



2026:AHC:62423

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 9847 of 2026

Ram Das

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	: Mahenam Haroon, Pratham Gaur, Rajesh Kumar Yadav
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	: G.A.

Court No. - 64

HON'BLE VIVEK VARMA, J.

1. Sri Yash Tandon and Sri Rajesh Kumar, Advocates, have filed their Parcha on behalf of the informant. The same is taken on record.
2. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, Sri V.P. Tripathi, learned AGA for the State-respondent, and Sri Yash Tandon, learned counsel for the informant.
3. The present bail application under Section 483 BNSS has been filed with a prayer to enlarge the applicant on bail in Case Crime No. 428 of 2025, under Sections 105, 115(2), 352, 351(3), 329(3), 191(2), 191(3), 190, BNS, Police Station Junawai, District Sambhal during the pendency of trial.
4. Counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. The incident is alleged to have occurred on 06.11.2025. The first information report was lodged on 15.11.2025. The delay is fatal to the prosecution case. During investigation, Section 103(1) BNS was deleted and Sections 105, 191(2), 191(3) and 190 BNS were added. As per the first information report, the applicant along with eleven named accused and 15-20 unknown persons are alleged to have assaulted the brother of the informant. The brother of the informant succumbed to the injuries on 14.11.2025. According to the postmortem report the deceased sustained six injuries. The injuries no. 1 and 2 were on the head, whereas the other injuries were on right thigh, left side of abdomen, left arm and right side of chest. In the opinion of the doctor, the cause of death is coma and shock due to antemortem head injuries. It is next contended that a vague and

general role has been assigned to the applicant. The applicant was not nominated as the principal offender, who caused the head injuries. At this stage, there is no corroborative evidence to link the applicant with the offence. Criminal history of the applicant has been explained in Paragraphs-22 and 23 of the affidavit. The applicant is in jail since 20.11.2025 and in case he is enlarged on bail, he will not misuse the said liberty.

5. Learned AGA and learned counsel for the informant have opposed the prayer for bail but could not satisfactorily dispute the aforesaid submissions from the record.

6. Having heard counsel for the parties and having perused the record, this Court prima facie finds that the first information report was lodged belatedly. As per the first information report, the applicant along with eleven named accused and 15-20 unknown persons are alleged to have assaulted the brother of the informant. The brother of the informant succumbed to the injuries on 14.11.2025. According to the postmortem report the deceased sustained six injuries. The injuries no. 1 and 2 were on the head, whereas the other injuries were on right thigh, left side of abdomen, left arm and right side of chest. In the opinion of the doctor, the cause of death is coma and shock due to antemortem head injuries. A vague and general role has been assigned to the applicant. The applicant was not nominated as the principal offender, who caused the head injuries. At this stage, there is no corroborative evidence to link the applicant with the offence. Moreover, the applicant has remained confined for more than four months and after submission of charge sheet there is no hope of early conclusion of trial, more so when no reasonable apprehension has been brought to the fore by the State that the applicant, if enlarged on bail, would either tamper with the evidence or delay the trial or intimidate the witness, without commenting on the merits of the case, I am of the opinion that the applicant is entitled to be enlarged on bail.

7. Let the applicant- Ram Das, involved in the aforesaid case, 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 the conditions that he:

(i) shall appear on the date fixed by the trial court;

(ii) shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence; and,

(iii) shall not pressurize the prosecution witnesses.

8. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move bail cancellation application before this Court.

(Vivek Varma,J.)

March 25, 2026

SKT/-