



2026:AHC:57566

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

**CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No.
- 2261 of 2026**

Kaisar And Another

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Pankaj Kumar Tiwari, Vijay Kumar Singh

Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A.

Court No. - 72

HON'BLE JITENDRA KUMAR SINHA, J.

1. Heard Mr. Pankaj Kumar Tiwari, learned counsel for the applicant, Mr. B.P. Maurya, 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. 89 of 2019 under Sections 147, 148, 452, 323, 504, 506, 308, 325 IPC, Police Station- Bhojipura, 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 applicants that applicants are innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that the charge sheet in the case has also been submitted and they are ready to co-operate with the trial. No bailable warrant and non-bailable warrant has been sent on the applicant. It was also submitted that applicants undertake to co-operate during trial and they would appear as and when required by the investigating agency or Court. It has been stated that in case, applicants are granted anticipatory bail, they 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 and it has been submitted by him that the applicants had approached this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.c. which was disposed of with a direction to the applicant to approach the learned court concerned for seeking regular bail but they have not complied with the order.

5. In reply, learned counsel for the applicants submitted that since the compromise had been taken place outside the Court and they have also submitted.

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 applicants 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 applicants- **Kaisar** and **Shahmat** 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 applicants shall not tamper with evidence and that they would appear before the trial Court on the date fixed unless exempted by the Court concerned;

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

(iv) The applicants 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 applicants.

(Jitendra Kumar Sinha,J.)

March 18, 2026
Virendra