



2026:AHC:127692

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 19406 of 2026

Ankit Yadav

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Nitesh Kumar Yadav
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 45

HON'BLE VIVEK KUMAR SINGH, J.

1. Heard 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. 86 of 2026 under Sections, 8/20 of NDPS Act, Police Station- Jahanganj, District- Azamgarh.
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 next contends that the similarly situated co-accused, namely, Rajneesh Yhadav has been granted bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 13.05.2026 passed in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 16173 of 2026. He further contends that the the applicant has no criminal antecedents and he is in jail since 13.04.2026.
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, Rajneesh Yadav, has been granted bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court.
5. In view of the entire facts and circumstances of the case, especially taking into account the fact that the similarly situated co-accused, namely, Rajneesh Yadav, 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 13.04.2026, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the applicant on bail.

6. The bail application is **allowed**.

7. Let the applicant- **Ankit 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.

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 17, 2026

A.P. Pandey