



2026:AHC:18081

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 20348 of 2025

Amrish Sharma

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

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

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised. Supplementary affidavit and rejoinder affidavit filed by learned counsel for the applicant are taken on record.
2. Heard Sri Sudhir Kumar, learned counsel for applicant, Sri Ram Mohit Yadav, 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.190 of 2024, under Sections 302, 201, 120-B, 404, 414, 34 I.P.C., Police Station Mawana, District Meerut 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 and he has nothing to do with the said offence. The applicant and co-accused person Sulekha are stated to have committed the said offence. The said allegations are per se false. The deceased person is stated to have given Rs.12 lakhs on loan to the applicant and co-accused person Sulekha, as such, the applicant has been falsely implicated in the case. There is no criminal history of the applicant. The applicant is in jail since 28.4.2024 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 A.G.A. has vehemently opposed the bail application.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that there is evidence that applicant was driving the vehicle belonging to the deceased and the dead body was recovered from the very same vehicle coupled by the fact that the cause of death was asphyxia as a result of antemortem strangulation, I do not find it a fit case for grant of bail to the applicant.

7. 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 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 27, 2026

Vikas Verma