



2026:AHC:178538

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No.
- 8337 of 2026

Rajkumar Dubey

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	G.A., Ravikant Shukla
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.
2. The present anticipatory bail application has been filed on behalf of the applicant in Case Crime No. 68 of 2018, under Sections 120B, 409, 467, 468, 471 of the I.P.C., Police Station – Chhawani, District Kanpur Nagar, with a prayer to enlarge him on anticipatory bail, as the applicant apprehends his arrest in the aforesaid case.
3. The learned counsel for the applicant has contended that the applicant is the first informant in the present case. He had himself invested in the company in the name of his wife. On the basis of fake documents he was shown as one of the directors of the company. He however resigned in the year 2015 and came forth to lodge the FIR in the year 2018. The investigation in the case is pending since 01.07.2018, i.e. the date of lodging of the FIR, and only to create pressure on the applicant, the applicant is now being implicated in the present case. The learned counsel further contends that the applicant has been implicated in several cases with respect to misappropriation of the investors' money by the company Dhenu Green India Ltd., Denu Green Marketing Pvt. Ltd. Dhenu Agro Producer Co. Ltd. and other companies of the Dhenu Group. The applicant is not a previous convict.
4. The learned AGA has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and has contended that the applicant only to shield himself from criminal prosecution has lodged the present FIR. One of the investors has clearly

given a statement against the applicant.

5. Rejoining the issue, the learned counsel for the applicant has contended that in the first statement of the investors, the name of the applicant was not mentioned and it is in the subsequent statement that the applicant has been implicated.

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

7. The applicant himself is the first informant. The applicant claims to have invested the money in the name of his wife in the company in question. He also claims to have invested money of his relatives in the company. The applicant has criminal antecedents which are related to the company in question except one case of 2009 in which the applicant is on bail and the trial is also pending. The matter appears to now being investigated by the EOW. For the past almost eight years the investigation is still pending.

8. 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. In the event of the arrest of the applicant- **Rajkumar**, involved in the aforesaid case crime, he shall be released on 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;

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

12. 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 24, 2026
Kushal