



2026:AHC:165761

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 27586 of 2026

Vinod

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	: S.M.Faraz I. Kazmi
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	: Durgesh Dubey, G.A., Kulveer Singh

Court No. - 65

HON'BLE SAMEER JAIN, J.

1. Heard Sri S.M.Faraz I.Kazmi, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Kulveer Singh, learned counsel for 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.423 of 2026, under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 115(2), 352, 351(3), 109(1), 103(1) and 3(5) BNS, Police Station Deoband, District Saharanpur during pendency of the trial.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that however, applicant is named in the FIR along with his father and three others and according to FIR all the accused persons after snatching gun from the informant opened fire upon his father due to which he sustained injuries and died and in the incident even informant also sustained injury but during investigation when the statement of the informant was recorded then he categorically stated that co-accused Pratap @ Pappu , the father of the applicant, after taking gun from his hand opened fire due to which his father died and therefore, role of causing fire arm injury to the deceased has been attributed to co-accused Pratap @ Pappu.
4. He further argued that however, in the present matter informant also sustained injuries but from his injury report it reflects that his injuries were simple in nature except injury no.1 and his injuries were also not dangerous to life.
5. He further submits, applicant is not having any criminal history and in the

present matter he is in jail since 14.6.2026 i.e., for the last more than a month.

6. Per contra, learned AGA as well as learned counsel for informant although opposed the prayer for bail but could not dispute the argument on facts advanced by the learned counsel for the applicant.

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

8. However, applicant is in jail in the present matter only since 14.6.2026 but from the record it reflects, co-accused Pratap @ Pappu is principal accused who by causing fire arm injury committed the murder of the deceased.

9. Further, however, in the alleged incident informant also sustained injuries but his injuries do not appear to be dangerous for life and even with regard to injury sustained by injured i.e. informant only general role has been assigned to all the accused including applicant.

10. Further, considering the fact that applicant is son of principal accused, the reason of his false implication disclosed by learned counsel for the applicant during the course of argument cannot be completely ruled out at this stage.

11. Further, applicant is not having any other criminal history.

12. Therefore, considering the facts and circumstances of the case discussed above, in my view, applicant is entitled to be released on bail.

13. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant bail application is allowed.

14. Let the applicant -**Vinod** be released on bail in the aforesaid case on furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned with the following conditions:-

(i) The applicant shall appear before the trial court on the dates fixed, unless his personal presence is exempted.

(ii) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly, make inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade her from disclosing such facts to the Court or any police officer or tamper

with the evidence.

(iii) The applicant shall not indulge in any criminal and anti-social activity.

15. In case of breach of any of the above condition, the prosecution will be at liberty to move an application before this Court for cancellation of the bail of the applicant.

16. 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.

August 7, 2026
AK Pandey

(Sameer Jain,J.)