

A.F.R.

Neutral Citation No. - 2025:AHC:104028

Court No. - 67

Case :- CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 15773 of 2025

Applicant :- Gulfam

Opposite Party :- State of U.P.

Counsel for Applicant :- Mohd Imran Khan

Counsel for Opposite Party :- G.A.

Hon'ble Sanjay Kumar Singh,J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, learned Additional Government Advocate representing the State and perused the record of the case.

2. By means of this application under Section 483 of BNSS, applicant Gulfam, who is involved in Case Crime No. 175 of 2024, under Section 3(1) of the Uttar Pradesh Gangsters and Anti Social Activities (Prevention) Act, 1986, police station Tanda, district Rampur seeks enlargement on bail during pendency of trial.

3. Brief facts of the case, which are required to be stated are that on the basis of a case registered as crime No. 494 of 2023 under Section 8/20 N.D.P.S. Act at Police Station-Tanda, District-Rampur against the applicant as well as considering his other criminal history, proceedings under the provisions of the Uttar Pradesh Gangsters and Anti Social Activities (Prevention) Act, 1986 were initiated against him. Accordingly, a First Information Report was lodged on 01.04.2024 against the applicant-Gulfam, Dilawar and Imran at Case Crime No. 175 of 2024, for the offence under Section 3(1) of the Uttar Pradesh Gangsters

and Anti Social Activities (Prevention) Act, 1986 at police station Tanda, district Rampur.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the applicant that according to the gang chart, the applicant is said to have involved in 08 criminal cases but the provisions of the Uttar Pradesh Gangsters and Anti Social Activities (Prevention) Act, 1986 have been invoked against the applicant on the basis of only 01 case being Case Crime No. 494 of 2023, under Section 8/20 NDPS Act, police station Tanda, district Rampur, in which he has already been enlarged on bail, copy of bail order has been brought on record as Annexure No. 3 to the bail application. It is next submitted that in 07 other criminal cases also, the applicant has been granted bail, copy of the bail orders have been annexed as Annexure Nos. 6 to 12 to the bail application. It is further argued that the applicant has falsely been implicated in the present case due to ulterior motive. He is neither gang leader nor member of any gang. There is no prospect of trial of the present case being concluded in near future due to heavy dockets. It is further submitted that co-accused Imran, who has a criminal history of 09 cases has been granted bail by the coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 28.08.2024 in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 27325 of 2024, therefore, the applicant, who is languishing in jail since 29.10.2023 is also entitled to be enlarged on bail. Lastly, it is submitted that in case the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.

5. Per contra, learned Additional Government Advocate for the State opposed the prayer for bail of the applicant by contending that there is recovery of 1kg and 100 grams of charas in base case being case crime no. 494 of 2023, under

Section 8/20 N.D.P.S. Act, registered at Police Station-Tanda, District-Rampur on 29.10.2023 against the applicant. It is next submitted that applicant is running a gang and co-accused Dilawar and Imran are the members of the applicant's gang. It is also pointed out that in 03 criminal cases being Case Crime No. 135 of 2000, under Section 3(1) of the Uttar Pradesh Gangsters and Anti Social Activities (Prevention) Act, 1986, police station Azeemnagar, district Rampur, Case Crime No. 282 of 2003, under Section 3(1) of the Uttar Pradesh Gangsters and Anti Social Activities (Prevention) Act, 1986, police station Tanda, district Rampur and Case Crime No. 1333 of 2010, under Section 3(1) of the Uttar Pradesh Gangsters and Anti Social Activities (Prevention) Act, 1986, police station Tanda, district Rampur, the applicant has already been convicted by the trial Court vide judgment and orders dated 30.06.2022, 01.07.2022 and 07.07.2022 respectively. It is further pointed out that the applicant is a history sheeter and apart from this case, he is involved in as many as **41** other criminal cases, which are as under:

(I) Case Crime No. 47 of 2000, under Section 25 Arms Act, police station Azeem Nagar, district Rampur.

(II) Case Crime No. 48 of 2000, under Sections 41/102 Cr.P.C. and Section 411 IPC, police station Azeem nagar, district Rampur.

(III) Case Crime No. 135 of 2000, under Section 3(1) Gangsters Act, police station Azeem nagar, district Rampur.

