



2026:AHC:178617

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 29841 of 2026

Dharmendra @ Parmanand

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Sanjeev Kumar Singh
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

alongwith

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 29943 of 2026

Jayhind

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Sanjeev Kumar Singh
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 65

HON'BLE SAMEER JAIN, J.

1. As both the bail applications arise from same case crime number, therefore, both are being heard and disposed of simultaneously by a common order.
2. Heard Sri Sanjeev Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the applicants and Sri Rajiv Dhar Dwivedi, learned AGA for the State-respondent.
3. The instant bail applications have been filed seeking release of the applicants on bail in Case Crime No. 158 of 2026, under Sections 115(2), 352, 351(3), 103(1) BNS, Police Station Sikriganj, District Gorakhpur, during pendency of the trial in the court below.
4. Learned counsel for the applicants submitted that however, applicants are named in the FIR and as per allegation by causing lathi injuries, they

committed murder of the wife of the informant but entire allegations levelled against them are totally false.

5. He further submitted that actually the incident occurred during scuffle and applicants were not having any intention to cause death of the deceased.

6. He further submitted that even only general allegations have been made against the applicants and even post mortem report does not corroborate the statements of the witnesses.

7. He further submitted that applicants are having no previous criminal history and they are in jail in the present matter since 7.6.2026.

8 . Per contra, learned AGA opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that applicants are named in the FIR and as per allegations, they made assault through lathi due to which wife of the informant sustained injuries and died. He further submitted that even post mortem report suggests that deceased sustained two injuries on her head and therefore, it can not be said, applicants are innocent.

9. He further submitted that even applicants are in jail in the present matter only since 7.6.2026.

10. He further submitted that therefore, considering the facts of the case, both the bail applications of the applicants may be dismissed.

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

12. Applicants are named in the FIR and as per prosecution both the accused by causing lathi injuries committed murder of the wife of the informant.

13. Further, post mortem report also suggests that deceased sustained two injuries on her head and therefore, prima facie, it cannot be said that applicants are innocent.

14. Further, in the present matter applicants are in jail only since 7.6.2026.

15. Therefore, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, discussed above, in my view, applicants are not entitled to be released on bail, at this stage.

16. Accordingly, both the instant bail applications stands ***rejected at this***

stage.

17. It is clarified that the observations made herein are limited to the facts brought in by the parties pertaining to the disposal of both the bail applications and the said observations shall have no bearing on the merits of the case during trial.

August 24, 2026
Ankita

(Sameer Jain,J.)