



2026:AHC:127286

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 20443 of 2026

Tarun Kumar

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Mohammad Danish
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 45

HON'BLE VIVEK KUMAR SINGH, J.

1. Heard Sri Mohammad Danish, learned counsel for the applicant and the learned A.G.A. for the State of State of U.P.
2. The instant bail application has been filed seeking release of the applicant on bail in Case Crime No. 568 of 2025, under Sections 318(4), 123, 70(1), 351(2), 115(2) of B.N.S., Police Station - Majhola, District - Moradabad,
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. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that a dispute pertaining to money transactions has been deliberately given the colour of a case of gang rape. It is alleged that co-accused Rohit Saini had misappropriated an amount exceeding ₹1 crore from the victim's funds, comprising her personal earnings as well as money borrowed from her relatives. It is further submitted that the FIR was lodged against the applicant and co-accused Rohit Saini and Sunil Kumar. According to the allegations made in the FIR, the alleged incident of rape took place on 12.04.2025, whereas the FIR was lodged on 17.06.2025. Thus, there is a substantial delay in lodging the FIR, and no satisfactory explanation for such delay has been offered by the victim. The unexplained delay casts serious doubt on the genuineness of the prosecution case. Learned counsel for the applicant next contends that the similarly situated co-accused, namely, Rohit Saini has been granted bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 11.5.2026 passed in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 14796 of 2026. He further contends that the the applicant has no criminal antecedents and he is in jail since 19.5.2026.
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, Rohit Saini 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, Rohit Saini 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 19.5.2026, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the applicant on bail.

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

8. Let the applicant- **Tarun Kumar** 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.

June 15, 2026
Fahad

(Vivek Kumar Singh,J.)