(IV) Case Crime No. 137 of 2000, under Section 25 Arms Act, police station Azeem nagar, district Rampur.

(V) Case Crime No. 229 of 2003, under Section 307 IPC, police station Tanda, district Rampur.

(VI) Case Crime No. 232 of 2003, under Sections 4/25 Arms Act, police station Tanda, district Rampur.

(VII) Case Crime No. 233 of 2003, under Section 8/20 NDPS Act, police station Tanda, district Rampur.

(VIII) Case Crime No. 282 of 2003, under Section 3(1) Gangsters Act, police station Tanda, district Rampur.

(IX) Case Crime No. 280 of 2004, under Sections 384/504/506 IPC, police station Tanda, district Rampur.

(X) Case Crime No. 1021 of 2005, under Sections 382/411 IPC, police station Tanda, district Rampur.

(XI) Case Crime No. 1056 of 2005, under Sections 18/20 NDPS Act, police station Tanda, district Rampur.

(XII) Case Crime No. 484 of 2006, under Section 382 IPC, police station Azeemnagar, district Rampur.

(XIII) Case Crime No. 496 of 2006, under Sections 356/411 IPC, police station Azeemnagar, district Rampur.

(XIV) Case Crime No. 513 of 2006, under Sections 307/147/148/149/411 IPC, police station Azeemnagar, district Rampur.

(XV) Case Crime No. 603 of 2006, under Section 457 IPC, police station Tanda, district Rampur.

(XVI) Case Crime No. 278 of 2007, under Sections 332/353/224 IPC, police station Azeemnagar, district Rampur.

(XVII) Case Crime No. 05 of 2008, under Sections 384/504/506 IPC, police station Azeemnagar, district Rampur.

(XVIII) Case Crime No. 12 of 2008, under Section 307 IPC, police station Azeemnagar, district Rampur.

(XIX) Case Crime No. 14 of 2008, under Section 25 Arms Act, police station Azeemnagar, district Rampur.

(XX) Case Crime No. 576 of 2008, under Sections 379/411 IPC, police station Patwai, district Rampur.

(XXI) Case Crime No. 624 of 2008, under Section 3/25 Arms Act, police station Patwai, district Rampur.

(XXII) Case Crime No. 469 of 2010, under Section 392 IPC, police station Tanda, district Rampur.

(XXIII) Case Crime No. 526 of 2010, under Section 392 IPC, police station Tanda, district Rampur.

(XXIV) Case Crime No. 539 of 2010, under Sections 379/411 IPC, police station Azeemnagar, district Rampur.

(XXV) Case Crime No. 547 of 2010, under Section 392 IPC, police station Tanda, district Rampur.

(XXVI) Case Crime No. 634 of 2010, under Section 392 IPC, police station Tanda, district Rampur.

(XXVII) Case Crime No. 978 of 2010, under Sections 8/22 NDPS Act, police station Tanda, district Rampur.

(XXVIII) Case Crime No. 1012 of 2010, under Section 392 IPC, police station Swar, district Rampur.

(XXIX) Case Crime No. 1080 of 2010, under Section 394 IPC, police station Swar, district Rampur.

(XXX) Case Crime No. 1333 of 2010, under Section 3(1) Gangsters Act, police station Tanda, district Rampur.

(XXXI) Case Crime No. 32 of 2014, under Sections 394/307 IPC, police station Ganj, district Rampur.

(XXXII) Case Crime No. 193 of 2018, under Sections 147/148/149/224/307/323/332/353/504 IPC, police station Azeemnagar, district Rampur.

(XXXIII) Case Crime No. 216 of 2018, under Section 302 IPC and Section 3(2) SC/ST Act, police station Tanda, district Rampur.

(XXXIV) Case Crime No. 119 of 2020, under Sections 8/15 NDPS Act, police station Azeemnagar, district Rampur.

(XXXV) Case Crime No. 217 of 2020, under Section 3/25 Arms Act, police station Azeemnagar, district Rampur.

(XXXVI) Case Crime No. 03 of 2021, under Section 3(1) Gangsters Act, police station Azeemnagar, district Rampur.

(XXXVII) Case Crime No. 100 of 2021, under Section 8/21 NDPS Act, police station Azeemnagar, district Rampur.

