



2026:AHC:64346

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 9410 of 2026

Maniram

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Uday Prakash
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 68

HON'BLE ASHUTOSH SRIVASTAVA, J.

Heard Sri Samondra Singh, learned counsel under the authority of Sri Uday Prakash, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Puneet Kumar Singh, learned AGA for the State and perused the records.

The instant bail application has been filed seeking enlargement on bail in Case Crime NO. 50 of 2014, under Sections 419, 420, 468, 467, 471, 120-B of IPC, Police Station Phase-3 Noida, District Gautam Buddh Nagar, during the pendency of the trial before the court below. The bail application of the applicant before the court below has been rejected by the Additional Sessions Judge, Court No. 6, Gautam Buddh Nagar, vide order dated 24.02.2026 and the applicant has been languishing in jail since 14.01.2026.

Learned counsel for the applicant has argued that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the instant case crime number for oblique motives. The FIR giving rise to the instant case crime number was lodged by the first informants Pramod Yadav and Vinod Yadav sons of late Sri Nanakchand nominating 15 persons including the applicant with the allegation that the informants are the recorded Bhumidhars in possession of Khasra No. 115, situate in village Garhi Chaukhandi, Pargana and Tehsil Dadri, Police Station Phase-3, Noida, Gautam Buddh Nagar and on perusal of the relevant khatauni of the aforesaid khasra on 27.02.2023 it was revealed that the nominated persons have got their names mutated over the khasra of the informant on the strength of forged fictitious sale deeds by setting up imposters and fictitious identity and Aadhar cards. The aforesaid persons have also acted as marginal witnesses for each other in the sale

deeds so executed besides three other witnesses have also been set up. On the strength of the fictitious sale deeds seven mutation applications were filed and names have been got recorded and the ancestral land of the informants have been grabbed. The applicant is stated to have acted as a witness of the sale deed.

Learned counsel for the applicant has argued that the applicant is merely a marginal witness of the sale deed and no sinister purpose can be said to be attracted to the case of the applicant so as to attract the offences alleged. The dispute is essentially a civil dispute. The applicant has criminal antecedents of one other case i.e. Case Crime No. 101 of 2024 under Sections 420, 468, 467, 120-B, 504, 506 IPC in which he is yet to be bailed out. Learned counsel for the applicant has further argued that co-accused Furkan, Rajesh, Rohit Verma and Praveen Yadav have been enlarged in bail and the applicant is also entitled to be released on bail on the ground parity. The applicant undertakes to cooperate in the trial and shall not misuse the liberty if released on bail. Hence bail is prayed for.

Per contra, the bail plea has been vehemently opposed by the learned AGA by submitting that the complicity of the applicant in the commission of the crime stands established from the material collected by the Investigating Officer during investigation. The applicant is prima-facie guilty of the offence alleged. The bail plea deserves outright rejection.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and having perused the records, I find that the applicant as a marginal witness identified the sellers/imposters being fully aware that the alleged sellers are not the owners of the land subject matter of the sale deeds. The applicant is also involved in another case of similar nature in which he is yet to be bailed out. In such view of the matter is not inclined to release the applicant on bail at this state. No case for parity is made out.

In the light of the facts and circumstances of the present case, it would be inappropriate to discuss the evidence in depth at this stage because it is likely to influence the trial of the accused. But, from the perusal of the evidences, collected during investigation so far, prima-facie, the involvement of the accused in the present case cannot be ruled out. No reason is found to falsely implicate the applicant/accused. Therefore, there is no good ground to release the applicant-accused on bail at this stage. All the

contentions raised by the learned counsel for the applicant pertain to the merits of the case and the same cannot be considered while considering application for grant of bail. This court is unable to form an opinion at this stage that the accused has not committed an offence.

In the ultimate conclusion, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, gravity of the offence, severity of punishment, in my opinion, no case for bail is made out. Accordingly, the bail application is hereby **rejected**.

It is clarified that the observations made regarding the bail application is limited to the decision of the bail application and any observations made herein shall not effect the trial of the case.

March 26, 2026

pks

(Ashutosh Srivastava,J.)