



2025:JHC-1 K0:29771

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

APPLICATION U/S 528 BNSS No. - 2146 of 2025

Rahul Mandal

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

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

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Shyamendra Singh, Shiv Om, Tej Singh

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

Court No. - 29

HON'BLE DIVESH CHANDRA SAMANT, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, learned AGA for the State and perused the record.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant has submitted that applicant is involved in as many as 7 cases and in all the cases, he has already been granted bail by this Court. It is further submitted that on account of requirement of two individual surety in each case, the applicant has not been released on bail. The details of the cases are as follows :-

(i) Case Crime No. 329 of 2025 under Sections 303(2), 317(2), 317(4), 318(2) B.N.S. and Section 66-C and 66-D of I.T. Act, Police Station-Kotwali Ayodhya, District-Ayodhya.

(ii) Case Crime No. 356 of 2025 under Sections 303(2), 317(2), 317(4), 318(2) B.N.S. and Section 66-C and 66-D of I.T. Act, Police Station-Kotwali Ayodhya, District-Ayodhya.

(iii) Case Crime No. 334 of 2025 under Sections 303(2), 317(2), 317(4), 318(2) B.N.S. and Section 66-C and 66-D of I.T. Act, Police Station-Kotwali Ayodhya, District-Ayodhya.

(iv) Case Crime No. 346 of 2025 under Sections 303(2), 317(2), 317(4), 318(2) B.N.S. and Section 66-C and 66-D of I.T. Act, Police Station-Kotwali Ayodhya, District-Ayodhya.

(v) Case Crime No. 115 of 2025 under Sections 303(2), 317(2), 317(4), 3(5) B.N.S. and Section 66-C and 66-D of I.T. Act, Police Station-Bababazar, District-Ayodhya.

(vi) Case Crime No. 313 of 2025 under Sections 303(2), 317(2), 317(4), 318(4) B.N.S. and Section 66-C and 66-D of I.T. Act, Police Station-Inayatnagar, District-Ayodhya.

(vii) Case Crime No. 176 of 2025 under Sections 303(2), 317(2) B.N.S. and Section 66-C and 66-D of I.T. Act, Police Station-Cantt, District-Ayodhya.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant has relied upon the decision of Apex Court in the case of ***Hani Nishad @ Mohammad Imran @ Vicky Vs. The State of Uttar Pradesh in Special Leave to Appeal No. 8914-8915 of 2018*** decided on 29.10.2018, in which, Hon'ble Apex Court has passed the order directing the petitioner to execute one personal bond and two sureties which shall hold good for all the 31 cases.

4. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, it is provided that the applicant shall furnish a personal bond and two heavy sureties (one surety should be of family member of the applicant) each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned in any one case. The said surety shall be valid in all above mentioned cases, where the bail order has been passed.

5. With the above observations, this application under Section 528 B.N.S.S. is finally **disposed** of.

(Divesh Chandra Samant,J.)

December 17, 2025

Karan