



2026:AHC:16310

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 2251 of 2026

Aneesh Singh @ Golu

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

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

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised. Supplementary affidavit filed today by the learned counsel for the applicant is taken on record.
2. Heard Sri Pradeep Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri Ram Mohit Yadav, learned A.G.A. for the State and also perused the material placed on record.
3. Applicant seeks bail in **Case Crime No. 193 of 2025, under Sections 103(1), 238(a) of BNS, Police Station - Haldi, District - Ballia**, during the pendency of trial.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant has argued that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has nothing to do with the said offence as alleged in the FIR. The FIR is delayed by about two days and there is no explanation of the said delay caused.
5. Learned counsel has also stated that there is no eye-witness account of the incident. The dead body was recovered three days after the incident. Even the postmortem report indicates that the cause of death has been found to be asphyxia as a result of *ante-mortem* drowning, as such, the allegations made in the FIR stand falsified.
6. Learned counsel has next contended that the applicant is languishing in jail since 27.11.2025, having no criminal history to his credit. In case, the

applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail and shall cooperate with trial.

7. Per contra, learned AGA has vehemently opposed the bail application but unable to dispute the submissions raised by the learned counsel for the applicant and also the fact that the applicant has no criminal history.

8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, nature of offence, severity of punishment, delay in lodging the FIR and also considering the fact that there is no eye-witness account of the incident coupled by the fact that the cause of death is found to be asphyxia as a result of *ante-mortem* drowning, *prima facie* I find it a fit case to release the applicant on bail. The bail application is **allowed**.

9. Let the applicant- **Aneesh Singh @ Golu**, who is involved in aforementioned case crime be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned subject to following conditions. Further, before issuing the release order, the sureties be verified.

- i) The applicant will not tamper with the evidence during trial.
- ii) The applicant will not pressurise/intimidate with the prosecution witnesses.
- iii) The applicant will appear before the trial court on the date fixed.

10. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, it shall be a ground for cancellation of bail.

11. It is made clear that observations made in granting bail to the applicant shall not in any way affect the learned trial Judge in forming his independent opinion based on the testimony of the witnesses.

(Krishan Pahal,J.)

January 22, 2026

Siddhant