



2026:AHC:56461

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 1878 of 2026

Jay Mahor

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Jitendra Kumar

Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A., Girja Shankar Prajapati, Suresh Kumar Verma

Court No. - 67

HON'BLE SAMEER JAIN, J.

1. Heard Sri Jitendra Kumar, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Girija Shankar Prajapati, learned counsel for the informant and Sri Rajiv Dhar Dwivedi, learned AGA for the State.

2. The instant bail application has been filed seeking release of the applicant on bail in Case Crime No.686 of 2025, under Sections 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 351(2), 316(2) BNS, Police Station Lisari Gate, District Meerut, during pendency of the trial.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits, as per allegation informant was NEET aspirant and applicant along with others duped her and received more than Rs.44 Lakhs from her under the pretext to clear NEET examination of her son but entire allegations levelled against the applicant are totally false.

4. He next argued, even as per the informant total Rs.49 Lakhs were given but only Rs. 15 lakhs were transferred in bank account and entire rupees 15 lakhs have been returned.

5. He next submits, even informant appears to be dishonest person.

6. He further argued, applicant is a petty employee of a coaching center.

7. He further submits, applicant is not having any previous criminal history and in the present matter, he is in jail since 04.10.2025 and even

all the offences are triable by Magistrate.

8. Per contra, learned AGA as well as learned counsel for the informant opposed the prayer for bail but could not dispute the argument on facts advanced by learned counsel for the applicant.

9. They also could not dispute the fact that all the alleged offences are triable by Magistrate and applicant is not having any previous criminal history and in the present matter, he is in jail since 04.10.2025.

10. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case.

11. However, as per allegation, applicant along with two others duped the informant and misappropriated about Rs.49 Lakhs of the informant but except Rs.15 Lakhs which were deposited in different bank accounts there is no evidence with regard to other amounts and entire money of Rs.15 Lakhs which were transferred by informant have been returned to her.

12. Further, this Court finds merit in the argument advanced by learned counsel for the applicant that even informant appears to be a dishonest person and she tried to secure seat for her son in the NEET examination with illegal mean.

13. Further, all the alleged offences are triable by Magistrate and applicant is not having any previous criminal history and in the present matter, he is in jail since 04.10.2025 i.e. for last five months. Further, even charge-sheet has already been filed in the present matter.

14. Further, the law is settled unless proven guilty an accused is deemed to be innocent and his bail application should not be rejected either for preventive or punitive purpose.

15. Therefore, considering the facts and circumstances of the case discussed above, in my view, applicant is entitled to be released on bail.

16. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant bail application is **allowed**.

17. Let the applicant -**Jay Mahor** be released on bail in the aforesaid case on furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned with the following conditions:-

(i) The applicant shall appear before the trial court on the dates fixed, unless his personal presence is exempted.

(ii) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly, make inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or any police officer or tamper with the evidence.

(iii) The applicant shall not indulge in any criminal and anti-social activity.

18. In case of breach of any of the above condition, the prosecution will be at liberty to move an application before this Court for cancellation of the bail of the applicant.

19. 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.

(Sameer Jain,J.)

March 17, 2026
S.A.