(XXXVIII) Case Crime No. 155 of 2022, under Section 307 IPC, police station Tanda, district Rampur.

(XXXIX) Case Crime No. 156 of 2022, under Sections 3/25/27 Arms Act, police station Tanda, district Rampur.

(XL) Case Crime No. 158 of 2022, under Sections 323/504 IPC, police station Tanda, district Rampur.

(XLI) Case Crime No. 494 of 2023, under Section 8/20 NDPS Act, police station Tanda, district Rampur.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and examined the matter in its entirety, I find that apart from the present case, the applicant has a long criminal history of 41 other criminal cases as noted above, out of which, criminal history of only 10 cases [mentioned above at Sl. Nos. (III), (VIII), (XXVII), (XXX), (XXXII), (XXXIV), (XXXV), (XXXVI), (XXXVII) and (XXXVIII)] have been disclosed by him in the

bail application. It is also admitted fact that in 03 cases, the applicant has been convicted as noted above.

7. In **Ash Mohammad Vs. Shiv Raj Singh alias Lalla Babu and another, (2012) 9 SCC 446**, Hon'ble Supreme Court, held as under:

"We may usefully state that when the citizens are scared to lead a peaceful life and this kind of offences usher in an impediment in establishment of orderly society, the duty of the court becomes more pronounced and the burden is heavy. There should have been proper analysis of the criminal antecedents. Needless to say, imposition of conditions is subsequent to the order admitting an accused to bail. The question should be posed whether the accused deserves to be enlarged on bail or not and only thereafter issue of imposing conditions would arise. We do not deny for a moment that period of custody is a relevant factor but simultaneously the totality of circumstances and the criminal antecedents are also to be weighed."

8. Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Neeru Yadav Vs. State of U.P. (2016) 15 SCC 422**, after referring a catena of judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court on the consideration of factors for grant of bail, held as under:

"This being the position of law, it is clear as cloudless sky that the High Court has totally ignored the criminal antecedent of the accused. What has weighed with the High Court is the doctrine of parity. A history sheeter involved in the nature of crimes which we have reproduced herein above, are not minor offences so that he is not to be retained in custody, but the crimes are of

heinous nature and such crimes, by no stretch of imagination can be regarded as jejune. Such cases do create a thunder and lightening having the effect potentiality of torrential rain in an analytical mind. The law expects the judiciary to be alert while admitting these kind of accused persons to be at large and, therefore, the emphasis is on exercise of discretion judiciously and not in a whimsical manner."

9. The aforesaid judgement has further been followed by the Apex Court in the case of **Sudha Singh Vs. State of U.P. and another, (2021) 4 SCC 781**. The fact in Sudha Singh's case was that F.I.R. under Section 3(1) of the Uttar Pradesh Gangsters And Anti-Social Activities (Prevention) Act, 1986 was registered against the accused Arun Yadav, in which as per gang chart, 16 cases were shown against him. The High Court granted bail vide order dated 08.05.2020 considering the fact that out of 16 cases, in 03 cases accused had been acquitted, in 08 cases accused had been granted bail, 04 cases ended in favour of the accused and in 01 case no F.I.R. was lodged against him. The said order dated 08.05.2020 granting bail to the accused Arun Yadav was challenged by Sudha Singh who is wife of the deceased, namely, Rajnarain Singh, who has been allegedly murdered by the accused. The Apex Court vide order dated 23.04.2021 allowed the appeal and set aside the order granting bail to the accused. The relevant observations made by the Hon'ble Apex Court in para no. 7 are quoted herein below :

"7. We find in this case that the High Court has overlooked several aspects, such as the potential threat to witnesses, forcing the trial court to grant

protection. It is needless to point out that in cases of this nature, it is important that courts do not enlarge an accused on bail with a blinkered vision by just taking into account only the parties before them and the incident in question. It is necessary for courts to consider the impact that release of such persons on bail will have on the witnesses yet to be examined and the innocent members of the family of the victim who might be the next victims.”

10. It would not be out of place to mention that in the matter of bail merely disclosure of criminal history by the accused is not sufficient but proper explanation (about the nature of crime, role assigned to accused and status of investigation or trial as the case may be) of the same is also required to be mentioned in the bail application.

