



2026:AHC:166083

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

**CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No.
- 8056 of 2026**

Saurabh Baghel

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Devidayal Tiwari, Jai Raj
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 71

HON'BLE RAJIV LOCHAN SHUKLA, J.

1. Heard, Learned counsel for the applicant, the Learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the record.
2. The present anticipatory bail application has been filed on behalf of the applicant in Case Crime No.001 of 2026, under Sections 3(5), 319(2), 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(1) B.N.S., Section 66 of the Information Technology Act, P.S.- Cyber Crime Chandauli, District- Chandauli, with a prayer to enlarge him on anticipatory bail as the applicant apprehends his arrest in the above-mentioned case.
3. The Learned counsel for the applicant contends that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. The police is stated to have arrested three named accused on information received from a police informer regarding some persons inducing people to obtain loan which was being provided at low interest rates. When the said accused were arrested by police, they disclosed the name of one Sudhanshu Rai. The allegation is that the three other named accused used to collect information and documents from unsuspecting persons and open their accounts, which were then used for online gaming/cyber fraud. It is in the confession of Sudhanshu Rai, after his arrest, that the name of the applicant has figured. The Learned counsel has further submitted that the accounts in question, which were supposedly being misused by the accused persons, have not been linked to any cyber crime. Neither any proceeds of crime nor any transactions have been shown to link the applicant to the offence in question. The applicant has no criminal

antecedents.

4. The Learned A.G.A. has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and has contended that the co-accused Sudhanshu Rai, in his confessional statement, has stated that he used to collect these accounts and send the ATM cards and PINs of the said accounts to the co-accused Saurabh, who is the applicant, on payment of Rs. 12,000. The Learned A.G.A. has stated that this chain of circumstances linking the applicant to the crime committed is complete. There are certain complaints which have been received on the NCRP portal regarding the accounts of the co-accused Sujit Kumar. The Learned A.G.A., however, could not dispute the fact that the applicant has no criminal antecedents.

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

6. The name of the applicant has surfaced in the confessional statement of the co-accused. There is no direct evidence linking the applicant to the cyber crime in question. The applicant is not stated to have received any money in his own account.

7. Taking into account all the facts and circumstances of the case, as also the fact that no monetary transactions have been shown in the account of the applicant, I deem it fit to enlarge the applicant on anticipatory bail till the submission of the police report.

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 **Saurabh Baghel**, he shall be released forthwith in the aforesaid case crime on anticipatory bail ***till the submissions of the police report*** on furnishing a personal bond and surety each 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 7, 2026

Sachin