



2026:AHC:7025

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 21891 of 2025

Vineet

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Ashok Kumar Yadav
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Ashok Kumar Yadav, learned counsel for applicant, Sri Rajendra Prasad Singh, learned State Law Officer for the State and perused the material placed on record.
3. The present bail application has been filed by the applicant in Case Crime No.28 of 2023, under Section 302 I.P.C., Police Station Jamunapar, District Mathura with the prayer to enlarge him on bail.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant has stated that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. There is no motive for him to commit the said offence, as such, he is entitled for bail. There is no criminal history of the applicant. The applicant is in jail since 05.02.2023 and he is ready to cooperate with trial. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.
5. Per contra, learned State Law Officer has vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that the witnesses have deposed against the applicant and the trial is at its conclusive end as the statement of PW-11 is going on.
6. This Court had called for the status of trial from the concerned Trial Court. As per the said status report dated 10.11.2025, twelve witnesses have been examined.

7. The Supreme Court in case of *X vs. State of Rajasthan & Anr., 2024 INSC 909*, has held that once the trial has commenced, it should be allowed to reach to its final conclusion, which may either result in conviction or acquittal of the accused. The bail should not be normally granted to the accused after the charge has been framed. It should also not be granted by looking into the discrepancies here or there in the deposition.

8. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the judgment of Supreme Court passed in *X vs. State of Rajasthan & Anr. (Supra)*, I do not find it a fit case for grant of bail to the applicant. The bail application is found devoid of merits and is, accordingly, **rejected**.

9. However, it is directed that the aforesaid case pending before the trial court be decided expeditiously in view of the principle as has been laid down in the recent judgments of the Supreme Court in the cases of *Vinod Kumar vs. State of Punjab; 2015 (3) SCC 220* and *Hussain and Another vs. Union of India; (2017) 5 SCC 702*, if there is no legal impediment.

10. 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.

(Krishan Pahal,J.)

January 12, 2026
(Ravi Kant)