



2026:AHC:127558

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD**

**CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 19937 of 2026**

Mohan Katheriya @ Pappu

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite  
Party(s)

---

|                               |   |                       |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Counsel for Applicant(s)      | : | Ram Ashish Pandey     |
| Counsel for Opposite Party(s) | : | G.A., Prashant Mishra |

---

**Court No. - 45**

**HON'BLE VIVEK KUMAR SINGH, J.**

1. Heard Sri Ram Ashish Pandey, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Prashant Mishra, learned counsel for the informant and the learned A.G.A. for the State of U.P.
2. The instant bail application has been filed seeking release of the applicant on bail in Case Crime No. 75 of 2026 under Section 123, 64(1), 76 BNS, Police Station-Bakewar, District-Etawah.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has nothing to do with the alleged offence. The FIR was lodged by moving an application before the learned Magistrate. The alleged incident had taken place on 08.08.2025 whereas the FIR was lodged after delay of more than seven months on 25.03.2026. It is alleged in the FIR that physical relationship was established by the applicant on false promise of marriage. It is further submitted that a case of consensual relationship has been converted into an offence of rape. The victim was major and matured lady and about 22 years of age. She remained in the relationship for a considerable period of time with the applicant but when the things did not work out she lodged the FIR against the applicant and his brother Sonu. Learned counsel for the applicant next contends that the similarly situated co-accused, namely, Sonu Kumar has been granted bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 12.05.2026 passed in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 16104 of 2026. He further contends that the applicant has no criminal antecedents and he is in jail since

20.05.2026.

4. Learned A.G.A., on the other hand, opposed the prayer for grant of bail, however, he could not dispute the fact that similarly situated co-accused, namely, Sonu Kumar has been granted bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court.

5. I have considered the rival submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties and perused the material brought on the record.

6. In view of the entire facts and circumstances of the case, especially taking into account the fact that the similarly situated co-accused, namely, Sonu Kumar has been granted bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court and the same order has not been set aside or stayed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, and the applicant has been languishing in jail since 20.05.2026, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the applicant on bail.

7. The bail application is **allowed**.

8. Let the applicant- **Mohan Katheriya @ Pappu** who is involved in the aforementioned case crime be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned subject to following conditions. Further, before issuing the release order, the sureties be verified.

(i) The applicant shall file an undertaking to the effect that he shall not seek any adjournment on the date fixed for evidence when the witnesses are present in Court. In case of default of this condition, it shall be open for the Trial Court to treat it as abuse of liberty of bail and pass orders in accordance with law.

(ii) The applicant shall remain present before the Trial Court on each date fixed, either personally or through his counsel. In case of his absence, without sufficient cause, the Trial Court may proceed against him under Section 229-A IPC/ 269 B.N.S.

(iii) In case, the applicant misuses the liberty of bail during trial and in order to secure his presence proclamation under Section 82 Cr.P.C./ 84 B.N.S.S., may be issued and if applicant fails to appear before the Court on the date

fixed in such proclamation, then, the Trial Court shall initiate proceedings against him, in accordance with law, under Section 174-A IPC/ 209 B.N.S.

(iv) The applicant shall remain present, in person, before the Trial Court on dates fixed for (1) opening of the case, (2) framing of charge and (3) recording of statement under Section 313 Cr.P.C. If in the opinion of the Trial Court absence of the applicant is deliberate or without sufficient cause, then it shall be open for the Trial Court to treat such default as abuse of liberty of bail and proceed against him in accordance with law.

9. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, it shall be a ground for cancellation of bail.

10. It is made clear that observations made in granting bail to the applicant shall not in any way affect the learned trial Judge in forming his independent opinion based on the testimony of the witnesses.

**(Vivek Kumar Singh,J.)**

**June 16, 2026**

Kirti