



2026:AHC-LKO:22221

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 183 of 2026

Sankalp Siddhi Sisodia

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Prin. Secy. Home Civil Sectt.
Lko. And 3 Others

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Vinay Kumar, Mayank Srivastav
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 28

HON'BLE RAJEEV BHARTI, J.

Heard learned counsel for the applicant who has filed supplementary affidavit which is taken on record and learned AGA for the State.

In prosecution case, it is alleged that that on 05.09.2025 at about 11:00 p.m., while the complainant was having his meal at LDA Market, Gomti Nagar, a dispute over seating arose, whereupon the accused persons allegedly abused and assaulted him with the intention to kill. One of the accused is stated to have struck him on the head with the butt of a pistol, and thereafter an attempt was allegedly made to run him over with a Scorpio vehicle. The complainant was saved due to the intervention of onlookers, after which the accused persons fled the spot. The police were informed, the complainant was taken to the hospital in an unconscious condition, and upon regaining consciousness, he lodged the FIR.

Submission of learned counsel for the applicant is that the applicant is not named in the FIR and that only vague and general allegations have been levelled against the accused persons in the prosecution case. It is further submitted that the vehicle allegedly involved in the incident does not belong to the applicant and that the injured sustained only simple injuries.

Learned counsel for the applicant while drawing the attention of the Court to the injury report submits that during the medico-legal examination, the injuries suffered by the injured were opined to be simple in nature. Although

the injured was referred for X-ray examination, the radiological report records no abnormality. It is further submitted that there is no independent witness to the incident, nor has the injured made any specific or categorical allegation against the applicant. No recovery of any incriminating article has been effected from the applicant or from any of the co-accused.

It is further contended that having regard to the statement of the injured and the nature of injuries sustained, the present case could not have travelled beyond Section 115(2) of the BNS, and the essential ingredients to attract Section 109 BNS (corresponding to Section 307 IPC) are wholly absent. The applicant is in judicial custody since 30.10.2025 and has no criminal antecedents.

The co-accused Tushar Yadav has been granted bail vide order passed in Bail No.12656 of 2025.

It is further submitted that there is no possibility of the applicant of fleeing away after being released from jail 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 prayer for bail.

Having considered the nature of the injuries sustained by the injured, the statements of the injured and the eye-witnesses, the bail order co-accused, noted above, and the fact that the applicant is in custody since 25.10.2025 without any criminal antecedents, this Court finds it to be a fit case for enlarging the applicant on bail.

Accordingly, the bail application is allowed on the ground of parity.

Let the applicant Sankalp Siddhi Sisodiya, involved in Crime No. 420/2025, U/S-109(1)/191(2)/115(2)/131/351(2)/352/3(5)BNS, P.S.- Gomti Nagar, District- Lucknow, 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 30, 2026

k kb/