



2026:AHC:57972

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL APPEAL No. - 1605 of 2026

Rudrabhan

.....Appellant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Appellant(s)	:	Arpit Pal, Manish Kumar Tripathi
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 50

HON'BLE SHEKHAR KUMAR YADAV, J.

1. The present criminal appeal under Section 14-A(2) Scheduled Castes & Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act has been filed by the appellant to set aside the bail rejection order dated 28.01.2026 passed by Special Judge (SC/ST Act) Prayagraj in Bail Application No.48 of 2026 arising out of Case Crime No.461 of 2025, under Sections 87, 137(2), 352 of BNS and Section 3(1)(Gha) and 3(2)(5) of SC/ST Act, Police Station Mauaima, District Prayagraj.
2. Heard learned counsel for the appellant, the learned AGA for the State-respondent no.1 and perused the entire record. Despite service of notice, none has appeared on behalf of respondent no.2.
3. In short, the prosecution story is that the impugned FIR has been lodged by the informant alleging therein that her daughter aged about 18 years was enticed away by the appellant.
4. Submission of learned counsel for the appellant is that the appellant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. The appellant has not committed any offence as alleged in the impugned FIR. Prosecution story is totally false and fabricated. The incident is said to have taken place on 10.12.2025 whereas the impugned FIR has been lodged on 12.12.2025 i.e. about two days delayed for which no explanation has been mentioned. Further submission is that the father of the victim and the victim herself have refused to conduit any internal or external medical examination of the victim. As per statement of the victim recorded under Sections 180 and 183 of BNSS the victim is major aged about 18 years and it appears that the

victim is having love affair with the appellant and they want to solemnize marriage with each other. there are material contradictions in her statement and it appears that the victim is a consenting party. Further submission is that there is no possibility of early conclusion of trial in near future, hence, the appellant may be enlarged on bail. Appellant is languishing in jail since 11.01.2026 having no previous criminal history. Further submission is that the impugned order rejecting the bail application of the appellant suffers from infirmity and illegality warranting interference by this Court.

5. On the other hand, learned A.G.A. vehemently opposed the the prayer for bail of the appellant.

6. I have considered the rival submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the entire record including the impugned order carefully.

7. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and keeping in view the nature of the offence, evidence, complicity of the accused, role assigned to the present appellant and the nature of injury, the Court is of the opinion that the appellant has made out a case for bail. The Court below erred in rejecting the bail application of the appellant. The impugned order suffers from infirmity and illegality and the same is liable to be set-aside and the appeal is liable to be allowed.

8. Accordingly, the appeal is **allowed** and the impugned order rejecting the bail application of the appellant is hereby set-aside.

9. Let the appellant-**Rudrabhan**, involved in aforesaid case crime number be **released on bail** on 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 appellant will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.

(ii) The appellant will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witness.

(iii) The appellant will appear before the trial court on the date fixed, unless personal presence is exempted.

(iv) The appellant shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused, or suspected, of the commission of which he is suspected.

(v) The appellant 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.

10. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move bail cancellation application before this Court.

March 20, 2026

Ajeet

(Shekhar Kumar Yadav,J.)