



2026:AHC:25878

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 3582 of 2026

Anuj Kumar Singh

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Sudhanshu Kumar Singh
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 3

HON'BLE DR. GAUTAM CHOWDHARY, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the record.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that this is the second bail application moved on behalf of applicant. His first bail application was rejected on merits by this Court vide order dated 05.08.2025 passed in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 1296 of 2025. Though the informant in his statement recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. has made specific allegation of embezzlement of money against the applicant, but after rejection of the first bail application the informant appeared at the trial as P.W.1, who in his cross-examination has not made any allegation of embezzlement against the applicant and has not supported the prosecution case, which statement has been filed as Annexure-7 to the affidavit filed in support of the bail application. Thus, it is argued that there is bleak chance that prosecution may prove its case beyond reasonable doubt and the applicant may be convicted. Several other submissions in order to demonstrate the falsity of the allegations made against the applicant have also been placed before the Court. The circumstances which, according to the counsel, led to the false implication of the accused have also been mentioned. It has also been assured on behalf of the applicant that he is ready to cooperate with the process of law and shall faithfully make himself available before the court whenever required and is also ready to accept all the conditions which the Court may deem fit to impose upon him. He next submits that applicant is languishing in jail since 30.09.2024, having no criminal history.

3. Per contra, learned A.G.A. has opposed the prayer for bail of the applicant by contending that the innocence of the applicant cannot be adjudged before conclusion of trial, therefore, he does not deserve any indulgence, but he has not disputed that the informant in his cross-examination has not supported the prosecution case during the course of trial and he has been declared hostile.

4. Considering the overall facts and circumstances, the nature of allegations, the gravity of offence and without expressing any opinion on merits, this Court finds it to be a fit case for bail. Accordingly, the bail application stands allowed.

5. Let the applicant-Anuj Kumar Singh, be enlarged on bail in Case Crime No. 356 of 2023, under Sections 409, 504 I.P.C., Police Station-Bansdeeh, District- Ballia, on executing a personal bond and furnishing two local sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned with the following conditions:

- i) The applicant shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence.
- ii) The applicant shall not threaten or harass the prosecution witnesses.
- iii) The applicant shall appear on the date fixed by the trial court.
- iv) The applicant shall not commit any offence similar to the offence of which the applicant is accused, or suspected of the commission.
- v) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade such person from disclosing facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence.

6. In case of default of any of the conditions enumerated above, the court concerned shall be at liberty to cancel the bail of applicant in accordance with law.

(Dr. Gautam Chowdhary,J.)

February 5, 2026

Mustaqeem.