



2026:AHC:67721

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL APPEAL No. - 2169 of 2026

Satyadev Shukla @ Satya

.....Appellant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Appellant(s)	: Arvind Singh Parmar, Virendra Singh Parmar
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: G.A.

Court No. - 50

HON'BLE SHEKHAR KUMAR YADAV, J.

1. The present criminal appeal under Section 14-A(2) Scheduled Castes & Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act has been filed by the appellant to set aside the bail rejection order dated 24.12.2025 passed by learned Special Judge SC/ST Act, Kanpur Nagar in Bail Application No.4999 of 2025 arising out of Case Crime No.158 of 2024, under Sections 147, 302, 120B IPC and 3(2)(5) of SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, Police Station Sachendi, District Kanpur Nagar.
2. Heard learned counsel for the appellant, the learned AGA for the State-respondent no.1 and perused the entire record. Despite service of notice, none has appeared on behalf of informant.
3. Submission of learned counsel for the appellant is that the appellant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. The appellant has not committed any offence as alleged in the impugned FIR. Further submission is that the prosecution story is totally false and fabricated. The incident is said to have taken place on 17.05.2024 whereas the impugned FIR has been lodged on 19.05.2024 against nine accused persons without any plausible explanation. There is no direct or indirect evidence against the appellant. Further submission is that **similarly placed co-accused, Raj Bahadur, Mahaveer @ Bajrangi @ Nanhe and Amand @ Satyam Singh** have already been granted bail by Apex Court as well as by another co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide orders dated 30.10.2025, 28.04.2025 and 21.11.2025, copy of bail orders has been annexed as Annexure Nos.10, 11 and 12 of the affidavit. Further submission is that since the similarly placed

co-accused persons have already been granted bail, the accused appellant is also entitled for bail on the ground of parity. Appellant is languishing in jail since 20.06.2024 having no previous criminal history. Further submission is that the impugned order rejecting the bail application of the appellant suffers from infirmity and illegality warranting interference by this Court.

4. On the other hand, learned A.G.A. vehemently opposed the the prayer for bail of the appellant but could not dispute the aforesaid fact.

5. I have perused the bail order of co-accused and find that the role assigned to the present appellant is almost similar to that of co-accused, who have already been enlarged on bail by this Court.

6. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and keeping in view the nature of the offence, evidence, complicity of the accused, role assigned to the present appellant and the nature of injury, this Court is of the view that the appellant has made out a case for grant of bail on the ground of parity. The Court below erred in rejecting the bail application of the appellant. The impugned order suffers from infirmity and illegality and the same is liable to be set-aside and the appeal is liable to be allowed.

7. Accordingly, the appeal is **allowed** and the impugned order rejecting the bail application of the appellant is hereby set-aside.

8. Let the appellant-**Satyadev Shukla @ Satya**, involved in aforesaid case crime number **be released on bail** on 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 appellant will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.

(ii) The appellant will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witness.

(iii) The appellant will appear before the trial court on the date fixed, unless personal presence is exempted.

(iv) The appellant shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused, or suspected, of the commission of which he is suspected.

(v) The appellant 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 him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence.

9. 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 31, 2026
Ajeet

(Shekhar Kumar Yadav,J.)