



2026:AHC:7806

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 24933 of 2025

Vikas

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Rahul Singh Tomar, Yogendra Pal Singh

Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A., Mohit Kumar Baisla

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Yogendra Pal Singh, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Mohit Kumar Baisla, learned counsel for the informant and Sri R.P. Patel, learned State Law Officer and perused the material placed on record.
3. Applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No. 36 of 2025, under Sections 103(1), 238, 3(5) B.N.S., Police Station Hastinapur, District Meerut, during the pendency of trial.
4. As per prosecution story, the applicant is stated to have been found at tubewell of Pappu Tyagi in the night of 10/11.2.2025, whereby he is stated to have slaughtered and committed murder of Ravi Shankar.
5. Learned counsel for the applicant has argued that the applicant is absolutely innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. The FIR is delayed as no time of offence is mentioned therein.
6. Learned counsel for the applicant has further argued that there is no ocular evidence of the incident, as no person has seen the applicant slaughtering the deceased person. The only evidence against him is of last seen by one Ompal, who is stated to have seen the applicant swiping and cleaning the blood stains at the tubewell. Another witness has come up i.e. Ajay, who is stated to have deposed regarding money transaction dispute between the two. Subsequently, one witness Sonu has also been roped in but his evidence

has no value. There is no criminal history of the applicant. The applicant is languishing in jail since 13.2.2025 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 State Law Officer and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the bail application but the submissions raised by the learned counsel for the applicant could not be disputed.

8. 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 there is no eye-witness of the incident, 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**.

9. Let the applicant- **Vikas**, 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.

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

11. 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

Shalini