



2026:AHC:11066

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 1050 of 2026

Mukarram

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Sudhir Kumar Agarwal
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Sudhir Kumar Agarwal, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Sushil Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the informant and Sri Arun Kumar Mishra, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the material placed on record.
3. Applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No.282 of 2025, under Sections 140(1), 103(1), 324(4), 238(A), 61(2), 3(5) B.N.S., Police Station- Chhapar, District- Muzaffarnagar, during the pendency of trial.
4. As per prosecution story, the son of the informant is stated to have left with his car, which he used to run as taxi, on 7.10.2025 but did not return. The informant instituted a missing report on 9.10.2025. Subsequently, the dead body of the deceased person was recovered on 17.10.2025 from Mohand, Dehradun Road, Uttarakhand. Subsequent to it, the FIR was instituted.
5. Learned counsel for the applicant has argued that the applicant is absolutely innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has nothing to do with the said offence. The FIR is delayed by about thirteen days and it is even delayed by three days from the date of recovery of dead body and there is no explanation of the said delay caused.
6. Learned counsel for the applicant has further stated that the missing report

was filed by the informant on 9.10.2025, but he did not whisper a single word against the applicant in it. The applicant has been nominated on the basis of suspicion only. There is no evidence of last seen, as such, the applicant is entitled for bail.

7. It is further argued by learned counsel for the applicant that there is no criminal antecedent of the applicant. The applicant is languishing in jail since 22.10.2025 and he is ready to cooperate with trial. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.

8. Per contra, learned counsel for the informant and learned A.G.A. have vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that there is CDR, whereby the applicant was having regular conversation with the deceased person.

9. The well-known principle of "*Presumption of Innocence Unless Proven Guilty*" gives rise to the concept of bail as a rule and imprisonment as an exception.

10. A person's right to life and liberty, guaranteed by Article 21 of the Indian Constitution, cannot be taken away simply because the person is accused of committing an offence until the guilt is established beyond a reasonable doubt. Article 21 of the Indian Constitution states that no one's life or personal liberty may be taken away unless the procedure established by law is followed, and the procedure must be just and reasonable. The said principle has been reiterated by the Supreme Court in ***Satender Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and another, (2022) 10 SCC 51.***

11. Reiterating the aforesaid view, the Supreme Court in the case of ***Manish Sisodia Vs. Directorate of Enforcement, 2024 INSC 595***, has again emphasized that the very well-settled principle of law that bail is not to be withheld as a punishment is not to be forgotten. It is high time that the Courts should recognize the principle that "*bail is a rule and jail is an exception*".

12. Learned A.G.A./State Law Officer could not bring forth any exceptional circumstances which would warrant denial of bail to the applicant.

13. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions made

by learned counsel for the parties, the evidence on record, taking into consideration the delay in institution of FIR coupled by the fact that there is no evidence of last seen, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, *prima faice*, the Court is of the view that the applicant has made out a case for bail. The bail application is ***allowed***.

14. Let the applicant- **Mukarram**, 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 pressurize/intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The applicant shall appear before the trial court on the date fixed.

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

16. 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 16, 2026
Vikas Verma