



2026:AHC:175636

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No.
- 4367 of 2026

Omrang Shridev

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Mary Puncha (Sheeb Jose), Mohd. Kalim
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A.

Court No. - 71

HON'BLE RAJIV LOCHAN SHUKLA, J.

1. On 13.05.2026, this Court passed the following order :

"1. Heard Ms. Sheeb Jose, learned counsel for the applicant, learned AGA for the State and perused the record.

2. It is contended by learned AGA that instruction is not being received so far and seeks time.

3. The learned counsel for applicant seeks interim anticipatory bail.

4. The present application has been moved seeking anticipatory bail in Case Crime no.230 of 2025, under Sections 3/5(1) of the Uttar Pradesh Prohibition of Unlawful Conversion of Religion Act, P.S. Ahraura, District- Mirzapur.

5. It is contended by learned counsel for accused-applicant that the false and frivolous F.I.R. has been lodged by the informant on 28.09.2025 for the allegation of pursuing the accused-applicant to adopt Christianity. It is alleged in the F.I.R. that on 28.09.2025 there was prayer meet where he was asked to convert to Christianity and allured for the benefits of becoming a christian. The applicant has no criminal history. The co-accused have already been granted anticipatory bail by the coordinate Bench of this Court. There is no specific role assigned to the accused-applicant. The accused-applicant wants to cooperate in the investigation, but apprehending arrest and hence, seeks interim anticipatory bail.

6. The scope of ambit of anticipatory bail is encapsulated in three

insightful judgments of Hon'ble Supreme Court right from Gurubaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab reported in (1980) 2 SCC 565, Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre Vs. State of Maharashtra reported in (2011) 1 SCC 694 and Sushila Aggarwal and others Vs. State (NCT of Delhi) and another reported in (2020) 5 SCC 1, wherein it is consistently held by Hon'ble Apex Court that while granting anticipatory bail, the Court should considering the application of the applicant to evaluate the threat or apprehension of arrest vis-a-vis the nature and gravity of accusation, criminal antecedent of the accused, false or exaggerated implication, need of custodial interrogation, willingness of the accused to cooperate in investigation and trial and the conduct of the accused and flight risk.

7. This Court considering the arguments, gravity of accusation and apprehension of arrest in the case vis-a-vis low flight risk and assurance of the accused in cooperating with the investigation and trial is of considered view to grant interim bail.

8. The applicant- Omrang Shridev involved in the aforesaid case crime shall appear before the trial court or the Investigating Officer, as the case may be within 30 days from the date of this order and shall be released on interim anticipatory bail till the next date fixed on his furnishing a personal bond of Rs. 25,000/- with two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned with following conditions :-

(i) The applicant shall not tamper with evidence and that he would appear before the trial Court on the date fixed unless exempted by the Court concerned;

(ii) 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/them from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) The applicant would co-operate during trial and would not misuse the liberty of bail.

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

(v) The applicant shall ensure his presence before the Investigating

Officer in view of interim anticipatory bail granted.

9. In default of any of the conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to file appropriate application for cancellation of interim anticipatory bail granted to the applicant.

10. List this case on 05.08.2026.

11. Learned AGA is directed to obtain instructions by the next date."

2. Today, when the case has been called on, the learned A.G.A. has stated that he has received instructions.

3. Heard Ms. Sheeb Jose, learned counsel for the applicant; and learned A.G.A. for the State.

4. The learned counsel for the applicant has reiterated the submissions, as recorded in the earlier order and has further stated that the co-accused Vinod Kumar and Shankar have been granted anticipatory bail by this Court in NABAIL No.865 of 2026 till submission of a police report. The applicant claims parity. The applicant has no criminal antecedents.

5. Learned A.G.A. has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail, however, could not dispute the factual submissions made by the learned counsel for the applicant.

6. I have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties.

7. In view of the submissions made before this Court, I deem it appropriate to confirm the interim order granted in favour of the applicant.

8. The anticipatory bail application of the applicant is **allowed**.

9. In the event of the arrest of the applicant- **Omrang Shridev**, involved in the aforesaid case crime, he shall be released on anticipatory bail, **till filing of a police report under Section 193 BNSS**, on his 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. 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. The applicant shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

iv. 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 20, 2026
Kushal