



2026:AHC:175450

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 7537 of 2026

Neeraj Yadav @ Golu Yadav

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Shailendra Kumar Yadav
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 65

HON'BLE SAMEER JAIN, J.

1. Heard Sri Shailendra Kumar Yadav, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri Ajay Singh, learned AGA for the State.

2. The instant bail application has been filed seeking release of the applicant on bail in Case Crime No.377 of 2025, under Sections 191(2), 115(2), 103(1) BNS, Police Station Mariyahun, District Jaunpur, during pendency of the trial.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits, FIR of the present case was lodged against unknown person but during investigation informant of the case disclosed the name of the applicant and admittedly he was not the eye-witness.

4. He further argued, actually eye-witness of the case was Payal Patel who was having affair with the deceased and according to her on 26.08.2025 when she was sitting alongwith the deceased then co-accused Sundaram and Anuj made assault through wooden stick due to which he sustained injuries and therefore as per eye-witnesses applicant did not cause any injury to the deceased.

5. He further argued, however apart from the present case applicant is also having criminal history of seven other cases but his criminal history has been explained and except a case under Section 109(1) BNS all the other cases were of minor nature and in all the cases applicant is on bail.

6. He next submits, considering the facts of the case it is not proper to

dismiss the bail application of applicant merely on the basis of history his criminal history.

7. He next submits, even in the present matter applicant is in jail since 28.08.2025 i.e. for last almost a year.

8. Per contra, learned AGA however opposed the prayer for bail but could not dispute the arguments on facts advanced by the learned counsel for the applicant.

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

10. FIR of the present case was lodged against unknown person but during investigation informant himself disclosed the name of applicant however he was not the eye-witness.

11. Further, from the record it reflects, one Payal Patel was the eye-witness of the incident who was having affair with the deceased and according to her on the date of incident while she was sitting alongwith the deceased then accused Sundaram and Anuj made assault upon him therefore from her statement it could not be reflected that applicant also made assault upon the deceased.

12. Further, however apart from the present case applicant is having criminal history of seven other cases but his criminal history has been explained and except one case other cases relate to minor offenses. Considering the facts of the case, in view of this Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents of applicant it is not proper to withhold his bail application specially considering the fact that he is in jail for last almost one year.

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

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

15. Let the applicant - **Neeraj Yadav @ Golu Yadav** 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 him 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.

16. 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.

17. 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.

(Sameer Jain,J.)

August 19, 2026

Shahroz