



2026:AHC:178200

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 29802 of 2026

Kanhaiya Lal @ Pappu

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Krishna Dev Mishra
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 69

HON'BLE AVNISH SAXENA, J.

1. Heard Sri Krishna Dev Mishra, learned counsel for accused applicant and learned A.G.A. for State.

1A. Learned counsel for the applicant hands up the supplementary affidavit annexing the additional documents in support of bail application, the same is taken on record.

2. The present bail application has been moved by the applicant/ accused- **Kanhaiya Lal @ Pappu** to enlarge him on bail in Case Crime No. 0383 of 2026, under Sections 109(1), 3(5) 191(2), 191(3), 351(3), 352, 115(2) BNS, P.S.- Jahangirabad, District- Bulandshahar, during the pendency of trial.

3. It is the contention of learned counsel for applicant that the accused applicant has been falsely implicated in the FIR dated 20.07.2026 lodged with the delay for the allegation in the FIR against six named including the accused/applicant and 10-15 anonymous persons with the allegation that on 19.07.2026 at about 6:45 p.m. while the informant and his father were passing through the road, there was a vehicle (Chhota Hathi) from where some items were unloading in the house of one Om

Prakash. The informant has asked for giving side to his vehicle on which there was some altercation between the parties, which led to the cross fight. It is the contention of learned counsel that the informant and his father Mukesh Kumar did not suffer any injuries. The persons came to save them, namely, Om Prakash (present Sabhasad), Taufeeq, Rinku and Smt. Jamuna Devi, suffered injuries. It is the contention of learned counsel that in the FIR the weapon used were lathi, danda, iron rod and sharp edged weapon. Further submits that the accused/applicant has been falsely implicated in this case. His wife suffered injuries for which he went to the police station to lodge the FIR but the same was not lodged and he resorted to an application under Section 173(4) BNSS. He submits that nearly 21 persons have been shown their role in the FIR and four persons were found injured out of whom informant and father, who were the genesis of the incident did not suffer injuries. It is the contention of learned counsel that the applicant has been falsely implicated. The Investigation is continuing and he is cooperating with the investigation. The accused/applicant has no criminal history. The accused applicant is languishing in jail since 20.07.2026. He seeks to be enlarged on bail.

4. Learned A.G.A. for State and learned counsel for the informant have opposed the prayer for bail.

5. This Court has taken into consideration the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. Considering the nature and number of injuries and corresponding number of accused, the accused/applicant is entitled to be released on bail.

7. Hence, without touching merit of the case, the bail application is **allowed**.

8. The accused/applicant 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 court concerned in view of

observation made by the Supreme Court in its dictums of **Girish Gandhi Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh [(2024) 10 SCC 674]** and **Policy Strategy for grant of bail in re [(2024)10SCC 685]**.

9. The accused-applicant shall cooperate in judicial process for fair and speedy disposal.

August 24, 2026

Abhishek Sri.

(Avnish Saxena,J.)