



2026:AHC:129606

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 20180 of 2026

Ramashankar Yadav

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Rayoof Ali
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 45

HON'BLE VIVEK KUMAR SINGH, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, and Sri Ajay Singh learned A.G.A.-Ist 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. 290 of 2021, under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 406, 120B IPC, Police Station- Bhadohi, District- Bhadohi.

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. It is further submitted that though seven persons were nominated in the FIR but the applicant has not been nominated in the F.I.R. The named co-accused Dilip Jain, Durga Prasad Yadav, Jaihind Prajapati have been enlarged on bail by Coordinate Bench of this Court. The bail order of the aforesaid accused have been appended as Annexure No. 4 to the affidavit. It is further contended that co-accused Gopal Prasad Gupta was not named in the FIR and he has already been granted bail by Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 13.6.2024 In Crl. Misc. Bail Application No. 22147 of 2024 and the copy of which has been appended at page no. 45 of the affidavit. It is further contended that the offences are exclusively triable by Magistrate and he is in jail since 15.09.2023.

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, Dilip Jain, Durga Prasad Yadav, Jaihind Prajapati have been granted bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court. He has further submitted that the applicant has criminal antecedent of one case in Case Crime No. 164 of 2017 under Sections 420, 406, 467, 466, 471 and 120B IPC, Police Hindaun, District Karauli (Rajasthan) which has not been explained.

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, Dilip Jain, Durga Prasad Yadav, Jaihind Prajapati have 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 15.09.2023, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the applicant on bail.

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

8. Let the applicant- **Ramashankar Yadav** 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 19, 2026
Kumar Manish