



2026:AHC:167652

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 27873 of 2026

Priyanshyu Singh

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Mangleshwar Verma, Renu Sharma
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 65

HON'BLE SAMEER JAIN, J.

1. Heard Sri Mangleshwar Verma, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri Kunwar Tejandra Bahadur, learned AGA for the State.

2. The instant bail application has been filed seeking release of the applicant on bail in Case Crime No. 191 of 2026, under Sections 103(1), 238 BNS, Police Station Kotwali Padrauna, District Kushinagar during pendency of the trial.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits, FIR of the present case was lodged against co-accused Rishabh Patel and according to the FIR Rishabh Patel enticed away the daughter of the informant and thereafter her dead body was found.

4. He further submits, during investigation on the basis of call detail of applicant and co-accused Rishabh Patel, he has also been made accused in the present matter. He further submits, as per prosecution, from the CDR of mobile it reflects, applicant along with co-accused Rishabh Patel at the time of incident was present near the place of incident.

5. He further submits, except CDR and confessional statement of applicant and statement of co-accused before police there is no cogent evidence against the applicant on record.

6. He further submits, merely on the basis of above evidence at this stage prima facie it cannot be said that applicant committed the murder of the deceased along with co-accused Rishabh Patel. He further submits, co-accused Rishabh Patel appears to be principal accused and applicant being

his friend has been made accused in the present matter.

7. He further submits, applicant is not having any criminal history and in the present matter he is in jail since 07.04.2026.

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

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

10. It is a case of circumstantial evidence and during investigation on the basis of CDR applicant has been made accused in the present matter and as per allegation applicant along with principal accused committed the murder of the deceased but it reflects, except the confessional statement of applicant and statement of co-accused before police and CDR of applicant and co-accused there is no cogent evidence against the applicant on record.

11. Further, from the CDR however it reflects, location of mobile phone of the applicant was near the place of incident but this fact only casts doubt and merely on the basis of said evidence prima facie at this stage it cannot be said that applicant committed the murder of the deceased.

12. Further, even co-accused Rishabh Patel appears to be principal accused who was even having motive to commit the murder of the deceased.

13. Further, applicant is not having any criminal history and in the present matter he is in jail since 07.04.2026.

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

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

16. Let the applicant -Priyanshyu Singh 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.

17. 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.

18. 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.

August 11, 2026
AK Pandey

(Sameer Jain,J.)