



2026:AHC:125136

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 19238 of 2026

Anmol

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Surya Prakash Tripathi, Utkarsh
Srivastava

Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A.

Court No. - 7

HON'BLE JAI PRAKASH TIWARI, J.

Heard learned counsel for the applicant, as well as learned A.G.A. and perused the record.

The present bail application has been filed with the prayer to enlarge the applicant on bail in Case Crime No. 158 of 2026, under Sections 191(2), 190, 125, 326(g), 333, 324(4), 115(2), 351(2), 3(5) of B.N.S. and 7 Criminal Law Amendment Act, Police Station Sector 63, District Gautam Buddh Nagar, during the pendency of the trial.

Learned counsel for applicant has submitted that the subject FIR has been lodged by the complainant against unknown mob and as per prosecution story, the allegation has been made against the accused persons that on 13.4.2026, they gathered and started stone pelting at the workshop of the complainant and tried to kill guard and beating few other staff. As per the FIR, incident took place on 13.4.2026 but the FIR has been lodged on 14.4.2026 without explaining the proper delay. No specific role has been assigned to the applicant and only vague allegations levelled upon him. Even, the present applicant is not named in the subject FIR. The applicant is a student. No recovery was shown from the possession of the applicant, neither he was present nor he has any concerned with the alleged incident. There is one criminal antecedent of the applicant, in which he has granted bail by the court concerned (Annexure Nos. 3 and 4). The applicant is in jail since 16.04.2026. Learned counsel for the applicant has further submitted that if the applicant is released on bail, he would not misuse

liberty of bail and is ready to co-operate in the trial.

Learned A.G.A. for the State vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that there is no illegality in the bail rejection order.

Having heard counsel for the parties and having perused the record this Court prima facie finds that a vague and general role has been assigned to the applicant. Applicant is not named in the FIR. At this stage there is no substantive evidence to link the applicant with the offence. Further, the applicant has remained confined for more than one and half month and there is no hope of early conclusion of trial, more so when no reasonable apprehension has been brought to the fore by the State that the applicant, if enlarged on bail, would either tamper with the evidence or delay the trial or intimidate the witness, without commenting on merits of the case, I am of the opinion that the applicant is entitled to be enlarged on bail. Bail Application is allowed.

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

- (i) The applicant shall appear before the trial court on the dates fixed, unless his personal presence is exempted.
- (ii) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly, make 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 any police officer or tamper with the evidence.
- (iii) The applicant shall not indulge in any criminal and anti-social activity.

In case of breach of any of the above condition, the prosecution will be at liberty to move an application before this Court for cancellation of the bail of the applicant.

It is clarified that the observations made herein are limited to the facts brought in by the parties pertaining to the disposal of bail application and

the said observations shall have no bearing on the merits of the case during trial.

(Jai Prakash Tiwari,J.)

June 3, 2026
Brijesh