



2026:AHC:16559

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 2214 of 2026

Vishal Rajput

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	: Rajendra Kumar Pandey, Smt. Kirti Pandey
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	: G.A., Indra Narayan, Rajat Singh

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Rajendra Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri Indra Narayan, learned counsel for the informant as well as Sri Deepak Kumar Singh, learned A.G.A. for the State and also perused the material placed on record.
3. Applicant seeks bail in **Case Crime No. 434** of 2024, **under Sections 103(1), 309(6), 238, 317(2), 3(5)** of BNS, **Police Station - Madhuban Bapudham, District - Ghaziabad**, 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. It is also stated that the applicant is not named in the FIR. His name has come up in his own confessional statement which has no evidentiary value in the eyes of law.
5. Learned counsel has also stated that the FIR is delayed by about one and a half months and there is no explanation of the said delay caused. A false recovery of several ornaments has been foisted on the applicant.
6. Learned counsel has next contended that the applicant is languishing in jail since 23.10.2024, 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 and learned counsel for the informant have 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 the applicant is not named in the FIR and no cogent evidence has come up against him, *prima facie* I find it a fit case to release the applicant on bail. The bail application is **allowed**.

9. Let the applicant- **Vishal Rajput**, 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.

January 22, 2026
Siddhant

(Krishan Pahal,J.)