11. In the present case, the applicant has misused the process of law by not mentioning his complete criminal history and tried to mislead the Court. The Courts of law are meant for imparting justice between the parties. One, who comes to the court, must come with clean hand and no material facts should be concealed. I am constrained to hold that more often the process of the court is being abused by unscrupulous litigants to achieve their nefarious design. I have no hesitation in saying that a person, whose case is based on falsehood, has no right to approach the Court.

12. In **Arunima Baruah Vs. Union of India** (2007) 6 SCC 120, Supreme Court held that it is trite law that to enable the Court to refuse to exercise its discretionary jurisdiction suppression must of material fact. Material fact would mean material for the purpose of determination of the lis. It was

further held that a person invoking the discretionary jurisdiction of the court cannot be allowed to approach it with a pair of dirty hands.

13. In **Prestige Lights Limited Vs. State Bank of India** (2007) 8 SCC 449, Apex Court held as under:

“It is well settled that a prerogative remedy is not a matter of course. In exercising extraordinary power, therefore, a Writ Court will indeed bear in mind the conduct of the party who is invoking such jurisdiction. If the applicant does not disclose full facts or suppresses relevant materials or is otherwise guilty of misleading the Court, the Court may dismiss the action without adjudicating the matter. The rule has been evolved in larger public interest to deter unscrupulous litigants from abusing the process of Court by deceiving it. The very basis of the writ jurisdiction rests in disclosure of true, complete and correct facts. If the material facts are not candidly stated or are suppressed or are distorted, the very functioning of the writ courts would become impossible.”

14. In **K.D Sharma Vs. Steel Authority of India Limited and others**, (2008) 12 SCC481, Supreme Court held that no litigant can play “hide and seek” with the courts or adopt “pick and choose”. To hold a writ of the court one should come with candid facts and clean breast. Suppression or concealment of material facts is forbidden to a litigant or even as a technique of advocacy. In such cases the Court is duty bound to discharge rule nisi and such applicant is required to be dealt with for contempt of Court for abusing the process of the court.

15. Supreme Court in **Dalip Singh Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and others**, (2010) 2 SCC 114 came down heavily on unscrupulous litigants by holding that it is now well established that a litigant who attempts to pollute the stream of justice or who touches the pure fountain of justice with tainted hands, is not entitled to any relief, interim or final. The Court further held as under:

“For many centuries, Indian society cherished two basic values of life i.e., ‘Satya’ (truth) and ‘Ahinsa’ (non-violence). Mahavir, Gautam Buddha and Mahatma Gandhi guided the people to ingrain these values in their daily life. Truth constituted an integral part of justice delivery system which was in vogue in pre-independence era and the people used to feel proud to tell truth in the courts irrespective of the consequences. However, post-independence period has seen drastic changes in our value system. The materialism has overshadowed the old ethos and the quest for personal gain has become so intense that those involved in litigation do not hesitate to take shelter of falsehood, misrepresentation and suppression of facts in the court proceedings. In last 40 years, a new creed of litigants has cropped up. Those who belong to this creed do not have any respect for truth. They shamelessly resort to falsehood and unethical means for achieving their goals. In order to meet the challenge posed by this new creed of litigants, the courts have, from time to time, evolved new rules and it is now well established that a litigant, who attempts to pollute the stream

of justice or who touches the pure fountain of justice with tainted hands, is not entitled to any relief, interim or final.”

16. In **Amar Singh Vs. Union of India** (2011) 7 SCC 69, Supreme Court held that Courts have, over the centuries, frowned upon litigants who, with intent to deceive and mislead the courts, initiated proceedings without full disclosure of facts. Courts held that such litigants have come with "unclean hands" and are not entitled to be heard on the merits of their case.

17. In **Kishore Samrite Vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012 (10) SCALE 330, The Supreme Court held as under:

“31. It has been consistently stated by this Court that the entire journey of a Judge is to discern the truth from the pleadings, documents and arguments of the parties, as truth is the basis of the Justice Delivery System.

