
(2025) 12 UK CK 0050

Uttarakhand HC

Case No: First Bail Application No. 2439 Of 2025

Kuldeep Nandrajog

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Uttarakhand

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Dec. 17, 2025

Acts Referred:

- Indian Penal Code, 1860 - Section 120B, 420
- Constitution Of India, 1950 - Article 21

Hon'ble Judges: Alok Kumar Verma, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Sharang Dhulia, Tumul Nainwal, Chitrarth Kandpal

Final Decision: Allowed

Judgement

Alok Kumar Verma, J

1. Applicant-Kuldeep Nandrajog is in judicial custody for the offence punishable under Section 420 and Section 120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 in Case Crime No.210 of 2024, registered at Police Station Bahadarabad, District Haridwar.
2. According to the First Information Report dated 17.04.2024, the informant Mukesh invested a sum of Rs.4,02,424/-(Rupees Four Lakh two Thousand Four Hundred Twenty Four) with M/S Octagon Builders and Promoters Private Ltd. for a developed plot, but, the builder has not handed over the plot to him yet. Now, the builder is allotting undeveloped plot.
3. Heard Mr. Sharang Dhulia, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr. Tumul Nainwal, learned Assistant Government Advocate for the respondent.
4. Mr. Sharang Dhulia, Advocate, contended that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present matter. The informant was dealt with by Vibhu Vishwabandhu, the director of the company, and the entire responsibility of selling the plot was of Vibhu Vishwabandhu. Applicant had no connection with the sale of

the plot to the informant. He had not cheated the informant. He had not received any amount from the informant. The company has gone under liquidation. The matter is pending before the Honble High Court of Delhi. Applicant is in custody for a long period. He is a permanent resident of Delhi, therefore, there is no possibility of his absconding. Charge-sheet has already been filed, therefore, there is no chance of tampering with the evidence.

5. Mr. Tumul Nainwal, learned Assistant Government Advocate, has opposed the bail application orally.

6. Bail is the rule and committal to jail is an exception. Refusal of bail is a restriction on the personal liberty of the individual, guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The object of keeping the accused person in detention during the trial is not punishment. The main purpose is manifestly to secure the attendance of the accused.

7. Having considered the submissions of learned counsel for both the parties and in the facts and circumstances of the case, no reason is found to keep the applicant behind the bars for an indefinite period, therefore, without expressing any opinion as to the merits of the case, this Court is of the view that the applicant deserves bail at this stage.

8. The Bail Application is allowed.

9. Let the applicant- Kuldeep Nandrajog be released on bail on his executing a personal bond and furnishing two reliable sureties, each in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the court concerned.