



2026:AHC:18240

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 31065 of 2025

Neha

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Vinay Kumar Tripathi
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A., Pankaj Sharma

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised. Learned counsel for the informant is not present.
2. Heard Sri Vinay Kumar Tripathi, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Ram Mohit Yadav, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the material placed on record.
3. Applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No.1110 of 2024, under Sections 103(1), 61(2), 3(5) BNS, Police Station Highway, District Mathura, during the pendency of trial.
4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the applicant that similarly placed co-accused person, Pawan Kumar Sisaudiya has already been enlarged on bail by this Court vide order dated 23.8.2025 passed in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No.21403 of 2025. The criminal history assigned to the applicant has been explained. The applicant is languishing in jail since 25.11.2024. He further submitted that since the role of the applicant is identical to that of co-accused who has already been enlarged on bail, she is also entitled to be enlarged on bail on the ground of parity. In case, the applicant is released on bail, she will not misuse the liberty of bail.
5. The prayer for bail has been vehemently opposed by learned A.G.A. However, the aforesaid factual aspect of the parity to the co-accused has not been disputed by him.
6. The Supreme Court in ***Prabhakar Tewari vs. State of U.P. And Another,***

(2020) 11 SCC 648 has observed that pendency of several criminal cases against an accused itself cannot be a basis for refusal of bail, if otherwise his case for bail is made out.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, the evidence on record, pending trial and in light of the judgement passed by this Court in **Nanha S/o Nabhan Kha vs. State of U.P., 1993 Crl.L.J. 938** and the judgements passed by the Supreme Court in **Paras Ram Vishnoi vs. The Director, Central Bureau of Investigation, MANU/SCOR/22410/2021** and in **Satender Kumar Antil vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and Another, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 825**, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the view that the applicant has made out a case for grant of bail on the ground of parity. The bail application is **allowed** on the ground of parity.

8. Let the applicant- **Neha**, who is involved in aforementioned case crime be released on bail on her 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 shall not tamper with evidence during trial.
- (ii) The applicant shall not pressurize/intimidate with the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The applicant shall appear before the trial court on the date fixed.

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

10. 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 27, 2026
(Ravi Kant)