



2025:AHC:178709

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 27717 of 2025

Prashant Chaudhary

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	: Dharmendra Pratap Singh, Manjeet Gupta
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	: G.A., Prabhat Chandra Mishra

Court No. - 64

HON'BLE VIVEK VARMA, J.

1. Heard counsel for the applicant, Sri Prabhat Chandra Mishra, counsel for the informant and Sri Neeraj Kumar Sharma, learned AGA for the State-opposite party. Perused the material available on record.
2. The present bail application has been filed with the prayer to enlarge the applicant on bail in Case Crime No. 93 of 2025, under Sections 191(2), 105 B.N.S., Police Station- Jansath, District- Muzaffar Nagar, during the pendency of the trial.
3. Counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. In the first information report seven persons including the applicant are nominated. Placing reliance on the police report dated 8.2.2025, addressed to the A.D.M. (Admn.), District Muzaffar Nagar, it is contended that the deceased met an accident and thereafter succumbed to his injuries. It is next contended that a vague and general role has been assigned to the applicant. Reliance has also been placed on the statements of independent witnesses, namely, Sanjeev, Devid @ Guddu, Baburam, Subhash and Salman to contend that it is a case of accident. CCTV footage collected during the course of investigation does not connect the applicant with the offence. Criminal history of the applicant has been explained in para no.22 of the bail application. The applicant is in jail since 27.6.2025 and in case, he is enlarged on bail, he will not misuse the said liberty.
4. Learned AGA and counsel for the informant have opposed the prayer for bail but could not satisfactorily dispute the aforesaid submissions from the record.

5. Having heard counsel for the parties and having perused the record this Court prima facie finds that vague and general role has been assigned to the applicant; according to the police report dated 8.2.2025, addressed to the A.D.M. (Admn.), District Muzaffar Nagar, the deceased met an accident and thereafter succumbed to his injuries; as per the statements of independent witnesses, namely, Sanjeev, Devid @ Guddu, Baburam, Subhash and Salman also, it is a case of accident; CCTV footage collected during investigation does not connect the applicant with the offence. Further, the applicant has remained confined for more than three months 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.

6. Let the applicant **Prashant Chaudhary**, 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) shall appear on the date fixed by the trial court;

(ii) shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence;

(iii) shall not pressurize the prosecution witnesses.

7. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move bail cancellation application before this Court.

October 8, 2025

Manish Kr

(Vivek Varma,J.)