



2026:AHC:2698

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 45733 of 2025

Jai Prakash Ram Alias Gyan Chandra Ram

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Shailendra Kumar Rai
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Shailendra Kumar Rai, learned counsel for applicant, Sri Sanjeev Singh, learned Additional Advocate General assisted by Sri R.P. Patel, learned State Law Officer and perused the material placed on record.
3. The present bail application has been filed by the applicant in Case Crime No. 248 of 2025, under Sections 103(1), 109(1) B.N.S., Police Station Shadiabad, District Ghazipur, with the prayer to enlarge him on bail.
4. As per prosecution story, applicant is stated to have slaughtered and put to death his ex-wife, as she had married one Shailendra and when another lady Kaushalya Devi rushed to save her, she was also assaulted by the applicant, injuring her severely on 23.7.2025 at about 6.00 pm.
5. Learned counsel for the applicant has stated that false allegations have been made against the applicant. The injury sustained by Kaushalya Devi is simple in nature, as such, the applicant is entitled for bail. The applicant is in jail since 24.7.2025 and is ready to cooperate with trial. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.
6. Per contra, learned A.G.A. has vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that the applicant is the sole named accused person and the FIR is prompt. It is further stated that even the injured Kaushalya Devi has nominated the applicant, as such, the applicant is not entitled for bail.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the FIR is prompt and applicant is the sole named accused person therein, I do not find it a fit case for grant of bail to the applicant. The bail application is found devoid of merits and is, accordingly, ***rejected***.

8. However, it is directed that the aforesaid case pending before the trial court be decided expeditiously as early as possible in view of the principle as has been laid down in the recent judgments of the Supreme Court in the cases of ***Vinod Kumar vs. State of Punjab; 2015 (3) SCC 220*** and ***Hussain and Another vs. Union of India; (2017) 5 SCC 702***, if there is no legal impediment.

9. 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.

(Krishan Pahal,J.)

January 7, 2026

Shalini