



2026:AHC:180761

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S
482 BNSS No. - 7956 of 2026

Sanjay And 3 Others

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Abhishek Dwivedi, Sunil
Kumar Dwivedi
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A.

Court No. - 71

HON'BLE RAJIV LOCHAN SHUKLA, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicants; and learned AGA for the State.
2. The present anticipatory bail application has been filed on behalf of the applicant in Case Crime No. 143 of 2026, under Sections 131, 115(2), 76 and 110 of the B.N.S., 2023, Police Station – Narsena, District Bulandshahar, with a prayer to enlarge them on anticipatory bail, as the applicants apprehend their arrest in the aforesaid case.
3. Learned counsel for the applicants has contended that the incident in question is said to be of 31.03.2026, however the First Information Report (FIR) has been lodged with an excessive delay of more than two months, on 06.06.2026. Learned counsel has further submitted that none of the injuries sustained by the two injured were found to be dangerous to life and a solitary fracture of a finger has been shown to the injured Gaurav. There is a property dispute between the parties. The parties are closely related to each other and it is due to this property dispute that this false FIR has been lodged. Charge sheet has already been submitted and the applicants are no longer required for any custodial interrogation or recoveries.
4. The learned AGA has opposed the prayer for bail, however

does not dispute the contentions on fact raised by the learned counsel for the applicants. He has pointed out that the applicant nos. 1 to 3 have a criminal history of one other case. He, however, does not dispute the explanation given by the applicants with respect to the said criminal history.

5. I have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties.

6. The applicants were not arrested during investigation. None of the injuries received by the two injured can be stated to be dangerous to life. Prima facie, from the perusal of the entire material on record, no offence under Section 110 of the BNS appears to be made out. The applicants have properly explained their criminal antecedents. Although the maximum punishment which can be imposed in the event of a conviction is not more than seven years, however, Section 110 of the B.N.S. is a sessions triable offence.

7. Taking into consideration the entire facts and circumstances of the case, as discussed above, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the applicant on anticipatory bail.

8. The anticipatory bail application of the applicants is **allowed.**

9. The applicants - **Sanjay, Shyopal, Naipal and Sushil @ Kalu** shall appear before the trial Court within four weeks from today and shall be released on bail on filing their personal bond and surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Court concerned with the following conditions:-

- i. The applicants shall remain present before the trial Court on each date fixed unless exempted by the trial Court;
- ii. The applicants shall not, directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;
- iii. The applicants shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

iv. The applicants shall not pressurize/intimidate the prosecution witness;

10. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, the Court concerned shall be at liberty to cancel the bail.

11. It is made clear that observations made hereinabove are exclusively for deciding the instant anticipatory bail application and are not to be considered to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

August 31, 2026

Kushal

(Rajiv Lochan Shukla,J.)