



2026:AHC-LKO:21780

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 1700 of 2026

Ankit Kataria

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

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

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Syed Mohammad Abuzar Zaidi,
Harikesh Kumar

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

Court No. - 28

HON'BLE RAJEEV BHARTI, J.

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

The accused-applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No.1149 of 2025 under Section 318(4), 338, 336 (3), 3(5), 340(2) BNS and Section 66D IT Act, Police Station Kotwali, District Barabanki.

In the prosecution case, it is alleged that the main accused, Deepak Tiwari, is involved in online betting activities and earns money by referring others to the said betting platforms. It is further alleged that the main accused, along with the co-accused persons, is also involved in other offences such as publishing false advertisements for providing jobs, pornography, digital arrest fraud, etc., and that by engaging in such illegal activities, the co-accused Deepak Tiwari and other accused persons used to receive money in their respective bank accounts.

Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that no material has been collected by the prosecution to establish the complicity of the applicant. False recovery of a mobile phone and Rs. 100/- cash is shown to have been recovered from the applicant. The offences alleged are triable by the Magistrate. Applicant has no other criminal history.

It is submitted that co-accused Adarsh Raj and Mennakshi Verma have been enlarged on bail vide orders dated 18.02.2026 and 18.02.2026 passed in Criminal Misc. Bail Application Nos. 825 of 2026 and 1208 of 2026, respectively. Applicant claims parity with the bail orders of the said co-accused.

It is further submitted that there is no possibility of the applicant of fleeing away after being released on bail or tampering with the witnesses. In case the applicant is enlarged on bail, he shall not misuse the liberty of bail.

Learned A.G.A. has opposed the bail prayer of the applicant but could not dispute the fact it is a case of parity.

I have considered the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the parties as well as perused the record.

On due consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case, bail orders of the co-accused, the fact that he has no criminal history; he is in judicial custody since 30.12.2025; the offences alleged are triable by the Magistrate; and considering the nature of material collected by the prosecution against the present applicant and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I find it to be a fit case for enlarging the applicant on bail on the ground of parity.

Accordingly, the bail application is allowed.

Let the applicant Ankit Kataria,, involved in the aforesaid FIR/Case crime number, be released on bail in the aforementioned case 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.

(Rajeev Bharti,J.)

March 26, 2026

k kb/