



2026:AHC:57874

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No.
- 2132 of 2026

Sukhram

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Manoj Pandey
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 72

HON'BLE JITENDRA KUMAR SINHA, J.

1. Heard Shri Manoj Pandey, learned counsel for the applicant, Shri Ashish Kumar Tripathi, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the record.
2. The present application has been moved seeking anticipatory bail in Case Crime no.71 of 2019, under Sections 308, 323, 504 of I.P.C., Police Station Rajpura, District Sambhal, with the prayer that in the event of arrest, applicant may be released on bail.
3. It has been argued by the learned counsel for the applicant that applicant is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that the general and omnibus allegations have been levelled against the applicant in the first information report and in the statement of the first informant, no specific role of assault has been assigned to the applicant, however, sometime he has filed an affidavit, in which, he has assigned the specific role of assault on the applicant. It is further submitted that the charge sheet in this case has already been submitted and the applicant is ready and willing to cooperate in the trial. It is also submitted that the applicant is having no criminal history. It was also submitted that applicant undertakes to co-operate during trial and he would appear as and when required by the investigating agency or Court. It has been stated that in case, applicant is granted anticipatory bail, he shall not misuse the liberty of bail and will co-operate with the investigation and would obey all conditions of bail.

4. On the other hand, learned A.G.A. has opposed the application for anticipatory bail.

5. As per first information report, applicant along with other co-accused persons are said to have assaulted the first informant side and no specific role has been assigned to the applicant as well as in the statement of the first informant/ injured recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C., however, the first informant subsequently filed an affidavit stating therein that it was the applicant, who assaulted him and the injury is said to have received incised wound and frontal fracture on his head. It is also submitted that the applicant is having no criminal history.

6. It may be stated that in case of **Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra, (2011) 1 SCC 694**, it has been held by Hon'ble Supreme Court that while deciding anticipatory bail, Court must consider nature and gravity of accusation, antecedent of accused, possibility of accused to flee from justice and that Court must evaluate entire available material against the accused carefully and that the exact role of the accused has also to be taken into consideration.

7. In the instant case, considering the settled principle of law regarding anticipatory bail, submissions of the learned counsel for the parties, role of applicant and all attending facts and circumstances of the case, without expressing any opinion on merits, a case for anticipatory bail is made out.

8. The anticipatory bail application is allowed.

9. In the event of arrest of the applicant- **Sukhram** involved in the aforesaid case crime shall be released on anticipatory bail on his furnishing a personal bond of Rs. 50,000/- with two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Court concerned, with the following conditions :-

(i) The applicant shall not tamper with evidence and that he would appear before the trial Court on the date fixed unless exempted by the Court concerned;

(ii) The applicant 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/her/them from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) The applicant would co-operate during trial and would not misuse the liberty of bail.

(iv) The applicant shall not leave India without prior permission of the Court concerned.

10. In default of any of the conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to file appropriate application for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the applicant.

(Jitendra Kumar Sinha,J.)

March 20, 2026
RKM