



2026:AHC:174890

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 29179 of 2026

Premveer

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Ajeet Kumar, Tarun Pratap Singh

Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A.

Court No. - 69

HON'BLE AVNISH SAXENA, J.

1. Sri Sarthak Mishra & Sri Yogesh Srivastava, learned counsel for the informant hands up the vakalatnama. The same is taken on record.

1A. Heard Sri Tarun Pratap Singh, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Mishra & Srivastava, learned counsel for the informant and learned A.G.A. for the State.

2. The present bail application has been moved by the accused-applicant **Premveer** to enlarge him on bail in Case Crime No. 362 of 2026, under Sections 109(2), 351(2), 352, 3(5) BNS and Section 3/5/25/27 Arms Act, P.S.- Ramgarh, District-Firozabad, during the pendency of trial.

3. It is contended by learned counsel for the accused-applicant that the accused-applicant has been falsely implicated belatedly in F.I.R. dated 09.06.2026 for the occurrence of 08.06.2026 registered after a lapse of 24 hours without plausible explanation of delay. Further submits that the informant, who is son of injured has lodged the F.I.R. against two named and one anonymous persons including the accused-applicant that the accused persons had assaulted the injured Munish with fire

arm, who suffered the gun shot injuries. Further submits that it is a false implication as both the parties fought the pardhani election and the injured suffered injuries somewhere else and falsely implicated in this case. Further submits that the gravity of injuries are not such, which are fatal in nature as he suffered two injuries, which is suspected to be fire arm injury. One of the injury of fire arm is on the tip of left thumb and another red pointed abrasions were found on his abdomen. Further submits that there is marked delay in F.I.R., which shows that the accused-applicant has been falsely implicated. The applicant has three cases criminal history and in all the cases he is on bail. The charge sheet is submitted. The applicant is in jail since 12.06.2026 and hence, the applicant seeks to be released on bail.

4. Learned counsel for the informant and learned A.G.A. for State have opposed the prayer for bail of the applicant and submitted that it is a fire arm injury, which is reflected from the medico-legal examination report. The role of shooting by the fire arm is on the accused-applicant and the country made pistol was recovered at the instance of the accused-applicant and hence, submits that the bail application be rejected.

5. Countering the argument, learned counsel for the applicant submits that the recovery of fire arm was shown in absence of independent witness. The recovery is therefore, planted.

6. This Court has taken into consideration the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Considered the nature and number of injuries on the person of injured and the political rivalry between the two as well as alleged delay in F.I.R.

8. Hence, without touching merit of the case, the bail application is **allowed**.

9. The accused/applicant 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 court concerned in view of observation made by the Supreme Court in its dictums of **Girish Gandhi Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh [(2024) 10 SCC 674]** and **Policy Strategy for grant of bail in re [(2024)10SCC 685]**.

10. The accused-applicant shall cooperate in judicial process for fair and speedy disposal.

(Avnish Saxena,J.)

August 19, 2026
Shivangi