



2026:AHC-LKO:21295

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 2072 of 2026

Ranjeet

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

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

.....Opposite
Party(s)

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

Court No. - 13

HON'BLE MANISH KUMAR, J.

1. Supplementary affidavit filed today is taken on record.
2. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned AGA for the State and perused the record.
3. By means of this application, the applicant, who is involved in Case Crime No. 15 of 2026, under Sections 310 (2), 317(3), 61(2), 111(3) B.N.S (Corresponding Sections 395, 412, 120-B I.P.C), Police Station Talgaon, District Sitapur, is seeking enlargement on bail during the trial.
4. The brief facts of the case are that an FIR dated 18.01.2026 has been registered under Section 310(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (akin to Section 395 IPC, now repealed), alleging therein that at around 1:00 a.m., some unknown persons committed theft at the house of the informant and looted cash amounting to Rs. 4,00,000, along with jewellery, and also threatened the informant to kill.
5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the FIR was initially lodged against unknown persons. During the course of investigation, the police prepared a recovery memo dated 24.01.2026 stating that on the tip-off of a *mukbir khas*, two motorcycles were intercepted and the applicant was apprehended while riding one of them. Upon search, a sum of Rs. 38,000 and a mobile phone were recovered from the possession of the applicant, while from other co-accused persons, a country-made pistol, live cartridges, and some jewellery were shown to have been recovered.
6. It is further submitted that the entire recovery story is false and cooked up. Learned counsel contends that on 22.01.2026, two police personnel had already taken the applicant into custody from his *sasural* (in-laws' house). On

the same day, the applicant's wife lodged a complaint before the Superintendent of Police, District Sitapur, through the IGRS portal, along with photographs showing police personnel in plain clothes taking away the applicant. It is submitted that after two days, the applicant's name has falsely been introduced in the present case. The applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated and he is in jail since 24.01.2026.

7. It is further submitted that co-accused Virendra Kumar, from whose possession only Rs. 1,130 is alleged to have been recovered, has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 13.03.2026. A copy of the said bail order has been annexed as S.A.-1 to the supplementary affidavit filed today thus, the applicant is also entitled to be released on bail.

8. Learned counsel for the applicant further submitted that the applicant has criminal history of only one case under Sections 323, 504, and 506 I.P.C, in which he has already been enlarged on bail at the police station level, as mentioned in paragraph 6 of the supplementary affidavit filed today.

9. Per contra, learned A.G.A has opposed the bail application and has submitted that the case of co-accused Virendra Kumar is distinguishable on facts and the applicant is not entitled to parity. However, learned AGA could not dispute the fact regarding the complaint made by the applicant's wife on the IGRS portal dated 22.01.2026, and in the instructions, it has specifically been acknowledged that such a complaint was received two days prior to the alleged arrest and recovery.

10. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and considering the material on record, particularly the complaint made by wife of the applicant on 22.01.2026 indicating that the applicant was taken into custody prior to the alleged recovery and arrest dated 24.01.2026, thus, prima-facie, it is found that it is a fit case in which the applicant may be enlarged on bail.

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

12. Let the applicant **Ranjeet** be released on bail in the aforesaid case crime number on his furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned with the following conditions:-

(i) The applicant will cooperate with the prosecution during trial.

(ii) The applicant will not tamper with the evidence during trial.

(iii) The applicant will not pressurize/intimidate the prosecution witness(es).

(iv) The applicant shall not commit an offence.

(v) 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 from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence.

(vi) The applicant shall remain present before the trial court on each date fixed, either personally or through counsel.

(vii) The applicant will not seek any adjournment on the dates fixed for evidence when the witnesses are present in court.

(viii) The applicant shall remain present, in person, before the trial court on the dates fixed for recording of statement under Section 313 Cr.P.C.

13. In case of default of above conditions it shall be open for the trial court to treat it as abuse of liberty of bail and pass orders in accordance with law.

14. As this order relates to enlargement of the applicant on bail, it is clarified that observations made in this order shall have no bearing on the merits of the case and the trial court shall not be influenced by any observations made in this order.

March 25, 2026
DiVYa

(Manish Kumar,J.)