



2026:AHC:37757

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S
482 BNSS No. - 1383 of 2026

Sangeeta Devi

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Bhawesh Pratap Singh,
Sanjay Kumar Dubey
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A.

Court No. - 65

HON'BLE DR. GAUTAM CHOWDHARY, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant as well as Shri Jayram Pandey, 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. 112 of 2025, under Sections 190, 191(2), 191(3), 352, 115(2), 110, 105, 117(2) of B.N.S., Police Station Mangalpur, District Kanpur Dehat, with the prayer that in the event of arrest, applicant may be released on anticipatory bail.
3. It has been argued by the learned counsel for the applicant that this is the second anticipatory bail application moved on behalf of applicant. Her first anticipatory bail application was rejected by this Court vide order dated 14.08.2025 passed in Criminal Misc. Anticipatory Bail Application No. 6527 of 2025. It has further been submitted that other accused have already been granted bail. The applicant has no criminal antecedents and that no coercive process has been issued against the applicant so far. It was also submitted that applicant undertakes to cooperate during trial and she would appear as and when required by the trial court. It has been stated that in case, the applicant is granted anticipatory bail, she shall not misuse the liberty of bail and will cooperate with the trial and would obey all conditions of bail.
4. Learned A.G.A. has opposed the application for anticipatory bail.
5. Having heard the learned counsel for the applicant as well as

learned A.G.A. for the State.

6. When this Court asked the learned counsel for the applicant to show as to whether after rejection of her first anticipatory bail application the applicant is cooperating with the trial, the learned counsel for the applicant failed to demonstrate anything regarding the aforesaid query. Further, the applicant has also failed to demonstrate any fresh ground for considering her second anticipatory bail application when her first anticipatory bail has already been rejected by this Court except that other accused have already been enlarged on bail, thus, the present anticipatory bail application deserves to be rejected.

7. Accordingly and in view of above, the present anticipatory bail application is rejected.

February 18, 2026

Mustaqeem.

(Dr. Gautam Chowdhary,J.)