



2026:AHC:179780

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No.
- 8290 of 2026

Rajkumar Dubey

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Ravikant Shukla
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 71

HON'BLE RAJIV LOCHAN SHUKLA, J.

1. This Court on 13.08.2026 passed the following order :

"1. The learned counsel for the applicant states that the case of the applicant is at par with that of the co-accused Devendra Prakash Tiwari, who has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court in NABAIL No. 4061 of 2026.

2. The learned A.G.A. states that he has not received instructions and prays for a short time.

3. The learned A.G.A. is granted ten days' time to seek instructions.

4. Taking into account the fact that the applicant claims parity with that of the co-accused Devendra Prakash Tiwari, a case for grant of interim anticipatory bail is made out.

5. Put up as fresh on 25.08.2026 at 2 p.m.

6. Till 25.08.2026, in the event of the arrest of the applicant- Rajkumar Dubey, involved in Case Crime No. 50 of 2017, under Sections 409, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the I.P.C., Police Station Chhawani, District Kanpur Nagar, he shall be released on interim anticipatory bail on his 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. 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. The applicant shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

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

7. In default of any of the conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to file appropriate application for cancellation of interim anticipatory bail granted to the applicant."

2. Today, when the case has been called on, the learned A.G.A. states that he has received instructions.

3. Heard learned counsel for the applicant; and the learned A.G.A. for the State.

4. The learned counsel for the applicant has stated that the applicant was the director of Dhenu Group of Companies and had resigned in the year 2015. The allegation is of embezzlement of Rs.65 crores belonging to the company. The offence, as per the FIR, was committed between 2016 and 2017 i.e. after the resignation of the applicant from the company. The applicant has a criminal history of four other cases, three of which relate to the same facts and circumstances, as involved in the present case, and in one previous case, being Case Crime No.521 of 2009, which has been shown against the applicant, the applicant is on bail. Co-accused Devendra Prakash Tiwari has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court in NABAIL No.4061 of 2026.

5. The learned A.G.A. has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail, however, has not disputed the explanation given by the applicant with respect to his criminal antecedents.

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

7. Similar allegations have been made against the accused Devendra Prakash Tiwari in the FIR, who had been granted anticipatory bail by this Court. The applicant has duly explained his criminal antecedents. In the prima facie opinion of the Court, the applicant is not a flight risk. The FIR was lodged in the year 2017 i.e. 3.4.2017 and the investigation has been pending since the last nine years. There is no allegation against the

applicant of violating the interim anticipatory bail granted to him under order of this Court.

8. In view of the entire facts and circumstances of the case, I deem it appropriate to confirm the interim anticipatory bail granted to the applicant. 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.

9. The anticipatory bail application of the applicant is **allowed**.

10. The interim anticipatory bail granted to the applicant is hereby confirmed. In the event of the arrest of the applicant- **Rajkumar Dubey**, in the above mentioned case, he shall be enlarged on anticipatory bail, on the same terms and conditions, as fixed in the earlier order dated 13.08.2026.

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
Kushal