



2026:AHC:57067

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 384 of 2026

Veeshu

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Rahul Kumar Tiwari, Sanjay Kumar
Srivastava
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A.

Court No. - 67

HON'BLE SAMEER JAIN, J.

1. Heard Sri Sanjay Kumar Srivastava, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri Imran Khan, learned AGA for the State.
2. The instant bail application has been filed seeking release of the applicant on bail in Case Crime No.195 of 2025, under Sections 308(5), 333, 324(4), 352,115(2), 351(2) BNS, Police Station Budhana, District Muzaffarnagar, during pendency of the trial.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits, however, as per allegation applicant made demand of Rs.50,000/- from the informant and also threatened him but entire allegation made against the applicant are totally false.
4. He next argued, actually, some dispute arose between informant and applicant and, therefore, he lodged FIR of the present case.
5. He next submits, admittedly, informant did not give any money to the applicant.
6. He further submits, applicant is having criminal history of five other cases but his criminal history has been duly explained in the supplementary affidavit filed in support of the instant bail application and in all the cases, he is on bail.
7. He further submits, in the present matter, applicant is in jail since

05.07.2025 i.e. for last more than 8 months.

8. Per contra, learned AGA opposed the prayer for bail but could not dispute the arguments on fact advanced by learned counsel for the applicant.

9. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case.

10. However, apart from the present case applicant is having criminal history of five other cases and there is also allegation of extortion but admittedly, no money was given by the informant to the applicant.

11. Further, even incident said to be taken place on 01.05.2025 and 03.05.2025 but FIR was lodged on 05.05.2025.

12. Further, even in all the previous cases applicant is on bail and his criminal history has been duly explained in the supplementary affidavit filed in support of the instant bail application.

13. Further, in the present matter, applicant is in jail for last more than eight months.

14. Therefore, considering the facts and circumstances of the case discussed above, in my view, applicant is entitled to be released on bail.

15. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant bail application is **allowed**.

16. Let the applicant - **Veeshu** be released on bail in the aforesaid case on 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 shall appear before the trial court on the dates fixed, unless his personal presence is exempted.

(ii) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly, make 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 any police officer or tamper with the evidence.

(iii) The applicant shall not indulge in any criminal and anti-social activity.

17. In case of breach of any of the above condition, the prosecution will be at liberty to move an application before this Court for cancellation of the bail of the applicant.

18. It is clarified that the observations made herein are limited to the facts brought in by the parties pertaining to the disposal of bail application and the said observations shall have no bearing on the merits of the case during trial.

(Sameer Jain,J.)

March 17, 2026
S.A.