



2026:AHC:4225

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 1345 of 2025

Parashram

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Ram Krishna Dubey, Ravi Shankar
Tripathi
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A.

Court No. - 65

HON'BLE DR. GAUTAM CHOWDHARY, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, Shri Bhagwati Prasad, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the record.
2. This is the second bail application moved on behalf of applicant. His first bail application has been dismissed by this Court vide order dated 01.05.2024 passed in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 16873 of 2024.
3. By means of the instant bail application, the applicant, Parashram, seeks bail in Case Crime No. 390 of 2014, under Sections 149, 201, 120B, 302 I.P.C., Police Station Barsana, District Mathura.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that applicant the present crime relates to the year 2014. The previous bail application has been rejected on 01.05.2024 and till date charge has not been framed till date and the next date is fixed for 12.01.2026. Thus, it appears that trial could not be concluded in near future, therefore applicant may be enlarged on bail. Learned counsel further submits that three other accused have already been enlarged on bail after the rejection of first bail application of the applicant, therefore, applicant may also be enlarged on bail on the ground of parity. The applicant is in jail since 23.02.2024.
5. Per contra, learned A.G.A. has opposed the prayer for bail by contending that there is active participation of applicant in the offence. Moreover, learned counsel for the applicant has not been able to show any fresh ground for enlarging the applicant on bail in this second bail application.
6. Having considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the applicant, the learned A.G.A. for the State, considering that there is active participation of applicant in the commission of offence and the trial is at

its inception, as well as considering the fact that no other new ground has been raised on behalf of applicant, I do not find any good reason to exercise my discretion in favour of the accused-applicant.

7. Accordingly, the bail application of applicant-Parashram, is rejected.

8. Trial court is directed to make all possible efforts/ endeavour to conclude the trial expeditiously.

(Dr. Gautam Chowdhary,J.)

January 7, 2026

Mustaqeem.