



2026:AHC:165110

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No.
- 7678 of 2026

Yaseen @ Guddu And Another

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Ajit Kumar
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 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 applicants in Case Crime No. 791 of 2016, under Sections 420, 406 IPC, Police Station- Delhi Gate, District Aligarh, with a prayer to enlarge them on anticipatory bail as the applicants apprehend their arrest in the abovementioned case.
3. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the applicants have been falsely implicated in the present case. The chargesheet had been filed against the applicants for offences under Sections 406 and 420 IPC and this Court in Application U/s 482 No.4894 of 2018 by the order dated 15.02.2018 was pleased to grant an interim order and further proceedings of the case were stayed.
4. Learned AGA has pointed out that the interim order granted to the applicant was no longer in force and this Court by the order dated 03.11.2022 has recorded that after arguments the Learned counsel for the applicant not pressed the prayers for quashing of the chargesheet dated 01.04.2017 and sought a direction to appear before the concerned Court within two weeks and apply for bail, which may be decided expeditiously in view of the judgement of the Supreme Court in the case of **Satender Kumar Antil vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and another (2021)**

10 SCC 773. The said application was disposed of on the said prayer and since 03.11.2022, the applicant has not appeared before the concerned Court and has quite belatedly appeared before the Sessions Court to seek anticipatory bail. He states that the applicant, who is also a previous convict having been convicted in ST No.877 of 2013 for a period of eight years and who is on bail under the orders of this Court passed in Appeal No.228 of 2020, may not be considered for grant of anticipatory bail.

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

6. This Court on 03.11.2022 passed the following orders in Application under Section 482 No.4894 of 2018:-

*"Learned counsel for the applicants after arguing for sometime on instructions submits that he is not pressing the prayers made in this application for quashing the charge-sheet dated 01.04.2017 arising out of Case Crime No.0791/2016, under Sections 406 and 420 IPC, Police Station Delhi Gate, District Aligarh and prayed that the applicants are desirous to appear before the trial court within a period of two weeks, file bail application and in case the bail application is filed, the same may be decided expeditiously in view of the judgment of Supreme Court in **Satender Kumar Antil vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and another, (2021) 10 SCC 773.***

In view of the above, prayers made in this application are rejected.

*Application is disposed of with the direction that in the event applicants honour their undertaking and file appropriate bail application, Trial Court will undertake all endeavour to decide the same expeditiously in accordance with law considering the judgment passed by Supreme Court in **Satender Kumar Antil vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and another, (2021) 10 SCC 773.**"*

7. The counsel for the applicant claims that the applicant was not informed by his previous Counsel regarding the passing of this order, however, in the prima facie opinion of this Court, the said submission is misconceived. No reasonable explanation for the excessive delay in approaching the Court for seeking anticipatory bail is given. The offences in question are not punishable in the event of conviction for a period of more than seven years and the direction given by the Supreme Court in

the case of **Satender Kumar Antil (supra)** are applicable to the case of the applicant. No direction is required to be given for the said order of the Supreme Court to be given consideration in favour of the applicant while considering his bail.

8. Taking into account the facts and circumstances of the case, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

9. The anticipatory bail application of the applicants is hereby ***rejected***.

10. 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 6, 2026

A. Pandey