



2026:AHC:8757

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD**

**CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 16876 of 2025**

Ritik

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite  
Party(s)

---

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Amit Kumar Pandey

Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : A.C.Srivastava, G.A., Suman Kumar  
Yadav

---

**Court No. - 66**

**HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.**

1. List has been revised. Counter affidavit filed by learned counsel for the informant is taken on record.
2. Learned counsel for the applicant does not propose to file any rejoinder affidavit to the counter affidavit filed by the counsel for the informant.
3. Heard Sri Amit Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for applicant, Sri A.C. Srivastava, learned counsel for the informant, Sri Rajendra Prasad Singh, learned State Law Officer for the State and perused the material placed on record.
4. The present bail application has been filed by the applicant in Case Crime No.118 of 2025, under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 103(1), 131, 352, 3(5) B.N.S., Police Station Sardhana, District Meerut with the prayer to enlarge him on bail.
5. Learned counsel for the applicant has stated that the case of the applicant is at par with co-accused person who has been enlarged on bail by this Court, as such, he is also entitled for bail on the ground of parity. The applicant is in jail since 08.03.2025 and is ready to cooperate with trial. In case, he is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.
6. Learned A.G.A. has vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that the applicant is the main accused person as he was named in the FIR, as such, he is not entitled for bail on the ground of parity.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the promptness of FIR and the fact that the applicant is the main accused person named in the FIR, I do not find it a fit case for grant of bail to the applicant. 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 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.

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 13, 2026**  
(Ravi Kant)