32. With the passage of time, it has been realized that people used to feel proud to tell the truth in the Courts, irrespective of the consequences but that practice no longer proves true, in all cases. The Court does not sit simply as an umpire in a contest between two parties and declare at the end of the combat as to who has won and who has lost but it has a legal duty of its own, independent of parties, to take active role in the proceedings and reach at the truth, which is the foundation of administration of justice. Therefore, the truth should become the ideal to inspire the courts to pursue. This can be achieved by statutorily mandating the Courts to become active seekers of

truth. To enable the courts to ward off unjustified interference in their working, those who indulge in immoral acts like perjury, prevarication and motivated falsehood, must be appropriately dealt with. The parties must state forthwith sufficient factual details to the extent that it reduces the ability to put forward false and exaggerated claims and a litigant must approach the Court with clean hands. It is the bounden duty of the Court to ensure that dishonesty and any attempt to surpass the legal process must be effectively curbed and the Court must ensure that there is no wrongful, unauthorized or unjust gain to anyone as a result of abuse of the process of the Court. One way to curb this tendency is to impose realistic or punitive costs."

18. Having considered the factual aspect of the case and the dictum of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, I am of the considered view that the applicant has not come to the Court with clean hand. Honesty, fairness, purity of mind should be of the highest order to approach the court, failing which the litigants should be shown the exit door at the earliest point of time.

19. Having considered the factual aspect of the case with regard to granting bail to the applicant previously in other cases and the dictum of the Hon'ble Apex Court, I also find that every time whenever the applicant was granted bail, a condition was imposed that in future he will not indulge in any criminal case, but every time the applicant violated the said condition and got himself involved in criminal cases,

hence I am of the considered view that he always misused the liberty of bail.

20. Here it would be useful to quote the provisions of Section 19(4) of the Uttar Pradesh Gangsters And Anti-Social Activities (Prevention) Act, 1986, which is one of the relevant factor to be kept in mind while considering bail of an accused under the said Act, which reads thus:-

Section 19

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4) Notwithstanding anything contained in the Code, no person accused of an offence punishable under this Act or any rule made thereunder shall, if in custody, be released on bail or on his own bond unless-

(a) the Public Prosecutor has been given an opportunity to oppose the application for such release, and

(b) where the Public Prosecutor opposes the application, the Court is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that he is not guilty of such offence and that he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail.

21. It is well settled that every law is designed to facilitate end of justice and not to frustrate it. Hence the aforesaid legislative mandate is required to be adhered and followed.

22. Taking into note of the aforesaid provisions, I find that Section 19 (4) (a) and (b) of the Uttar Pradesh Gangsters And

Anti-Social Activities (Prevention) Act, 1986 are mandatory in nature. Hence while considering/granting bail, said provisions cannot be ignored.

23. However, it is relevant to mention that no strait-jacket formula can be laid down with regard to satisfaction of the Court in terms of aforesaid Section 19 (4) (b) of Act, 1986, because every case turns on its own facts. Even one additional or different fact may make a big difference between the conclusion in two cases, because even a single significant detail may alter the entire aspect.

24. The expression “reasonable grounds” has not been defined in the said Act but means something more than prima facie grounds. It connotes substantial probable causes for believing that the accused is not guilty of the offence he is charged with. The reasonable belief contemplated in turn points to existence of such facts and circumstances as are sufficient in themselves to justify satisfaction that the accused is not guilty of the alleged offence. Thus, recording of satisfaction on both the aspects, noted above, is sine qua non for granting bail under the Uttar Pradesh Gangsters And Anti-Social Activities (Prevention) Act, 1986.

25. The primary objective of the Uttar Pradesh Gangsters And Anti-Social Activities (Prevention) Act, 1986 is to prevent organized crimes and gangster activities within the State of Uttar Pradesh. It aims to dismantle criminal networks and prevent the growth of illicit activities. The offences mentioned in Section 2 (b) (i) to (xxv) of the Uttar Pradesh Gangsters And Anti-Social Activities (Prevention) Act, 1986, involve significant harm or pose a threat to public safety. The Act empowers law enforcement agencies and State

authorities to take necessary measures against gangsters to ensure the safety and security of the citizens.

26. The plea of false implication is a stereotyped defence raised in every case. Experience shows that such statements are made in almost every case, therefore, plea of false implication without any basis or material on record is not liable to be accepted blindly.

