



2026:AHC:17661

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 1124 of 2026

Satish Patel

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Chandra Kumar Rai, Girish Kumar Pandey

Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : Amarnath Tripathi, G.A., Raj Raghuvanshi

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Chandra Kumar Rai, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri Arvind Kumar Verma, Advocate holding brief of Sri Raj Raghuvanshi, learned counsel for the informant as well as Sri Ashwani Kumar Tripathi, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the record.
3. Applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No. 320 of 2025, under Sections 103(1), 3(5) of BNS, Police Station - Bhelupur, District - Varanasi, during the pendency of trial.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant has submitted 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. He is not named in the FIR. The applicant had left the place of occurrence before the incident, as such, he is entitled for bail.
5. Learned counsel has further contended that the applicant is languishing in jail since 22.08.2025, 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.
6. Per contra, learned counsel for the informant and learned AGA have vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that the applicant

was very much present at the time of offence as he is visible in the CCTV footage also. The statement of Guard was taken and he has categorically stated that the applicant has actively participated in the said offence, as such, the applicant is not entitled for bail.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the applicant is visible in the said CCTV footage, I do not find it a fit case to release the applicant on bail.

8. The bail application is, accordingly, **rejected**.

9. However, it is directed that the aforesaid case pending before the trial court be decided expeditiously, in view of the principle laid down in the recent judgements 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 27, 2026
Siddhant