SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			ABA/919/2025 Tafajjul --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Pranav Singh, Advocate for the applicant. Mr. Rakesh Kumar Joshi, A.G.A. and Mr. Manoj Bhatt, Brief Holder for the State of Uttarakhand. Mr. Gaurav Singh, Advocate for the complainant. 2. The applicant has preferred the present anticipatory bail application apprehending arrest in connection with F.I.R./Case Crime No.263 of 2025, registered under Sections 109(1), 115(2), 190, 191(2), 191(3), 352 of B.N.S., 2023, registered at Police Station Bhagwanpur, District Haridwar. 3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that applicant has neither been named in the First Information Report nor has any specific role been assigned to him therein. He further submits that four other co-accused persons have already been enlarged on regular bail and, therefore, the applicant is also entitled to the protection of anticipatory bail on the ground of parity. 4. Learned State Counsel, however, opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that, although the applicant may not have been named in the F.I.R., his name has subsequently surfaced in the statement of the victim, wherein a specific role has also been

attributed to him. It is, therefore, contended that the applicant cannot claim parity with the co-accused merely on the basis of their having been granted regular bail, particularly when the nature of allegations and the material available against the applicant are distinguishable.

5. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that the applicant has been specifically named and a role has been attributed to him in the statement of the victim. The fact that the applicant was not named in the F.I.R. by itself would not entitle him to the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail, particularly when his involvement has subsequently been disclosed by the victim. The grant of bail to other co-accused persons also does not, by itself, constitute a ground for extending the benefit of parity to the applicant. The question of parity has to be considered having regard to the specific allegations and the material available against each accused. In the present case, the specific role attributed to the applicant in the statement of the victim distinguishes his case from that of the co-accused who have been granted regular bail.

6. In view of the nature of allegations, the specific role attributed to the applicant and the material available against him, this Court is not inclined to exercise its discretionary jurisdiction in favour of the applicant. No ground for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

7. Accordingly, the present anticipatory bail application is dismissed.

(Alok Mahra, J.)
25.08.2026

Arpan

ARPAN
JAISWAL