



2026:AHC:18454

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 2713 of 2026

Chetan Verma Alias Juganu

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Anand Mohan Rai
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard learned counsel for applicant and Sri V.K.S. Parmar, learned A.G.A. 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. 430 of 2023, under Sections 302, 504 IPC, Police Station Rawatpur, District Kanpur Nagar, with the prayer to enlarge him on bail.
4. As per prosecution story, the applicant is stated to have stabbed the deceased with a knife over an altercation over the distribution of certain ornaments and household items on 25.12.2023 at about 7.00 pm. The wife of the deceased rushed him to hospital where he was declared as brought dead.
5. Learned counsel for the applicant has stated that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. The FIR is delayed by about three hours and there is no explanation of the said delay caused. The applicant has nothing to do with the said offence. The case is of sudden provocation. There is no witness examined to date. The applicant is in jail since 26.12.2023, as such, about two years have passed since his incarceration. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.
6. Per contra, learned A.G.A. has vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that the applicant is the sole accused person named in the FIR.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the FIR is prompt and the applicant is the sole named accused person in the FIR, 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***.

8. However, it is directed that the aforesaid case pending before the trial court be decided expeditiously as early as possible 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.

9. 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 28, 2026

Shalini