



2026:AHC:129251

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 16610 of 2026

Ravindra Singh Rathor

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Manoj Kumar Srivastava
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	Deepak Rana, G.A.

Court No. - 71

HON'BLE VIVEK KUMAR SINGH, J.

1. Heard Sri Manoj Kumar Srivastava, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Deepak Rana, learned counsel for the first informant, Sri Pankaj Saxena, learned A.G.A.-I for the State of U.P. and perused the record.

2. The instant bail application has been filed seeking release of the applicant on bail in Case Crime No.16 of 2026, under Sections 61(2), 318(4), 338, 336(3), 114(4), 340(2) BNS & 66 D I.T. Act, Police Station- Cyber Crime, District- Aligarh.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. The alleged incident took place between 18.12.2025 and 28.01.2026, whereas the FIR was lodged on 31.01.2026. The applicant is not named in the FIR, which was lodged against co-accused Ms. Kavya Godbole. The name of the applicant surfaced in the confessional statement of co-accused Rizwan on 07.02.2026. It is further contended that there is no material against the applicant to connect him with the alleged offence. The only allegation against him is that he introduced co-accused Rizwan and Ruby when they opened their bank accounts. There is no money transaction in the bank account of the applicant. There is no evidence to show that the applicant hatched any criminal conspiracy with the other co-accused. It is further contended that the investigation in the matter is complete and the charge-sheet has already been submitted against the applicant. The offences are exclusively triable by the Court of a Magistrate. The case of the applicant

is distinguishable from that of the other co-accused. It is further submitted that the applicant has no criminal history to his credit. However, after the lodging of the present FIR, one more case was registered against the applicant in District Faridabad (Haryana) on 11.03.2026. The applicant has been languishing in jail since 07.02.2026 and, in case he is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail and will cooperate in the trial.

4. Per contra, learned A.G.A. and learned counsel for the first informant have opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the applicant and submitted that there is ample evidence against the applicant regarding his involvement in the offence, therefore, he is not entitled to be released on bail.

5. Having considered the rival submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties, the nature of accusations, the evidence brought on record, the period of incarceration undergone by the applicant, the absence of any criminal antecedents, and the fact that the case of the applicant is distinguishable from that of the other co-accused, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court finds that the applicant has made out a case for grant of bail.

6. Accordingly, the bail application is **allowed**.

7. Let the applicant- **Ravindra Singh Rathor**, 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./ 351 of B.N.S.S. 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.

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

9. 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 25, 2026
Radhika