



2026:AHC:179313

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD**

**CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No.  
- 8128 of 2026**

Mukesh Kumar Singh

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite  
Party(s)

---

|                               |   |                           |
|-------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| Counsel for Applicant(s)      | : | Devidayal Tiwari, Jai Raj |
| Counsel for Opposite Party(s) | : | G.A.                      |

---

**Court No. - 71**

**HON'BLE RAJIV LOCHAN SHUKLA, J.**

1. Heard Learned counsel for the applicant and Learned A.G.A. for the State as well as perused the record.
2. The present anticipatory bail application has been filed on behalf of the applicant in Case Crime No.205 of 2025, under Sections 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340 B.N.S. Police Station Garautha, District Jhansi, with a prayer to enlarge him on anticipatory bail as the applicant apprehends his arrest in the abovementioned case.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant contends that the applicant is stated to be the District Coordinator of the IFFCO Tokio Insurance Company and the applicant and the other accused are said to have edited the Aadhaar cards and other documents of ten farmers and obtained fake insurance reimbursement. Learned counsel has stated that the co-accused Paras was arrested and he has been granted regular bail by this Court in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No.13595 of 2026. He further contends that co-accused Umesh Kumar, Smt. Roshni, Smt. Bharti, Smt. Phoolan Devi, Chhavilal and Smt. Ram Murti have been granted anticipatory bail by this Court. He further contends that Bhupendra Singh Rajput has been granted regular bail by this Court. The applicant has no criminal antecedents.
4. Learned AGA has opposed the prayer for bail and has contended that it was the applicant who had directed co-accused Paras Nayak to increase

the EMI of the company and then had also received his share of the misappropriated insurance amount. Learned AGA further contends that the computer used for the purposes of editing the documents of the farmers has also been recovered from the pointing out of co-accused Paras Nayak. He has not disputed the fact that the applicant has no criminal antecedents.

5. I have considered the submissions made by the Learned counsels for the parties.

6. From the perusal of the material on record, especially the statement of co-accused Paras Nayak, it appears that editing and uploading the fake documents was done by the co-accused. The applicant is said to have received a share of the amount misappropriated. There is no direct evidence of the applicant being the one who has received any part of the insurance amount in his account. The applicant is not named in the FIR. Co-accused Umesh Kumar, Smt. Roshni, Smt. Bharti, Smt. Phoolan Devi, Chhavilal and Smt. Ram Murti have been granted anticipatory bail by this Court. Co-accused Paras and Bhupendra Singh Rajput have been granted regular bail.

7. Taking note of the entire facts and circumstances of the case as also the fact that the case in question involves primarily documentary evidence, I deem it appropriate to grant bail to the applicant.

8. In view of the above, the anticipatory bail application of the applicant is ***allowed***.

9. In the event of the arrest of the applicant-**Mukesh Kumar Singh**, he shall be released forthwith in the aforesaid case crime on anticipatory bail on furnishing a personal bond and surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Station House Officer of the police station/Court concerned with the following conditions:-

- i. the applicant shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;
- ii. that the applicant 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. that the applicant shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

iv. that the applicant 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.

**(Rajiv Lochan Shukla,J.)**

**August 25, 2026**

A. Pandey