



2026:AHC:167672

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 27888 of 2026

Bhupendra @ Golu Raikwar

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Rajeev Kumar Singh
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 65

HON'BLE SAMEER JAIN, J.

1. Sri Sanjeev Kumar Khare, learned Advocate filed his power on behalf of informant, today in the Court, which is taken on record.
2. Heard Sri Rajeev Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Sanjeev Kumar Khare, learned counsel for informant and Dr. S.B. Maurya, learned AGA-I for the State.
3. The instant bail application has been filed seeking release of the applicant on bail in Case Crime No. 120 of 2026, under Sections 103(1), 352, 351(3) BNS and Section 3/25 Arms Act, Police Station Kotwali Mahoba, District Mahoba during pendency of the trial.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits, however, applicant is named in the FIR but it reflects, nobody could see the real incident and merely on the basis of information given by one Preetam Singh informant named the applicant in the FIR. He further submits, even from the statement of witness Preetam Singh the complicity of applicant could not be revealed.
5. He further submits, it is a case of circumstantial evidence and except motive and previous enmity there is no cogent evidence against the applicant on record.
6. He further submits, applicant is son-in-law of the deceased and however with regard to his wife there was some dispute pending between deceased and applicant but no presumption can be drawn that due to this reason, he committed the murder of the deceased.

7. He further submits, applicant is not having any criminal history and in the present matter he is in jail since 03.04.2026.

8. Per contra, learned AGA as well as learned counsel for informant 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. However, applicant is named in the FIR but it is a case of circumstantial evidence and it reflects, on the basis of information given by one Preetam Singh informant named him in the FIR. Further, from the statement of Preetam Singh it could not be reflected that applicant committed the murder of the deceased.

11. Further, however, during investigation when Investigating Officer recorded the statement of one Amit then he stated that applicant informed him that he will commit the murder of the deceased and except this evidence and confessional statement of applicant before police there is no cogent evidence against the applicant on record.

12. In considered view of this Court, merely on the basis of above evidence prima facie at this stage it cannot be said that applicant committed the murder of the deceased, who was however his mother-in-law.

13. Further, applicant is not having any criminal history and in the present matter he is in jail since 03.04.2026.

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 - **Bhupendra @ Golu Raikwar** 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.)