



2026:AHC:178915

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

**CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S
482 BNSS No. - 7728 of 2026**

Anuj

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Jitendra Pal Singh Jadaun,
Seema Singh Jadaun
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A.

Court No. - 72

HON'BLE VIVEK KUMAR SINGH, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, 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.269 of 2026, under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 109(1), 126(2), 351(2), 352, 125 BNS & Section 7 of Criminal Law (Amendment) Act and Sections 25/27 of Arms Act, P.S. - Hathras Gate, District- Hathras, with a prayer to enlarge him on anticipatory bail as the applicant apprehends his arrest in the above-mentioned case.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. The FIR was lodged by a Sub-Inspector of police, alleging that two groups of persons were engaged in violence and were firing at each other. It is further contended that no one sustained firearm injury though it is alleged that both the groups were opening fire upon each other; two persons Mona Thakur and Sonu sustained injuries, however, injuries were not opined dangerous to life. The Learned counsel for the applicant has submitted that the applicant is named in the FIR alongwith 7 other co-accused. One of the named accused Surya @ Surya Prakash has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court in CRIMINAL

MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No. - 7123 of 2026. The applicant has a criminal history of 9 other cases. However, he is not a previous convict. The applicant has been introduced in the present case by the police solely to increase his criminal history. Learned counsel for the applicant further submits that the applicant undertakes to cooperate during investigation and trial and shall appear as and when required by the Investigating Agency or the Court concerned. It has also been stated that, in case the applicant is granted anticipatory bail, he shall not misuse the liberty of bail, shall cooperate with the investigation, and shall abide by all the conditions that may be imposed by the Court.

4. On the other hand, learned A.G.A. has opposed the application for anticipatory bail, however, he does not dispute the factual aspect.

5. I have heard the rival submissions of both sides and perused the record.

6. In **Sushila Aggarwal and others vs. State (NCT of Delhi) and another, (2020) 5 SCC 1**, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that while considering an application for grant of anticipatory bail, the court has to consider the nature of the offence, the role of the person, the likelihood of his influencing the course of investigation, or tampering with evidence including intimidating witnesses, likelihood of fleeing justice, such as leaving the country, etc. It has further been held that Courts ought to be generally guided by considerations such as the nature and gravity of the offences, the role attributed to the applicant, and the facts of the case, while considering whether to grant anticipatory bail, or refuse it. Whether to grant or not is a matter of discretion.

7. In **Siddharth Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Another, (2022) 1 Supreme Court Cases 676**, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that personal liberty is an important aspect of our

constitutional mandate. The occasion to arrest an accused during investigation arises when custodial investigation becomes necessary or it is a heinous crime or where there is a possibility of influencing the witnesses or accused may abscond. Merely because an arrest can be made because it is lawful does not mandate that arrest must be made. A distinction must be made between the existence of the power to arrest and the justification for exercise of it. If arrest is made routine, it can cause incalculable harm to the reputation and self-esteem of a person. If the Investigating Officer has no reason to believe that the accused will abscond or disobey summons and has, in fact, throughout cooperated with the investigation, then there is no compulsion on the officer to arrest the accused.

8. Considering the settled principle of law regarding anticipatory bail, submissions of the learned counsel for the parties, nature of accusation, role of applicant and all attending facts and circumstances of the case, without expressing any opinion on merits, a case for anticipatory bail is made out.

9. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is **allowed** with following directions:-

(i) In the event of arrest of the applicant- **Anuj**, involved in aforesaid case shall be released on anticipatory bail till the conclusion of trial, on his furnishing a personal bond of Rs.50,000/- with two sureties each of the like amount to the satisfaction of the Station House Officer of the police station or the court concerned;

(ii) The applicant shall co-operate with the Investigating Officer during investigation and shall report to the Investigating Officer as and when required for the purpose of conducting investigation;

(iii) 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/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer; and

(iv) The applicant shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court.

10. In default or misuse of any of the conditions, the Public Prosecutor/ Investigating Officer/ first informant-complainant is at liberty to file appropriate application for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the applicant, before the concerned court.

August 24, 2026
Nitendra

(Vivek Kumar Singh,J.)