27. So far as submission of learned counsel for the applicant that since co-accused Imran, who has a criminal history of 09 cases has been granted bail by the coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 28.08.2024 is concerned, it is relevant to mention that it is well settled that a judge is not bound to grant bail to an accused on the ground of parity, where the order granting bail to an identically placed co-accused contains no cogent reasons or if the same has been passed in flagrant violation of well established principle of law. If any illegality is brought to the knowledge of the Court, the same should not be permitted to perpetuate. In the said case, bail has been granted ignoring the provisions of Section 19 (4) (b) of the Uttar Pradesh Gangsters And Anti-Social Activities (Prevention) Act, 1986 as no finding has been recorded in terms of Section 19 (4) (b) of the said Act, 1986, whereas said accused has a criminal history of nine cases.

28. In this regard, it is also apposite to mention that after considering plethora of judgements on the guiding principle for adjudicating a regular bail, Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Deepak Yadav vs. State of U.P. and Another**, (2022) 8 SCC 559 held as under:

26. "The importance of assigning reasoning for grant or denial of bail can never be undermined.

There is prima facie need to indicate reasons particularly in cases of grant or denial of bail where the accused is charged with a serious offence. The sound reasoning in a particular case is a reassurance that discretion has been exercised by the decision maker after considering all the relevant grounds and by disregarding extraneous considerations."

"XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX"

"39. Grant of bail to the Respondent No. 2/accused only on the basis of parity shows that the impugned order passed by the High Court suffers from the vice of non-application of mind rendering it unsustainable. The High Court has not taken into consideration the criminal history of the respondent No. 2/accused, nature of crime, material evidences available, involvement of respondent No. 2/accused in the said crime and recovery of weapon from his possession."

(emphasis supplied)

29. Hence, in the light of the aforesaid discussions, the benefit of parity of bail order dated 28.08.2024 of co-accused Imran cannot be extended to the present applicant. Accordingly, the submission of learned counsel for the applicant for granting bail to the applicant on the ground of parity is hereby rejected.

30. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case as well as keeping in view the submissions advanced on behalf of parties as noted above, gravity of offence, role assigned to the applicant in base case and severity of

punishment, this Court in the light of criminal history of the applicant does not find reasonable grounds for believing that the applicant is not guilty of such offence and that he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail. Hence aforesaid mandatory requirement of Section 19 (4) (b) of the Uttar Pradesh Gangsters And Anti-Social Activities (Prevention) Act, 1986 does not stand satisfied.

31. In view of the above, the instant bail application stands **rejected**.

32. It is clarified that observations made herein above are limited to the extent 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 to be adduced uninfluenced by anything mentioned in the order.

33. The trial Court shall make an endeavour to conclude the trial of the applicant expeditiously without granting any unnecessary adjournments to either of the parties in light of the provisions of Section 12 of the Uttar Pradesh Gangsters and Anti Social Activities (Prevention) Act, 1986.

34. Copy of this order be sent to the concerned trial Court immediately for necessary information and compliance.

35. Before parting with the case, it would also be apposite to mention that criminal history of an accused is one of the important factors for consideration of a bail application, therefore, its correct disclosure along with status of bail and trial is necessary, however, invariably there is a default on behalf of accused-applicant or pairakar that criminal history is either not disclosed or declaration remained half truth,

which may be considered as a serious defect and bail application may be rejected on sole ground of misrepresentation or concealing vital informations. It is also seen that declaration about criminal history is made in later part of bail application, even in some cases criminal history are mentioned in different supplementary affidavits, which causes great inconvenience to learned Government Advocates to search those paragraphs and assist the Court properly and effectively and precious time of the Courts are also wasted in searching and making query about criminal history of the accused. Sometimes it remained unnoticed by the Court also, which adversely affects outcome of the bail application. Therefore, this Court feels that an appropriate direction be issued for declaration/mentioning of criminal history at the place earmarked for it.

36. Accordingly, it is desirable that declaration of complete criminal history alongwith status of bail or trial should be made in first five paragraphs of the affidavit filed in support of the bail application or reasons for any default.

37. The Registrar General of this Court is directed to place copy of this order before Hon'ble the Chief Justice on administrative side for consideration and necessary directions.

Order Date :- 3.7.2025
Shubham