



2026:AHC:19120

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 45873 of 2024

Teetu Alias Dhirendra

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Shailesh Kumar Srivastava, Shamsheer Singh

Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : Anand Priya Singh, G.A.

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised. Rejoinder affidavit filed today is taken on record.
2. Heard Sri Shailesh Kumar Srivastava, learned counsel for applicant, Sri Anand Priya Singh, learned counsel for the informant, Sri Sunil Kumar, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the material placed on record.
3. The present bail application has been filed by the applicant in Case Crime No.825 of 2024, under Sections 352 and 103 B.N.S., Police Station Kotwali City, District Bijnor with the prayer to enlarge him on bail.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant has stated that the applicant has nothing to do with the said offence. He has been falsely implicated in the present case. The real culprit was the person in whose house the deceased person was sleeping, but as a cover up he has falsely implicated the applicant. Only one witness has been examined to date. There is no likelihood of conclusion of trial in near future. The applicant is in jail since 01.09.2024 and is ready to cooperate with trial. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.
5. Learned counsel for the informant and learned A.G.A. have vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that the applicant is the main accused person, as such, he is entitled for bail.
6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the applicant is the sole named accused person in the FIR, I do

not find it a fit case for grant of bail to the applicant. The bail application is found devoid of merits and is, accordingly, ***rejected***.

7. However, it is directed that the aforesaid case pending before the trial court be decided expeditiously as early as possible in view of the principle as has been laid down in the recent judgments of the Supreme Court in the cases of ***Vinod Kumar vs. State of Punjab; 2015 (3) SCC 220*** and ***Hussain and Another vs. Union of India; (2017) 5 SCC 702***, if there is no legal impediment.

8. 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.

(Krishan Pahal,J.)

January 28, 2026
(Ravi Kant)