



2026:AHC:4254

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 44799 of 2025

Keetav Alias Vikash

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Kaushal Mishra, Raghvendra Prakash, Sr. Advocate
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A., Umesh Singh

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised. Learned counsel for the informant is not present.
2. Supplementary affidavit filed today is taken on record.
3. Heard Sri Gaurav Kakkar, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Sri Raghvendra Prakash, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Ram Mohit Yadav, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the material placed on record.
4. Applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No.146 of 2025, under Sections 103(1), 109(1) B.N.S., 2023, Police Station Shivala Kalan, District Bijnor, during the pendency of trial.
5. Learned Senior Counsel for the applicant has stated that the case of the applicant is at par with co-accused person Hardeep who has already been enlarged on bail by this Court vide order dated 12.12.2025 passed in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No.43967 of 2025, but in addition to the allegations made in first part of the FIR, the applicant has also been assigned the role of having fired at the deceased person, although the deceased has not sustained any firearm injury whatsoever.
6. Learned Senior Counsel for the applicant has further argued that false recovery of stick has been shown at the pointing out of the applicant. The criminal history of one case assigned to the applicant stands explained. The applicant is languishing in jail since 21.09.2025 and he is ready to cooperate with trial. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the

liberty of bail.

7. Learned A.G.A. has vehemently opposed the bail application but the submissions raised by the learned counsel for the applicant could not be disputed.

8. The Supreme Court in ***Prabhakar Tewari vs. State of U.P. And Another, (2020) 11 SCC 648*** has observed that pendency of several criminal cases against an accused itself cannot be a basis for refusal of bail, if otherwise his case for bail is made out.

9. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, the evidence on record, taking into consideration the fact that the case of the applicant is at par with co-accused person Hardeep who has already been enlarged on bail by this Court, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, *prima-facie* the Court is of the view that the applicant has made out a case for bail. The bail application is **allowed**.

10. Let the applicant- **Keetav Alias Vikash**, who is involved in aforementioned case crime be released on bail on his 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 applicant shall not tamper with evidence during trial.
- (ii) The applicant shall not pressurise/intimidate with the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The applicant shall appear before the trial court on the date fixed.

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

12. It is made clear that observations made in granting bail to the applicant shall not in any way affect the learned trial Judge in forming his independent opinion based on the testimony of the witnesses.

(Krishan Pahal,J.)

January 8, 2026
(Ravi Kant)