



2026:AHC:14390

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 28699 of 2025

Ratandeep Nishad

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Kumar Ashutosh Srivastava, Nagendra Bahadur Singh, Shweta Nishad, Vivek Mishra

Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A., Kundan Mishra, Vishveshwar Mani Tripathi

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Vivek Mishra, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Kundan Mishra, learned counsel for the informant, Sri Abhishek Mishra, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the material placed on record.
3. Applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No.218 of 2025, under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 115(2), 117(2), 103(1) BNS, Police Station Rudrapur, District Deoria, during the pendency of trial.
4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the applicant that similarly placed co-accused person, Raj Nishad has already been enlarged on bail by this Court vide order dated 14.1.2026 passed in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No.31708 of 2025, as such, since the role of the applicant is identical to that of co-accused, who has already been enlarged on bail, he is also entitled to be enlarged on bail on the ground of parity. There is no criminal history of the applicant. He is languishing in jail since 28.6.2025. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.
5. The prayer for bail has been vehemently opposed by learned counsel for the informant and learned A.G.A. on the ground that in the viral video, which was furnished by the witness Bobby Deol, co-accused person Raj Nishad was not found rather the other accused persons were found

nominated including the applicant.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case 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) 10 SCC 51***, the Court is of the view that the applicant has made out a case for bail. The bail application is ***allowed*** on the ground of parity.

7. Let the applicant- **Ratandeep Nishad**, 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 shall not tamper with evidence during trial.
- (ii) The applicant shall not pressurise/intimidate with the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The applicant shall appear before the trial court on the date fixed.

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

9. 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.

10. 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.

(Krishan Pahal,J.)

January 20, 2026

(Ravi Kant)