

**Court No. - 75**

**Case :-** CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 40610 of 2023

**Applicant :-** Veer Pal

**Opposite Party :-** State of U.P.

**Counsel for Applicant :-** Sonu Kumar Tiwari

**Counsel for Opposite Party :-** G.A.

**Hon'ble Umesh Chandra Sharma,J.**

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, learned AGA for the State and perused the record.

2. The instant fourth bail application has been moved on behalf of the applicant - Veer Pal with a prayer to enlarge him on bail in Case Crime No.62230990002 of 1999, under Section 2/3 of the UP Gangsters and Anti-Social Activities (Prevention) Act, Police Station Mandrak, District Aligarh, during pendency of the trial.

3. It is argued by the learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is also argued that the prosecution under the Gangsters Act has been launched against the applicant on the basis of four cases shown in the gang chart in which he has been enlarged on bail which have been explained in paragraph-5 of the affidavit filed in support of the bail application. There is no likelihood of his abscondence or tampering with the evidence. The applicant is languishing in jail since 28.07.2023. In case the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the said liberty.

4. Learned AGA has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail submitting that the applicant was absconding since 2003/04, therefore, it can be said that he had flouted the conditions of the bail order imposed by the court on the basis thereof he argues that the bail application of the applicant is liable to be rejected.

5. From perusal of the record it transpires that after the applicant was enlarged on bail in an offence committed in the year 1999, he attended the case upto 10.11.2023. An exemption application was moved on behalf of the applicant on 25.05.2004, thereafter he never appeared in the court. It also transpires that non-bailable warrants against the applicant had been issued on 20.06.2006 and he has surrendered only on 28.07.2023. The bail application of the applicant was also

rejected on 30.08.2023 by the court below.

6. In view of above, this Court does not find the applicant entitled to be enlarged on bail. Accordingly, the bail application is **rejected**.

7. However, it is directed that the case of the applicant would be decided expeditiously, preferably within a period of six months from the date of production of certified copy of this order and thereafter a compliance report would also be sent to this Court through Registrar (Compliance) which shall be kept on record.

**Order Date :- 2.11.2023**

Shahroz/Vinod.