



2026:AHC:127164

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 19781 of 2026

Ankit Kumar Raghav

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Abhay Pratap Singh, Manish Kumar
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 U.P.
2. The instant bail application has been filed seeking release of the applicant on bail in Case Crime No.646 of 2025, under Sections 80(2), 85, 115(2) and 352 of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and 3/4 of D.P. Act, Police Station- Jahangirabad, District- Bulandshahr.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He happens to be the husband of the deceased, Chhaya. As per the post-mortem report, the cause of death was asphyxia as a result of ante-mortem injuries. The deceased was a short-tempered lady and committed suicide in a fit of anger. The marriage of the deceased's younger sister, Sheetal, was solemnized with the younger brother of the applicant. Had there been any demand for dowry, the first informant or the parents of the deceased would never have consented to the marriage of the deceased's younger sister with the applicant's younger brother. It is alleged by the informant in the FIR that the deceased was subjected to cruelty and harassment on account of demand for dowry. However, when his statement was recorded before the trial court as PW-1 on 05.05.2026, he stated that no demand for dowry was ever made by the applicant or his family members and that the deceased was never subjected to cruelty or harassment on account of any such demand. PW-1/the informant was declared hostile by the learned

A.D.G.C. during the course of the trial. The applicant has no criminal history. Learned counsel for the applicant further submits that the applicant has been languishing in jail since 26.11.2025 and that, if released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail and will cooperate with the trial proceedings.

4. Per contra, learned A.G.A. has 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. I have considered the rival submissions of the parties and perused the record.

6. The first informant/PW-1, Mohan, did not support the prosecution case during the course of the trial and was declared hostile. Rather, he stated that the deceased was never subjected to harassment on account of any demand for dowry. The charge-sheet has already been submitted in the present case. The applicant has been in jail since 26.11.2025, and there is no likelihood of the early conclusion of the trial.

7. 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 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.

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

9. Let the applicant-**Ankit Kumar Raghav**, 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.

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

11. 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 15, 2026
Radhika