



2026:AHC:15610

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 17800 of 2025

Anurag Yadav

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Kaushlendra Pratap Singh
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Yash Pandey, Advocate holding brief of Sri Kaushlendra Pratap Singh, learned counsel for applicant, Sri R.P. Patel, 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.27 of 2025, under Sections 103(1), 115(2), 351(3), 352 B.N.S., Police Station Bidhanu, District Kanpur Nagar with the prayer to enlarge him on bail.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant has stated that the story has been developed by the prosecution subsequently. It has nowhere come up as to who was the person who assaulted the deceased person and smashed his head to the floor, thereby killing him. As far as the other injured persons are concerned, there is no evidence that the applicant assaulted them whatsoever. The applicant is in jail since 03.02.2025. The trial is moving at a snail's pace. Five witnesses have been examined. There is no direct evidence against the applicant. He 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. 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.

7. After hearing the rival submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the judgment of the Supreme Court passed in *X vs. State of Rajasthan & Anr. (Supra)*, 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 21, 2026
(Ravi Kant)