



2026:AHC:7231

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 17724 of 2025

Rahul Sharma

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Sameer Khan, Vidit Narayan Mishra
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A., Kapil Tyagi

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Shashikant Shukla, learned Senior Advocate assisted by Sri Sameer Khan, learned counsel for applicant, Sri Kapil Tyagi, learned counsel for the informant and Sri D.K. Singh, 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. 518 of 2024, under Sections 103(1), 61(1) B.N.S., Police Station Sector 113 Noida, District Gautam Budh Nagar, with the prayer to enlarge him on bail.
4. As per the prosecution story, the applicant is the brother-in-law (Jeth) of the deceased and he alongwith other co-accused persons is stated to have committed the murder of the daughter of the informant in their house on 8.11.2024 at about 5.15 pm.
5. Learned counsel for the applicant has stated that there is no eye-witness account of the incident. The applicant has been falsely implicated in the case. Although he is nominated in the FIR but the allegations are *per se* false. The applicant is in jail since 10.11.2024 and is ready to cooperate with trial. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.
6. Per contra, learned A.G.A. and learned counsel for the informant have

vehemently opposed the bail application.

7. This Court had called for the status of trial. The status report indicates that three witnesses have been examined. The star witness, who happens to be daughter of the deceased, is yet to be examined.

8. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the deceased had expired within the precincts of the house of the applicant and there are eighteen stabbed wounds sustained by the deceased, which indicates the case to be of extreme mental depravity and is heinous in nature, 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**.

9. 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.

10. 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 12, 2026

Shalini