



2026:AHC-LKO:19642

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 1447 of 2026

Bhagwan Shankar Singh @ Uttam Singh

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Addl. Chief Secy. Deptt. Home
Lko.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	: Janardan Singh
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	: G.A., Akanksha Awasthi, Vijay Nath Pandey

Court No. - 15

HON'BLE KARUNESH SINGH PAWAR, J.

Supplementary affidavit filed by the applicant is taken on record.

Heard learned counsel for the accused-applicant, learned A.G.A. for the State as well as Sri Vijay Nath Pandey, learned counsel for the complainant.

In the prosecution case, it is alleged that on 16.11.2025 at about 11:30 A.M., due to old enmity, a Panchayat took place, and thereafter, near Lalbagiya Bridge, the husband of the complainant, Anand Yadav, and his *patidars*, namely Kishan Lal Yadav and Dashrath Lal Yadav, were assaulted by seven named accused persons using sharp-edged weapons, spears, and iron rods, etc. In the said incident, the husband of the complainant sustained injuries on his head, and the *patidars*, namely Kishan Lal Yadav and Dashrath Lal Yadav, also sustained injuries.

Submission of the learned counsel for the accused-applicant is that general allegations of causing injuries to three persons have been made against seven accused persons in the prosecution case, and there is no specific role assigned to the present applicant. It is further submitted that, except Anand, who is stated to have sustained a fracture injury on his head, no other injured person has suffered grievous injuries. The alleged use of a firearm is false, as neither any such weapon has been recovered nor is there any firearm injury reported. The applicant has duly explained his criminal history of two cases in paragraphs 9 and 10 of the bail application. It is further submitted that it is not clear from the prosecution case, including the statements of the injured witnesses, as to who caused the fatal injury to Anand.

It has been further submitted that applicant is in jail since 17.11.2025 and, if facility of bail is granted, there is no apprehension that he will flee from the judicial process and he will abide by the orders passed by the Court below and will co-operate in speedy trial of the case.

Learned A.G.A. as well as learned counsel for the complainant-Sri Vijay Nath Pandey have opposed the prayer for bail. Learned counsel for the compaliannt submits that iron rod and danda have been recovered from the applicant.

Perused the record including the injury reports of all the injureds.

Injury reports of the all the three injured persons are as under:-

"Dashrath Lal Yadav-

- 1. LW of 6 cm x 1 cm x deep skin over Ri. stile forehead 3 cm above from R. eyebrow edge clear, bleeding present. Adv. X-ray.*
- 2. Contuse swelling of 4 cm x 3 cm all around Lt. eye, just below from La eyebrow. Ref. to ophthaloology.*
- 3. Abrasion of 3 cm x 0.6 cm Rr. side of face just side to Rt. ear.*

Kishan Lal Yadav-

- 1. L.W of 7 cm of 1 cm deep scalp Lt. side forehead, 3 cm above from Lt. eyebrow, edge clear, bleeding present. Adv.- X-ray.*
- 2. Abrased swelling of 7 cm x 4 cm Rt. side head, 9 cm above from Rt. ear.*
- 3. Abrased confused swelling of 8 cm x 8 cm Rt. side face, Just below from Rt. eyebrow.*
- 4. Abrased swelling of 9 cm all around over top of Rt. shoulder. Adv. X-ray.*
- 5. Reddish contusion of 3 cm x 1.5 cm back of Lt. lower leg. 10 cm above from Lt. ankle Joint.*

Anand Kumar Yadav-

- 1. L.W of 12 cm x 1 cm scalp deep Rt. of head, 6 cm above from Rt. ear, bleeding present. Adv.- X-ray Head.*
- 2. Contuse swelling of 5 cm x 2 cm Rt. forehead, just above Rt. eyebrow.*
Adv.-X-ray head.
- 3. Rt. nose bleeding present. Refer ENT surgeon.*

4. Lt. ear bleeding present. Refer ENT surgeon.

5. Contuse swelling 8 cm-x all around Lt. arm, 6 cm below Lt. shoulder joint.

Adv. X-ray."

Upon due consideration of the aforesaid, it is not disputed that, except Anand, no other injured person has sustained grievous injuries, other two injured persons have sustained simple injuries; there is no specific allegation against the present applicant and only general allegations have been made against all the accused persons in the prosecution case, coupled with the fact that the applicant has explained his criminal history, has undertaken to cooperate in the trial and has been languishing in jail since 17.11.2025, I find it to be a fit case for enlarging the applicant on bail.

Accordingly, the bail application is **allowed**.

Let the applicant-**Bhagwan Shankar Singh @ Uttam Singh**, involved in Case Crime/FIR No. 521 of 2025, under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 115(2), 118(1), 117(2), 109(1), 110, 352, 351(3) BNS, Police Station-Kotwali Dehat, District-Gonda, be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of Magistrate/Court concerned, subject to following conditions:-

- (i) the applicant shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence;
- (ii) the applicant shall not pressurize the prosecution witnesses;
- (iii) the applicant shall appear on each and every date fixed by the trial Court.

Any other condition(s) which the trial court/concerned court may deem fit and proper, in the circumstances of the case, may also be imposed.

It is clarified that the observations made in this order are confined to the present bail application and shall have no bearing on the merits of the trial.

March 18, 2026

Vinay/-

(Karunesh Singh Pawar,J.)