



2026:AHC:170306

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD**

**CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No.  
- 7932 of 2026**

Janved Kumar

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite  
Party(s)

---

|                               |   |                  |
|-------------------------------|---|------------------|
| Counsel for Applicant(s)      | : | Raj Kumar Mishra |
| Counsel for Opposite Party(s) | : | G.A.             |

---

**Court No. - 71**

**HON'BLE RAJIV LOCHAN SHUKLA, J.**

1. Heard Learned counsel for the applicant 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. 640 of 2025, u/s 3/7 Essential Commodities Act, Police Station Auraia, District Auraia, 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 this is a second anticipatory bail application. The first anticipatory bail application of the applicant had been dismissed with the liberty given to the applicant of filing a fresh application after explaining the criminal antecedents as required under Chapter XVIII Rule 18(7) of the Rules of the Court. Learned counsel for the applicant has contended that the applicant has a criminal history of one case which has been duly explained. He is not a previous convict. Learned counsel has further submitted that the applicant is merely a truck driver, who was said to have been transporting food grains. The allegations in the FIR were of shifting of food grains from one truck to another being driven by three other co-accused. Learned counsel for the applicant has contended that co-accused Subhash Chandra, Pranshu and Ashok Singh, who were similarly truck drivers, have been granted anticipatory bail by this Court in NABAIL No. 5616 of 2026, 5625 of 2026 and 5646 of 2026. The case of the applicant stands on a

similar footing.

4. Learned AGA has opposed the prayer for bail, however, has not been able to dispute the fact that the case of the applicant stands on a similar footing to that of the co-accused, nor the explanation given by the applicant with respect to his criminal antecedents.

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

6. From the perusal of the FIR, it is not clear as to which Control Order has been violated by the applicant. Prima facie, in the opinion of the Court, no control order appears to have been violated and no offence under the Essential Commodities Act is made out. There is no evidence to show that the food grains in question were being black marketed. Similarly situated co-accused have been granted anticipatory bail by this Court.

7. Taking into account the facts and circumstances of the case, I deem it appropriate to enlarge applicant on anticipatory bail.

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-**Janved Kumar**, he shall be released forthwith in the aforesaid case crime on anticipatory bail on furnishing a personal bond and surety 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 13, 2026**  
A. Pandey