



2025:JHC-1 K0389811

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 11947 of 2025

Vakeel @ Senapati (In Rejection Order Mentioned
As Kafeel @ Senapati)

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Prin. Secy. Home U.P. Lko.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Nevedita Gupta, Afreen Bano, Syed
Ahmad Mehdi

Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A.

Court No. - 15

HON'BLE KARUNESH SINGH PAWAR, J.

Heard learned counsel for the accused-applicant as well as learned A.G.A.
for the State and perused the record.

Learned counsel for the accused-applicant submits that in respect of the
same incident, FIR No. 133 of 2025 was registered, in which the applicant
has already been granted bail by the Sessions Court, Ayodhya, vide order
contained at page 51 of the bail application. It is further submitted that upon
a single arrest, this is the second case in which the applicant has been
implicated.

It is submitted that the alleged recovery of one country-made pistol and two
live cartridges of 315 bore, shown to have been recovered from the
applicant, is false, as there is no independent witness to the alleged recovery.
The applicant has explained his criminal history of 33 cases in paragraph 13
of the bail application as well as in paragraph 3 of the supplementary
affidavit. It is submitted that most of the said cases pertain to offences of
theft.

It has been further submitted that applicant is in jail since 26.08.2025 and, if
facility of bail is granted, there is no apprehension that he will flee from the
judicial process and he will abide by the orders passed by the Court below
and will co-operate in speedy trial of the case.

Learned A.G.A. has opposed the prayer for bail but has not disputed the
factual submissions made by the learned counsel for the accused-applicant.

On due consideration of the facts that the applicant has been languishing in jail since 26.08.2025, offence is triable by a Magistrate, the charge sheet in the case has been filed and he has explained the criminal history, I find it to be a fit case for enlarging the applicant on bail.

Accordingly, the bail application is **allowed**.

Let the applicant- **Vakeel @ Senapati (In Rejection Order Mentioned As Kafeel @ Senapati)**, involved in Case Crime/FIR No. 136 of 2025, under Sections 313 BNS & 3/25 Arms Act, Police Station-Kumarganj, District-Ayodhya, be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of Magistrate/Court concerned, subject to following conditions:-

- (i) the applicant shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence;
- (ii) the applicant shall not pressurize the prosecution witnesses;
- (iii) the applicant shall appear on each and every date fixed by the trial Court.

Any other condition(s) which the trial court/concerned court may deem fit and proper, in the circumstances of the case, may also be imposed.

It is clarified that the observations made in this order are confined to the present bail application and shall have no bearing on the merits of the trial.

December 17, 2025

Vinay/-

(Karunesh Singh Pawar,J.)