



2026:AHC:8563

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 624 of 2026

Shueb

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Mazhar Ullah, Rizwan Ahmad
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Mazhar Ullah, learned counsel for applicant, Sri Sanjeev Singh, learned Additional Advocate General assisted by Sri Sunil Kumar, 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.80 of 2025, under Sections 103(1) B.N.S. and Section 4/25 Arms Act, Police Station Badhapur, District Bijnor with the prayer to enlarge him on bail.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant has stated that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has nothing to do with the said offence. It is a case of sudden provocation as the applicant was teased and tormented by the deceased person by calling him with false name.
5. Learned counsel for the applicant has further stated that the case does not fall within the category of murder, as such, the applicant is entitled for bail. There is no criminal history of the applicant. The applicant is in jail since 26.5.2025 and he is ready to cooperate with trial. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.
6. Per contra, learned Additional Advocate General has vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that it is an open and shut case as the deceased person himself lodged the FIR, which is prompt, and he

had nominated the sole accused-applicant, as such, the applicant is not entitled for bail.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the FIR is prompt and has been instituted by the injured/deceased, I do not find it a fit case for grant of bail to the applicant.

8. 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 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 13, 2026

Vikas Verma