



2026:AHC:174084

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

**CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No.
- 7841 of 2026**

Kuldeep Prajapati

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Anurudh Kumar Prajapati, Deepak
Kumar Prajapati
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : Babul Kumar Sharma, G.A.

Court No. - 71

HON'BLE RAJIV LOCHAN SHUKLA, J.

1. Heard Learned counsel for the applicant, Shri Babul Kumar Sharma, Learned counsel for the informant 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.527 of 2025 under Sections 318(4), 351(3) 338, 336 (3), 340 (2) Police Station-Nawabad, B.N.S., District-Jhansi, 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 been falsely implicated in the present case. The allegations are of promising employment under the NHM or the Medical College in district Jhansi on payment of money. Learned counsel for the applicant contends that no such job can be obtained by payment of money. The allegations against the applicant have been leveled falsely. The monetary transactions can only be traced to the wife of the applicant and there is no transaction in the account of the applicant which may indicate his complicity in the said crime. The applicant has a criminal history of one other case in which a final report has been submitted by the police. The applicant has also filed a divorce petition against his wife.

4. Learned counsel for the informant has submitted that the applicant and his wife have taken huge sums of money by promising employment to

innocent and unknowing persons. The monetary transactions have been made into the bank account of the wife of the applicant and cash has been taken by the applicant. He has stated that as the applicant was a regularly employed Ward Boy, he deliberately took money in the account of his wife to shield himself from any departmental action regarding unknown source of income. Learned counsel for the informant has further submitted that statements of witnesses Sahab Singh Pal and Smt. Kunti Raikwar have been recorded who have also been duped by the applicant and his wife and in their statements they have clearly mentioned transfer of money into the bank account of the co-accused. The applicant has a criminal history of a similar case lodged at PS Nadbai, District Bharatpur, State Rajasthan, in which also the applicant and his wife were nominated for taking money to secure a job at District Jhansi. Even though a final report has been submitted in the said case, the applicant and his wife duping innocent persons is clear from the statement of witnesses recorded in the present investigation.

5. Learned AGA has adopted the submissions made by the learned counsel for the informant. However, he has not reported any other criminal antecedents than the one explained by the learned counsel for the applicant.

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

7. This Court in Criminal Misc. Writ Petition No.4985 of 2026, while refusing to quash the first information report filed, observed as follows:

"Money taken from members of the public for offering employment under the Government by unauthorized men, has become a menace. No doubt, it is equally a menace that the public too, are ready to shell out money, virtually becoming parties, to the offence themselves."

8. Other than the informant, one Sahab Singh Pal and Smt. Kunti Raikwar have also disclosed that the applicant and his wife had promised employment in the medical college. Details of the transactions made in the account of the wife of the applicant, Kanchan Prajapati, have been disclosed in the statements of the said witnesses. From the material

collected during investigation the chain of circumstances appearing against the applicant is compelling and requires thorough investigation. In the opinion of the court, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out and the application for anticipatory bail is hereby ***rejected***.

9. 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. It is provided that in case the applicant appears and applies for regular bail before the concerned Court, his bail application shall be considered and disposed of expeditiously without being influenced by the observations made in this order.

(Rajiv Lochan Shukla,J.)

August 18, 2026

A. Pandey