3. The matter is fixed for hearing on the Bail Application of the Appellant.</p> <p>4. Heard learned counsel for the parties on the Bail Application (I.A. No. 01 of 2025).</p> <p>5. The main grounds advanced by learned counsel for the Appellant are, firstly, that the Appellant is an old and infirm person aged about 76 years and has already undergone almost half of the sentence of five years' rigorous imprisonment awarded to him; and secondly, that the mother of the victim did not support the prosecution case and has turned hostile. It is prayed that, on the cumulative grounds mentioned above, the Appellant be enlarged on bail during the pendency of the appeal.</p> <p>6. Learned State Counsel has vehemently opposed the bail application, contending that the present matter relates to sexual assault by the Appellant upon a five-year-old girl child, who has supported the prosecution case. It is further submitted that the allegations are grave in nature and, therefore, the Appellant is not entitled to bail.</p> <p>7. Considering the FIR lodged against the Appellant and the statement of the victim recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C., this Court does not find sufficient grounds for granting bail.</p> <p>8. As per the FIR, it is alleged that a video of the sexual assault upon the minor girl child, who is the victim in the present case,</p>

went viral, wherein the Appellant is seen engaging in obscene physical acts falling within the ambit of sexual assault. The victim has specifically named the Appellant as the person who exploited her.

9. Considering the gravity of the offence and the overall facts and circumstances of the case, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the appeal, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the Appellant on bail at this stage.

10. Accordingly, the Bail Application (I.A. No. 01 of 2025) is rejected.

11. List this case on 20.05.2026.

**(Ashish Naithani, J.)**  
**23.03.2026**

Shiksha

--	--	--	--