



2026:AHC-LKO:20219

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

**CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No.
- 1870 of 2025**

Anjani

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

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

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Ankit Tripathi
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 13

HON'BLE SAURABH LAVANIA, J.

1. As per letter of the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sitapur, dated 22.12.2025, the service of notice upon the opposite party No.2 is sufficient. However, none is present for the private opposite party No.2 to oppose the anticipatory bail. This Court on 16.03.2026 observed that *"It is made clear that on the next dates of listing, the case would not be adjourned on any ground including the illness and appropriate orders, which includes adversarial order to the private opposite party, would be passed in first call even in the absence of counsel for the private opposite party"*. In the above circumstances, this court proceeded to decide the case finally.

2. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the material placed on record.

3. The present anticipatory bail application has been filed by the applicants in relation to Case Crime No.0144/2025, under Section(s) 80(2), 85 of BNS, 2023 and Section 3 & 4 of the D.P. Act, Police Station - Sadarpur, District - Sitapur.

4. Vide order dated 03.12.2025, this Court had protected the interest of the applicant. The order dated 03.12.2025, referred, reads as under : -

"1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant as well as learned A.G.A. and perused the record.

2. The present application has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS seeking anticipatory bail apprehending arrest in 144 of 2025, under Sections 80(2), 85 of BNS and Section 3/4 of D.P. Act, Police Station Sadarpur, District Sitapur.

3. The FIR in question was lodged alleging that the daughter of the informant was married

to the son of the applicant. Subsequently, the entire matrimonial family had killed her for dowry.

4. The submission of the Counsel for the applicant is that the applicant is the sister-in-law. The cause of death, as per the postmortem report, is ante mortem hanging and no injury, other than the ligature mark was observed on the body of the deceased. The co-accused, who is the husband and the brother-in-law, were enlarged on bail. The applicant had also preferred a Criminal Misc. Writ Petition No.6998 of 2025, in which, interim protection was granted to the applicant.

5. Learned A.G.A. vehemently opposed the bail prayer.

6. Considering the fact that the co-accused have been enlarged on bail and the allegations against the applicant are similar to the said co-accused and also considering the postmortem report, I am of the view that the applicant is entitled for the benefit of add interim anticipatory bail.

7. Issue notice.

8. Steps be taken to serve the opposite party no. 2 within a week.

9. List after four weeks.

10. In the event of arrest, let the applicant Anjani be released on add interim anticipatory bail in the abovesaid first information report number till conclusion of the trial on his furnishing personal bond and two reliable sureties of Rs.20,000/- each to the satisfaction of the court concerned with the following conditions:

(a) The applicant shall execute a bond to undertake to attend the hearings;

(b) The applicant shall not commit any offence similar to the offence of which he is accused or suspected of the commission; and

(c) 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.

(d) The applicant shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court."

5. The learned counsel appearing for the prosecution could not demonstrate from the record that there is any adversarial facts which are pleaded in the bail application. This Court finds that the applicant was enlarged on anticipatory bail after considering the merits of the case. The learned counsel for the prosecution also could not point out any fact based upon which it can be inferred that the applicant has not cooperated with the investigation proceedings or otherwise any glaring fact which can adversely affect the merit of the case.

6. In view of the aforesaid, the present anticipatory bail application is hereby **allowed** while extending anticipatory bail to the applicant - **Anjani** till disposal of the trial, subject to the following conditions:-

(i) that the applicant shall make herself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) that 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

from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence;

(iii) that the applicant shall not leave India without the previous permission of the court;

(iv) that the applicant shall appear before the trial court on each date fixed, unless personal presence is exempted; and

(v) that the applicant shall not pressurize/intimidate the prosecution witness.

7. In case of default, it would be open for the Investigating Agency to move application for vacation of this order.

(Saurabh Lavania,J.)

March 19, 2026

ML/-