



2025:AHC:178825

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 29310 of 2025

Sahil @ Laddan

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Ramesh Kumar Singh, Sanjai Kumar Singh
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : Anup Kumar Pandey, G.A.

Court No. - 64

HON'BLE VIVEK VARMA, J.

1. Heard Sri Ramesh Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Anup Kumar Pandey, counsel for the informant and Sri S.S.Pandey, learned AGA for the State-respondent.

2. The present bail application under Section 483 BNSS has been filed with a prayer to enlarge the applicant on bail in Case Crime No. 103 of 2025, under Section 105 BNS and Section 3/25 Arms Act, Police Station Nichlaul, District Maharajganj during the pendency of trial.

3. Counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. As per the first information report, statement of the informant under Section 180 BNSS and the statement of independent witness Suhail Ansari recorded under Section 183 BNSS, the role of firing has been assigned to the co-accused Sahil son of Parvez. The case of the applicant is clearly distinguishable from that of co-accused Sahil son of Parvez. The applicant had no role in the alleged incident. Investigation has been completed. Charge sheet has been filed. The applicant is in jail since 20.04.2025 having no criminal antecedents and in case he is enlarged on bail, he will not misuse the said liberty.

4. Learned AGA 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 the as per the first information report, statement

of the informant under Section 180 BNSS and the statement of independent witness Suhail Ansari recorded under Section 183 BNSS, the role of firing has been assigned to the co-accused Sahil son of Parvez. Further, the applicant has remained confined for more than five 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 the merits of the case, I am of the opinion that the applicant is entitled to be enlarged on bail.

6. Let the applicant **Sahil @ Laddan**, involved in the aforesaid case 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 the conditions that he:

- (i) shall appear on the date fixed by the trial court;
- (ii) shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence; and,
- (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.

(Vivek Varma,J.)

October 8, 2025

Lbm/-