



2026:AHC:15646

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 1798 of 2026

Madhuri Yadav

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Surendra Mohan Mishra
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Surendra Mohan Mishra, learned counsel for applicant, Sri Ram Mohit Yadav, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the material placed on record.
3. The present bail application has been filed by the applicant in Case Crime No.189 of 2025, under Sections 103(1), 118(2), 3(5) B.N.S., Police Station Khesaraha, District Siddharth Nagar with the prayer to enlarge her on bail.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant has stated that the FIR is delayed and there is no explanation of the said delay caused. The applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and she has nothing to do with the said offence. There is no criminal history of the applicant. The applicant is in jail since 6.11.2025 and she is ready to cooperate with trial. In case, the applicant is released on bail, she will not misuse the liberty of bail.
5. Per contra, learned A.G.A. has vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground there is dying declaration of the deceased person, whereby the applicant and co-accused person Sudha had sprinkled petrol over the deceased person, thereby co-accused person Rakesh had set him afire by lighting matchstick, as such, she is not entitled for bail.
6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and taking into

consideration the dying declaration of the deceased person, I do not find it a fit case for grant of bail to the applicant.

7. The bail application is found devoid of merits and is, accordingly, **rejected**.

8. However, it is directed that the aforesaid case pending before the trial court be decided expeditiously 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.

9. 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 21, 2026
Vikas Verma