



2026:AHC:58217

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD**

**CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 1752 of 2026**

Indrajeet Ram @ Nandu

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Opposite  
Party(s)

---

|                               |   |                      |
|-------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Counsel for Applicant(s)      | : | Akhilesh Kumar Singh |
| Counsel for Opposite Party(s) | : | G.A.                 |

---

**Court No. - 64**

**HON'BLE VIVEK VARMA, J.**

1. As per office report dated 19.2.2026, notice of the present bail application has been personally served upon the opposite party no.2/ informant. However, no one appears on behalf of the opposite party no.2 nor any counter affidavit has been filed on his behalf.

2. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Rupak Chaubey, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the record.

3. The present bail application has been filed with a prayer to enlarge the applicant on bail in Case Crime No. 163 of 2025, under Sections 137(2), 87, 65(1) B.N.S. and 5/6 POCSO Act, Police Station- Sahatwar, District- Ballia during pendency of the trial.

4. Counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. The incident is alleged to have occurred on 25.7.2025. The first information report was lodged on 22.8.2025. The delay is fatal to the prosecution case. The victim is major. The age of the victim was incorrectly got registered in the school records by the victim's parents to give her advantage in life. There is no lawful basis for the age

related entry of the victim in the school records. It is next contended that the victim in her statements under Sections 180 and 183 B.N.S. has stated that she left her house voluntarily and had gone with the applicant to Budaun and Patna. At Patna she had married the applicant, thereafter they went to Assam and stayed there for 15 days. She established relations with the applicant voluntarily. At this stage, there is no corroborative evidence to link the applicant with the offence. The applicant is in jail since 22.9.2025 having no criminal history. In case he is enlarged on bail, he will not misuse the said liberty.

5. Learned A.G.A. has opposed the prayer for bail but could not satisfactorily dispute the aforesaid submissions from the record.

6. Having heard counsel for the parties and having perused the record, this Court prima facie finds that the first information report was lodged belatedly. The victim in her statements under Sections 180 and 183 B.N.S. has stated that she left her house voluntarily and had gone with the applicant to Budaun and Patna. At Patna she had married the applicant, thereafter they went to Assam and stayed there for 15 days. She established relations with the applicant voluntarily. At this stage, there is no corroborative evidence to link the applicant with the offence. The applicant has no criminal antecedents. Further the applicant has presently remained confined for almost six months and there is no hope of early conclusion of trial, more so when no reasonable apprehension has been brought to the fore by the State that the applicant, if enlarged on bail, would either tamper with the evidence or intimidate the witness, without commenting on the merits of the case, I am of the opinion that the applicant is entitled to be enlarged on bail.

7. Let the applicant, **Indrajeet Ram @ Nandu** involved in the aforesaid case be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each of the like amount to the satisfaction of court concerned on the following conditions that:

i. the applicant shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence;

- ii. the applicant shall not pressurize the prosecution witness;
- iii. the applicant shall appear on each and every date fixed by the trial court.

8. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move bail cancellation application before this Court.

**March 20, 2026**  
S.S.

**(Vivek Varma,J.)**