



2026:AHC:3862

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 26780 of 2025

Muntazir Urf Munti

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Ashfaq Ahmed Ansari
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	Dhiraj Kumar Pandey, G.A.

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Ashfaq Ahmed Ansari, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri Ankaj Kumar Pal, Advocated holding brief of Sri Dhiraj Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the informant as well as Sri Jai Kishan Chaurasia, learned State Law Officer and perused the record.
3. Applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No. 56 of 2024, under Sections 302/34 of I.P.C. and 4/25 of Arms Act, Police Station - Rampur Maniharan, District - Saharanpur, during the pendency of trial.
4. As per prosecution story, the applicant is stated to have assaulted and inflicted stab wound to informant's son on 27.02.2024 at about 11:00 AM which ultimately proved fatal to him.
5. Learned counsel for the applicant has submitted that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has nothing to do with the said offence as alleged in the FIR. The FIR is delayed by about five hours and there is no explanation of the said delay caused.
6. Learned counsel has also stated that although the role of applicant has been shown of having assaulted the deceased with knife but the allegations are false, as such, the applicant is entitled for bail.
7. Learned counsel has further contended that the criminal history

assigned to the applicant stands explained in the affidavit. The applicant is languishing in jail since 28.02.2024. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail and shall cooperate with trial.

8. Per contra, learned counsel for the informant and learned State Law Officer have vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that the applicant is the primary accused as he is named in the FIR. The autopsy report corroborates the prosecution story, as such, the applicant is not entitled for bail.

9. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the applicant is named in the FIR, I do not find it a fit case to release the applicant on bail.

10. The bail application is, accordingly, **rejected**.

11. However, it is directed that the aforesaid case pending before the trial court be decided expeditiously, in view of the principle laid down in the recent judgements 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.

12. 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 5, 2026

Siddhant