



2026:AHC:127570

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

**CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No.
- 4742 of 2026**

Sandeep Singh @ Sandeep Kumar Singh And
Another

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Ashutosh Shukla, Avanish Kumar
Shukla, Pramod Kumar
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A., Praveen Kumar Dubey

Court No. - 47

HON'BLE TARUN SAXENA, J.

1. Supplementary affidavit on behalf of the applicant filed today in Court, is taken on record.
2. Heard learned counsel for the applicants, learned counsel for the informant and learned AGA for the State.
3. The present anticipatory bail application has been filed by the applicant under Section 482 of BNSS apprehending his arrest in Case Crime No. 314 of 2025, under Sections 506, 471, 468, 467, 420, 406 I.P.C., P.S.- Kotwali, District- Azamgarh.
4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the applicants that the parties have entered into a compromise and the entire money in dispute has been returned by the accused-applicants to the informant, therefore, the applicants are entitled to be enlarged on anticipatory bail. It is also submitted that the applicants have no criminal history. It is further submitted that the applicants undertake to cooperate during investigation and trial and they would appear as and when required by the investigating agency or Court. It has been submitted that in case, applicants are granted anticipatory bail, they shall not misuse the liberty of bail and will cooperate with the investigation and would obey all conditions of bail.
5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the informant does not dispute the

aforesaid facts and submits that the informant does not propose to oppose the anticipatory bail application of the applicants.

6. Learned AGA, however, opposed the application for anticipatory bail but could not dispute the aforesaid facts.

7. The scope of ambit of anticipatory bail is encapsulated in three insightful judgments of Hon'ble Supreme Court right from **Gurubaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab** reported in (1980) 2 SCC 565, **Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre Vs. State of Maharashtra** reported in (2011) 1 SCC 694 and **Sushila Aggarwal and others Vs. State (NCT of Delhi) and another** reported in (2020) 5 SCC 1, wherein it is consistently held by Hon'ble Apex Court that while granting anticipatory bail, the Court should consider the application of the applicant to evaluate the threat or apprehension of arrest vis-a-vis the nature and gravity of accusation, criminal antecedent of the accused, false or exaggerated implication, need of custodial interrogation, willingness of the accused to cooperate in investigation and trial and the conduct of the accused and flight risk.

8. This Court after considering all the facts and circumstances of the case, is of considered view that applicants have made out a case of anticipatory bail.

9. The applicants- **Sandeep Singh alias Sandeep Kumar Singh and Kalamuddin alias Alauddin Khan** involved in the aforesaid case crime shall appear before the trial court or the Investigating Officer, as the case may be within 30 days from the date of this order and shall be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond of Rs. 25,000/- with two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned with following conditions :-

(i) The applicants 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 him from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence.

(ii) The applicants shall not pressurize/intimidate the prosecution witnesses.

(iii) The applicants shall remain present, in person, before the trial court on the dates fixed for (i) opening of the case, (ii) framing of charge and (iii)

recording of statement under Section 351 of BNSS.

(iv) The applicants shall file an undertaking to the effect that they shall not seek any adjournment on the dates fixed for evidence when the witnesses are present in the trial court.

(v) The applicants shall remain present before the trial court on each date fixed, either personally or through their counsel.

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

11. It is clarified that anything said in this order is limited to the purpose of determination of this bail application and will in no way be construed as an expression on the merits of the case. The trial court shall be absolutely free to arrive at its independent conclusions on the basis of evidence led unaffected by anything said in this order.

(Tarun Saxena,J.)

June 16, 2026

Abhishek