



2026:AHC:163085

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 26195 of 2026

Rizwan

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Shams Uz Zaman
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	Adesh Kumar, G.A.

Court No. - 65

HON'BLE SAMEER JAIN, J.

1. Heard Sri Shams Uz Zaman, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Adesh Kumar, learned counsel for the informant and Sri Imran Khan, learned AGA, for the State.
2. The instant bail application has been filed on behalf of the applicant with the prayer to release him on bail in Case Crime No.187 of 2026, under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 109(1), 103(1), 352, 351(3) and 115(2) BNS and Section 4/25 Arms Act, Police Station Sardhana, District Meerut during pendency of the trial.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that however, applicant is named in the FIR but along with the applicant as many as nine others were also made accused and only general role has been assigned to all the accused.
4. He next argued that however, it is a case of double murder and in the incident five persons also sustained injuries but considering the fact that there are total ten named accused and only general and omnibus allegations have been made against all the accused prima facie it appears to be a case of over implication.
5. He further submits that applicant never participated in the alleged incident but as his father was also accused in the case, therefore, he has also been made accused along with him and others.
6. He further submits that applicant is not having any previous criminal history and in the present matter he is in jail since 26.3.2026 i.e., for the

last more than four months.

7. Per contra, learned AGA as well as learned counsel for the informant opposed the prayer for bail and submit that it is a case of double murder and in the alleged incident apart from two deceased, five persons also sustained injuries and they also categorically disclosed the name of the applicant and there is no reason to disbelieve their statements.

8. They further submitted that in the present matter two persons died and five persons sustained injuries therefore it cannot be said that it is a case of over implication.

9. They further submitted that even in the present matter applicant is in jail only since 26.3.2026. They further submits, therefore, considering the above facts of the case applicant should not be released on bail.

10. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case.

11. It is a case of double murder and in the alleged incident five persons also sustained injuries. Further, even applicant is named in the FIR and even injured persons also disclosed his name.

12. Further, however, in the FIR along with applicant nine others were also made accused and only general role has been assigned to all the accused but considering the fact that in the alleged incident two persons died and five persons sustained injuries, prima facie it does not appear to be a case of over implication.

13. Further, considering the fact that in the alleged incident five persons also sustained injuries, the argument advanced by learned AGA as well as learned counsel for the informant that there is no occasion to disbelieve their testimony, can also not be brushed aside at this stage.

14. Further, even in the present matter applicant is in jail only since 26.3.2026.

15. Therefore, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in my view, applicant is not entitled to be released on bail.

16. Accordingly, the instant bail application is **rejected**.

17. It is clarified that the observations made herein are limited to the facts brought in by the parties pertaining to the disposal of bail application and the said observations shall have no bearing on the merits of the case during trial.

(Sameer Jain,J.)

August 5, 2026
SKM