



2025:004 - 1 K03:29241

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 12061 of 2025

Rohit Singh @ Monu Singh

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

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

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Vaibhav Chauhan
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 15

HON'BLE KARUNESH SINGH PAWAR, J.

1. Vakalatnama filed today by Shri Dinesh Kumar Tripathi and Shri Prashant Shukla on behalf of informant is taken on record.
2. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, learned A.G.A. for the State, Shri Dinesh Kumar Tripathi, learned counsel for the informant and perused the record.
3. The accused-applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No.197 of 2025 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 504, 506, 408 IPC, Police Station Antu, District Pratapgarh.
4. In the prosecution case it is stated that Indian Oil petrol pump of complainant - Shivam Automobile is operating in Paramnathpur, District Pratapgarh. The bank account of the petrol pump is with State Bank of India, Pratapgarh. On the petrol pump of complainant Rohit Singh, who was the Manager from July 2017 to February 2025, Rajendra Bahadur Singh, Rahul Singh and Ajay Mishra were kept to look after day to day affairs of petrol pump. It is alleged that these accused persons from 2018 to February 2025 whatever petrol was supplied to the police department Pratapgarh through the petrol pump they had committed forgery by making forged receipts and also committing forgery in the register showing sale and purchase which are in two handwritings of Rohit Singh. From the statement of bank the complainant came to know that these accused by hatching conspiracy since October 2018 to February 2025

have embezzled rupees three crores and they have also stolen the register. The complainant is having the register for the years 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 which shows gross discrepancy in money received from police department.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant further states that although forgery is alleged on the applicant however it is not disputed in the prosecution case that whatever sale invoices were sent to the police department the payment was made by the police department through treasury into the bank account of the petrol pump therefore there is no reason for the accused to commit the forgery when the amount is not received by him. No assessment or audit report of income of various years of the petrol pump have been collected by the investigating officer.

6. Learned counsel for the applicant further states that prosecution case is denied by the statement of independent witness Ayush Dubey, Krishn Pal Mishra, Sarad Yadav, Virendra Gupta, Mangal who have denied prosecution case and further stated that petrol pump was managed by one Rajesh Prasad Tiwari.

7. Learned counsel further submits that the applicant has been in judicial custody since 26.8.2025. The alleged offence is triable by a Magistrate, and the applicant has no criminal antecedents.

8. It is further submitted that there is no possibility of the applicant of fleeing away after being released on bail or tampering with the witnesses. In case the applicant is enlarged on bail, he shall not misuse the liberty of bail.

9. Learned A.G.A. for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the bail application. It is submitted on behalf of the learned counsel for the informant that original sale invoices prepared by the accused for the department used to be destroyed by the applicant and in their place forged sale receipt / invoice were shown in the register.

10. I have considered the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the parties as well as perused the record.

11. Upon due consideration of the facts that the applicant has been in

judicial custody since 26.8.2025; the alleged offence is triable by a Magistrate; and that the applicant has no criminal antecedents, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court finds it to be a fit case for enlarging the applicant on bail. Accordingly, the bail application is **allowed**.

12. Let the applicant **Rohit Singh @ Monu Singh**, involved in the aforesaid FIR/Case crime number, be released on bail in the aforementioned case 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.

13. 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.

14. 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.

(Karunesh Singh Pawar,J.)

December 17, 2025

J. K. Dinkar