



2026:AHC:128129

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 18512 of 2026

Abuzar Shamim

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite Party(s)

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

Court No. - 48

HON'BLE LAKSHMI KANT SHUKLA, J.

1. Heard Shri Pavan Kumar, learned counsel for the applicant, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the record.
2. The present bail application has been filed by the accused/applicant- Abuzar Shamim Raen S/o Shamim Ahmad R/o Mohalla Afganani Kiratpur, Police Station Kiratpur, District Bijnor with a prayer to release him on bail in Case Crime No. 57 of 2026, under Sections 326 (F), 152 of B.N.S., Police Station- Kiratpur, District- Bijnor, during the pendency of the trial.
3. In nutshell the prosecution case is that an FIR was lodged by the informant Neemis Rastogi on 10.03.2026 stating that his vehicle No.UP20T1781 was parked on 04.03.2026 near Motichoor in front of Kali Mata temple. At about 10:20 P.M, a person poured petrol and lit fire, due to which, his vehicle got damaged very much. On that basis, an F.I.R was lodged on 10.03.2026. During investigation, several informations along with CCTV footage obtained by the Investigating Officer and the name of applicant surfaced and he was apprehended on 12.03.2026. Mobile of Vivo brand, IME No.866003075957453 and 866003075957446 in first slaughter mobile of sim of Mobile No. 7819014581 was attached, the second slaughter was empty for the contents of Mobile review for applicant, was in touch of people naming applicant-Abuzar Shamim Raen was indulging him jihadi activities. Thus the applicant was facilitated by him in meeting with another person. Abuzar was also indulged him ex-promised Jehadi's activity.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant has submitted that applicant is innocent and there is no evidence of the case. The applicant is not named in the FIR. There is no credible evidence in case diary against the applicant. Only the applicant has been made accused on the basis of so called information of the informer and the statement of the applicant made before the police. Nothing incriminating substance has been recovered from the possession of the accused- applicant.

5. It is stated that a mobile was recovered from his possession, which contains objectionable contents but the report of FSL regarding originality of those contents is still awaited.

6. It is next contended that on the basis of above noted facts and circumstances,, the applicant is entitled to be released on bail by this Court.

7. Per contra, learned Additional Government Advocate has vehemently opposed the bail prayer of the applicant and submitted that it is true that initially the applicant was not named in the FIR. During the investigation, the Investigating Officer made hectic search and collected some CCTV footage, the same CCTV footage were got certified under Sections 63(4)(c) of IPC.

8. On the basis of those evidence, the Investigating Officer proceeded with investigation, the applicant was apprehended and one mobile along with Rs.400/- was recovered from the possession of the applicant. The accused-applicant was in the need of money due to which he contacted co-accused Jaid son of his Khala (Mausi) and got him economically helped from him, then he disclosed a known person Abuzar who used to help the member of his community. He had continuously chatting on What'sapp telephone and on which Jaid who used to chat with him against Hindus of this country saying that all the Muslims in India are being harassed as well as Masjid are being demolished, they have to revenge of these Hindus. The said Zaid extorted him to set photographs of Hindus fired and made available some objectionable videos and clips. He was furnished for economic help for activities against Hindus. The contents of recovered Mobile goes to show that the applicant with the help of co-accused have tried to undermine the integrity, unity and sovereignty

of the India. Continuously receiving objectionable videos and clips from two persons he send videos of burning vehicle to Abuzar on his Mobile after recording it. The applicant also sent his two mobile numbers to Abuzar with request to send money online from him.

9. So in presence of all above evidences purported to cause harm to unity and integrity of India.

10. It is next contended that the appliance does not deserve for bail.

11. Having heard rival submissions and material available on record, exploring a nexus, without expressing any opinion on merits of the case, the Court do not find it a fit case for bail.

12. Accordingly, the bail application is hereby **rejected**.

(Lakshmi Kant Shukla, J.)

June 18, 2026
SFH