



2026:AHC:60839

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No.
- 2140 of 2026

Azim

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

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

Court No. - 72

HON'BLE JITENDRA KUMAR SINHA, J.

1. Heard Mr. Lavlesh Kumar Sharma, learned Advocate holding brief of Mr. Anurag Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the applicant, Mr. Manoj Gautam, 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. 0020 of 2026, under Sections 8/21/29 of N.D.P.S. Act, Police Station Fatehganj West, District Bareilly, 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 applicant was not named in the FIR and his name was surfaced in the confessional statement of arrested co-accused persons and from their possession 51 gm and 54 gm smack are said to have been recovered separately. It is further submitted that in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Tofan Singh Vs. State of Tamil Nadu** confessions made to NDPS officers during investigation are not admissible in court because they are considered equivalent to police officers. 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. The applicant was not named in the FIR and his name was surfaced in the confessional statement of arrested co-accused persons and from their possession 51 gm and 54 gm smack are said to have been recovered separately.

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- **Azim** involved in the aforesaid case crime shall be released on anticipatory bail on 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
Virendra