SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			BA1/2016/2025 Hon'ble Rakesh Thapliyal, J. (Through V.C.) 1. Mr. Harshpal Sekhon, learned counsel for the applicant. 2. Mr. G.S. Sandhu, learned Addl. Advocate General with Mr. Himanshu Sain, learned Brief Holder for the State. 3. Present applicant Taufiq Ahmad, S/o Shahbuddin is praying for bail in reference to FIR dated 26.03.2025, bearing FIR No. 86 of 2025 at P.S. Sitarganj District U.S. Nagar, wherein the present applicant has been implicated for the offences punishable under Section 80(2), 85 of BNS 2023. 4. It is argued by the learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated and there is no demand of dowry which is evident from the statements of the parents of the victim. He further submits that present applicant is languishing in jail since 28.03.2025, and now charge sheet has already been filed and two other co-accused mother and sister of the applicant have already been enlarged on bail. He submits that present applicant married with the deceased in the year 2021, and, since, the applicant is druggist there may be possibility that deceased (wife of the present applicant) committed suicide by hanging. He further submits that since now charge sheet has been filed, as such, there is no need of custodial interrogation of the applicant and taking into consideration that applicant is languishing in jail since 28.03.2025, the applicant be released on bail. 5. On the other side, Mr. Sandhu, learned Addl. Advocate General with Mr. Himanshu Sain, learned Brief Holder for

			the State seriously opposed the bail application by submitting that the applicant does not deserve for bail since after this incident applicant and his family members communicated to the parents of the deceased that deceased died due to cardiac arrest, though, as a matter of fact she died due to hanging. He further submits that not only this, after this incident applicant as well as all the family members left the place of incident which, in fact, is the house of the present applicant and when the family members of the deceased reached no one was there which is also evident from the inquest report, as the inquest report is signed by the family member of deceased and neither the applicant nor their family members were present at the time of preparation of inquest report. He submits that due to the conduct of the present applicant and other family members wrong information was given to the parents of the deceased that deceased died due to cardiac arrest and after the incident they ran away by leaving the dead body of the deceased. 6. So far as grant of bail of the other accused is concerned Mr. Sandhu, submits that both the co-accused are females, i.e., mother and sister of the applicant, therefore, the applicant cannot claim parity of other accused. 7. After hearing the arguments of the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the conduct of the present applicant and their family members this Court is of the view that the applicant does not deserve for bail. 8. Accordingly, bail application is rejected. (Rakesh Thapliyal, J.) 28.11.2025 Parul
