



2026:AHC:126843

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 19528 of 2026

Faeem

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Avesh Mishra, Paritosh Sukla
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 5

HON'BLE SANJIV KUMAR, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the material on record.
2. The instant bail application has been filed on behalf of the applicant, Farid, with a prayer to release him on bail in Case Crime No. 200 of 2026, under Sections 3/5/8 of Cow Slaughter Act, Police Station- Chandpur, District- Bijnor, during pendency of trial.
3. It is argued by the learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant is quite innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. The FIR was lodged against unknown persons and thereafter, the police in a fake encounter, apprehended the applicant and on his confessional statement, he has been implicated in this case. Nothing incriminating has been recovered from the possession of the applicant. Similarly placed co-accused person namely Waseem has already been granted bail by a coordinate bench of this Court, vide order dated 05.06.2026 passed in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 18787 of 2026. It has further been submitted that there is criminal history of 5 cases against the applicant which has been explained in paragraph no. 16 of the affidavit filed in support of bail application. In all cases the applicant is on bail. The applicant has not been convicted by any court of law. The applicant is languishing in jail since 17.04.2026. In case the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty.
4. Per contra learned A.G.A. has opposed the bail prayer of the applicant

by contending that the innocence of the applicant cannot be adjudged at pre trial stage, therefore, he does not deserves any indulgence. He has strongly opposed the bail and contended that cow slaughtering leads to acrimony between various groups of society. It has also resulted into riot like situations which poses serious problem for law and order before the State. He has finally submitted that due to above reasons, State had to apply U.P. Gangster and Anti-Social Activities (Prevention) Act, 1986 against some of such accused. He has pointed out that for the above reasons the U.P. Prevention of Cow Slaughter Act, 1955, Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960, U.P. Goshala Adhiniyam, 1964 and U.P. Go-Sewa Ayog Adhiniyam, 1999 have been enacted by the State Government.

5. Considering the material/evidence brought on record, the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties as well as the dictum of Apex Court in the case of **Dataram Singh Vs. State of U.P. and another, reported in (2018) 3 SCC 22 and recent judgment dated 11.07.2022 of the Apex Court** in the case of **Satendra Kumar Antil vs. C.B.I., passed in S.L.P (Crl.) No. 5191 of 2021** larger mandate of Article 21 of the constitution of India.

6. Let the applicant **Faeem** involved in the aforesaid case crime be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each of the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned, subject to the following conditions :-

(i) The applicant 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 applicant shall not pressurize/intimidate the prosecution witnesses.

(iii) The applicant 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 B.N.S.S.

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

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

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

8. 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.

(Sanjiv Kumar,J.)

June 11, 2026

Gss