



2026:AHC:19039

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 44187 of 2024

Ravi @ Veeru Patel

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Atharva Dixit, Pranav Tiwary, Roshni
Murad, Sr. Advocate
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : Amarnath Tripathi, G.A.

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised. Learned counsel for the informant is not present.
2. Heard Sri Manish Tiwari, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Sri Atharva Dixit, learned counsel for applicant, Sri Sunil Kumar, 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.0039 of 2024, under Sections 147, 148, 149, 302 IPC and Section 3/7/25 Arms Act, Police Station Maduwadeeh, District Varanasi with the prayer to enlarge him on bail.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant has stated that the applicant has nothing to do with the said offence. He has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is a clear-cut case of false implication. The post-mortem report does not corroborate the prosecution story. The applicant is in jail since 11.04.2024 and is ready to cooperate with trial. In case, he is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.
5. Learned A.G.A. has vehemently opposed the bail application.
6. This Court had called for the status of trial from the concerned Trial Court. As per the said status report dated 02.12.2025, eight witnesses have been examined and the cross-examination of PW-8 is going on.
7. 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.

8. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the trial is at its conclusive end as eight witnesses have already been examined, 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**.

9. 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.

10. 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
(Ravi Kant)