



2026:AHC:65134

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 7512 of 2026

Reetu Gautam

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Ajay Kumar Pandey
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 69

HON'BLE JITENDRA KUMAR SINHA, J.

1. Heard Mr. Ajay Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the applicant, O.P. Singh, learned A.G.A. for the State-respondents and perused the record.

2. The present bail application under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, has been filed on behalf of applicant Reetu Gautam, with a prayer to release him on bail in Case Crime No. 74 of 2025, under Sections 316(3), 336(3), 338, 340(2), 61(2) B.N.S. and Sections 65, 66, 66-B of I.T. Act, registered at Police Station Cyber Crime, District Bulandshahar, during pendency of the trial.

3. It has been argued by the learned counsel for the applicant that applicant is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that co-accused Rashmi Sharma has already been granted anticipatory bail by co-ordinate bench of this Court vide order dated 18.2.2026 passed in Criminal Misc. Anticipatory Bail Application U/s 482 No. 1373 of 2026. It is further submitted that the role of the applicant is much lower than the role of co-accused Rashmi Sharma as the applicant was assigned the role of checking the various entries of account. The applicant, who is languishing in jail since 31.1.2026, undertakes that he will not misuse the liberty, if granted. It has also been pointed out that in the wake of heavy pendency of cases in the Court, there is no likelihood of any early conclusion of trial.

4. Per contra learned A.G.A. has opposed the prayer for bail of the applicant.

5. Co-accused Rashmi Sharma has already been granted anticipatory bail by co-ordinate bench of this Court vide order dated 18.2.2026 passed in Criminal Misc. Anticipatory Bail Application U/s 482 No. 1373 of 2026. It is further submitted that the role of the applicant is much lower than the role of co-accused Rashmi Sharma as the applicant was assigned the role of checking the various entries of account. The applicant, who is languishing in jail since 31.1.2026.

6. Upon considering the totality of facts, nature and the evidence reflected from record and without expressing any opinion on merits of the case, I find it to be a fit case for bail. Hence, the present bail application is allowed.

7. Let the applicant- **Reetu Gautam** involved in the aforesaid case crime be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond of Rs. 50,000/- with two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Court concerned :-

(i) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat, or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence.

(ii) The applicant shall not pressurize/intimidate the prosecution witnesses.

(iii) The applicant shall remain present, in person, before the trial court on the dates fixed for (i) opening of the case, (ii) framing of charge and (iii) recording of statement under Section 351 of B.N.S.S.

(iv) The applicant shall file an undertaking to the effect that he shall not seek any adjournment on the dates fixed for evidence when the witnesses are present in the trial court.

(v) The applicant shall remain present before the trial court on each date fixed, either personally or through his counsel.

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

9. It is clarified that anything said in this order is limited to the purpose of determination of this bail application and will in no way be construed as an expression on the merits of the case. The trial court shall be absolutely free to arrive at its independent conclusions on the basis of evidence led unaffected by anything said in this order.

(Jitendra Kumar Sinha,J.)

March 26, 2026

Kumar Manish