



2026:AHC:63800

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

APPLICATION U/S 528 BNSS No. - 11069 of 2026

Satyapal

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

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

Court No. - 77

HON'BLE SAURABH SRIVASTAVA, J.

1. Heard Mr. Vinay Kumar Tripathi, learned counsel for applicant and learned A.G.A. for State.

2. This application under Section 528 BNSS has been filed for a direction to learned courts concerned to accept single personal bond and two sureties submitted on behalf of applicant in all the 6 cases, in which, applicant has been enlarged on bail.

3. Record shows that applicant has been enlarged on bail in different case crime numbers. The details of same are as under;-

(i) Case Crime No. 608 of 2012, under Sections 395, 397, 506, 411 IPC, Police Station- Kasna, District- Gautam Budh Nagar.

(ii) Case Crime No. 645 of 2012, under Sections 364-A, 358, 120-B IPC, Police Station- Kasna, District- Gautam Budh Nagar.

(iii) Case Crime No. 29 of 2023, under Section 2/3 Gangster Act, Police Station- Kasna, District- Gautam Budh Nagar.

(iv) Case Crime No. 159 of 2012, under Sections 394 IPC, Police Station- Highway, District- Mathura.

(v) Case Crime No. 96 of 2012, under Sections 147, 148, 149, 307 IPC, Police Station- Maghora, District- Mathura.

(vi) Case Crime No. 439 of 2012, under Sections 147, 148, 149, 307 IPC and 7 CLA Act, Police Station- Highway, District- Mathura.

4. Learned counsel for applicant contends that applicant is unable to arrange 12 sureties. Consequently, in spite of the fact that applicant has been released on bail in all the six criminal cases pending against him, applicant has yet not been released on bail as applicant has failed to furnish separate surety bonds in all the cases. In the facts and circumstances of the case, it is thus urged that applicant be directed to furnish a common personal bond and common surety bonds of like amount in all the cases. He, therefore, contends that appropriate direction, in the light of above, be issued in exercise of jurisdiction under Section 528 BNSS.

5. Reference has also been made to the judgments of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **Hani Nishad @ Mohammad Imran @ Vikky Vs. State of U.P., 2018 SCC OnLine SC 3946**. Learned counsel for applicant has also relied upon orders passed by this Court in **Bail No. 4965 of 2018 (Ramwati Awasthi Vs. State of U.P.) decided on 09.04.2019, Rizwan alias Atta Vs. State of U.P.), 2019 SCC OnLine All 7631, Application U/s 482 Cr.P.C. No. 40957 of 2019 (Mobin Vs. State of U.P.) decided on 21.11.2019 and Application U/s 482 Cr.P.C. No. 5444 of 2021 (Rajesh Khantwal Vs. State of U.P.) decided on 06.08.2021**, wherein Court has been modified the conditions of bail by providing that the personal bond and two sureties furnished by applicant, be accepted in all the cases pending against applicant.

6. On the aforesaid factual and legal premise, it is thus urged that present application be allowed and one personal bond and two sureties furnished by applicant in one case crime number be accepted as personal bond and sureties in all the cases.

7. Per contra, learned A.G.A. has opposed this application. However, he could not dispute the orders relied upon by the learned counsel for applicant.

8. The issue as to whether a personal bond and a single set of sureties furnished in one case can be treated as valid for other bail orders to enable the release of an accused has already been settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Girish Gandhi vs. State of U.P. and others [2024 INSC 617, decided on 22.08.2024]** wherein, Hon'ble the Supreme Court, while emphasizing that imposing excessive bail conditions defeats the very purpose of granting bail and infringes the fundamental right to personal liberty under Article 21, held that for FIRs pending in the States of Uttar

Pradesh, Rajasthan, Punjab, and Uttarakhand, the petitioner is required to furnish only one personal bond along with two sureties, and such single set of sureties shall be treated as valid for all FIRs within the concerned State.

9. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances as well as in light of the judgments rendered by Hon'ble the Apex Court as well as this Court, the present application succeeds and is liable to be allowed.

10. It is, accordingly, **allowed**.

11. It is, accordingly, provided that applicant shall be allowed to execute one personal bond and two sureties to the satisfaction of learned courts concerned, which shall hold good in all the 6 cases pending against present applicant.

March 26, 2026
Vivek Kr.

(Saurabh Srivastava,J.)