



2026:AHC:6935

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 491 of 2026

Sanu

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Ramajan Ahmad
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Hasan Parvej, Advocate holding brief of Sri Ramajan Ahmad, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Rajendra Prasad Singh, learned State Law Officer for the State and perused the material placed on record.
3. Applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No.101 of 2025, under Sections 123, 103(1), 3(5) B.N.S., Police Station Bithri Chainpur, District Bareilly, during the pendency of trial.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant has argued that the applicant is not named in the FIR and has been falsely implicated in the present case. His name has come up in the confessional statement of the co-accused person which has no evidentiary value in the eyes of law. The criminal history of one case assigned to the applicant stands explained. The applicant is languishing in jail since 27.02.2025 and he is ready to cooperate with trial. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.
5. Learned State Law Officer has vehemently opposed the bail application but the submissions raised by the learned counsel for the applicant could not be disputed.
6. 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.

7. 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 applicant has been implicated on the basis of confessional statement of the co-accused person which has no evidentiary value, 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**.

8. Let the applicant- **Sanu**, 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.

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

10. 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 12, 2026
(Ravi Kant)