



2026:AHC:23739

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 2728 of 2026

Sujeet Kumar @ Sonu

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Mahesh Dwivedi, Ravi Kant Pathak
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A.

Court No. - 65

HON'BLE DR. GAUTAM CHOWDHARY, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, learned A.G.A for the State and perused the record.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant has contended that initially F.I.R. was lodged under Section 137(2) of B.N.S. and during the course of investigation, said section has been dropped and in its place Section 69 of B.N.S.S., has been incorporated. Learned counsel further argued the incident is alleged to have taken place on 05.12.2025, whereas the the F.I.R., has been lodged on 08.12.2025 without there being any plausible explanation of such delay. Learned counsel further argued that the victim in her statement recorded under Section 180 of B.N.S.S., did not level any allegation of inducement false promise of marriage, however the victim in her statement recorded under Section 180 of B.N.S.S., has stated that the applicant since last one years on the pretext of marriage had established physical relations on number of times. Learned counsel further argued that there are material contradictions in the statements of the victim recorded under Sections 180 and 183 of B.N.S.S. Act. Learned counsel has further argued that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. Several other submissions in order to demonstrate the falsity of the allegations made against the applicant have also been placed before the Court. The circumstances which, according to the counsel, led to the false implication of the accused have also been mentioned. It has also been assured on behalf of the applicant that he is ready to cooperate with the process of law and shall faithfully make himself available before the court whenever required and is also ready to

accept all the conditions which the Court may deem fit to impose upon him. He next submits that applicant is languishing in jail since 08.12.2025.

3. Per contra, learned A.G.A. has opposed the prayer for bail of the applicant by contending that the innocence of the applicant cannot be adjudged at pre trial stage, therefore, he does not deserve any indulgence. In case the applicant is released on bail he will again indulge in similar activities and will misuse the liberty of bail.

4. Considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case, submissions of learned counsel for the parties, nature of evidence, and all attending facts and circumstances of the case, without expressing any opinion on merits of the case, this Court is of the view that the applicant has made out a case for bail. Hence the bail application is allowed.

5. Let applicant **Sujeet Kumar @ Sonu** involved in Case Crime No.135 of 2025 under Section 69 B.N.S., Police Station Shahabganj, District Chandauli, be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond and two local heavy sureties each of the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned subject to the following conditions:-

- i) The applicant shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence.
- ii) The applicant shall not threaten or harass the prosecution witnesses.
- iii) The applicant shall appear on the date fixed by the trial court.
- iv) The applicant shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which the applicant is accused, or suspected of the commission.
- v) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade such person from disclosing facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence.

6. In case of breach of any of the above condition, the trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail of the applicant in accordance with law.

(Dr. Gautam Chowdhary,J.)

February 4, 2026

S.Ali