



2026:AHC:170367

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

**CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No.
- 7708 of 2026**

Deepak

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Kameshwar Singh, Sudhanshu Kumar
Singh
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.50 of 2017, under Section 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 61(2) B.N.S., Police Station Jarcha, District Gautam Budh Nagar, 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 has contended that the applicant has not been named in the FIR. The sale deeds in question were executed by one Khushboo Devi. After his implication in the present case, the applicant was subsequently implicated in five other cases, all relating to the same transactions. Learned counsel for the applicant has further contended that one of the accused, who is named in the FIR, Ramesh, has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court in NABAIL No.5337 of 2026. He further submits that other accused, Saurabh Singh and Poonam Rana, have been granted regular bail by this Court in Bail Application No.20758 of 2026 and 20367 of 2026. Co-accused Praveena Rana and Mamta Kumari have also been granted anticipatory bail by this Court in NABAIL No.7328 of 2026 and 7288 of 2026. The case of the applicant stands on a similar footing. The applicant has no previous criminal case to his credit except the six cases which have been registered pertaining to the

transactions in question.

4. Learned AGA has opposed the prayer for bail, however, does not dispute the fact that the case of the applicant stands on a similar footing to that of the co-accused.

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

6. The applicant is not named in the FIR. The applicant has no criminal antecedents. The six cases that have been shown against the applicant all relate to the present controversy. The applicant is not the vendor nor the vendee and is also not shown as a marginal witness in the sale deeds. Similarly situated co-accused have been granted bail by this court.

7. Taking into account the facts and circumstances of the case, I deem it appropriate to enlarge applicant on anticipatory bail.

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-**Deepak**, 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 13, 2026

A. Pandey