



2026:AHC:12355

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 385 of 2025

Ayan

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Anil Kumar Dubey, Arun Bhanu Shukla, Chandra Bhan Dubey, Shubhangini Dwivedi

Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A.

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Ms. Shubhangini Dwivedi, learned counsel for applicant as well as Sri Jai Kishan Chaurasia, learned State Law Officer 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.94 of 2024 (S.T. No.1454 of 2024), under Sections 302, 452, 307, 394, 411, 34 I.P.C., Police Station Kotwali, 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. He has nothing to do with the said offence. The applicant is not named in the FIR. There is no proper test identification parade conducted by the Investigating Officer of identification of the applicant rather he has been identified by showing his photograph to the injured person. There is no criminal history of the applicant. The applicant is in jail since 25.6.2024 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 State Law Officer has vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that it is an open and shut case as the applicant was visible in the CCTV footage and has been identified by the injured

person, as such, he is not entitled for bail.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the applicant is visible in the CCTV footage and has been identified by the injured person, 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 19, 2026
Vikas Verma