



2026:AHC:18183

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD**

**CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 22028 of 2025**

Lalji Yadav

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite  
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Manvendra Narain Pathak, Satya Dheer  
Singh Jadaun

Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A., Parvesh Singh, Praveen Kumar  
Pandey

**Court No. - 66**

**HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.**

1. List has been revised. Second supplementary affidavit filed by learned counsel for the applicant is taken on record.

2. Heard Sri Manvendra Narain Pathak, learned counsel for applicant, Sri Praveen Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the informant 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. 245 of 2021, under Sections 147, 148, 149, 323, 302, 307, 336, 34 IPC and 27/30 Arms Act, Police Station Barahaj, District Deoria, with the prayer to enlarge him on bail.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant has argued that the applicant is absolutely innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant has further argued that the case of the applicant is at par with the co-accused person Baijnath Yadav, who has been enlarged on bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 10.4.2025 passed in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 5392 of 2025, as such, the applicant is also entitled for bail on the ground of parity. There is no criminal history of the applicant. The applicant is languishing in jail since 25.11.2021 and he is ready to cooperate with trial. 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 two persons have been put to death. A fake cross case was foisted on the informant and his family members by the applicant. The said case does not indicate any assault on any person, whatsoever. The trial is at its conclusive stage, as already fifteen witnesses have been examined and P.W. 16 is being cross examined, as such, at this stage, the applicant is not entitled for bail.

7. This Court had called for the status of trial. The status report dated 7.11.2025 indicates that already fifteen witnesses have been examined.

8. 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.

9. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration that the trial is at its conclusive end, 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**.

10. 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.

11. 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**  
Shalini