



2025:011:1051M31

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 190 of 2026

Mohammed Shuaib

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Mohit Kumar Singh, Shams Uz Zaman,
Sujata Choudhary
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A., Taufir-Ul-Islam

Court No. - 65

(Sr. No.123 out of 259)

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.

2. Heard Ms. Sujata Choudhary, learned counsel for applicant, Sri Taufir-Ul-Islam, learned counsel for the informant as well as Sri Jai Kishan Chaurasia, learned State Law Officer for the State and perused the material placed on record.

3. The present bail application has been filed by the applicant in Case Crime No.186 of 2025, under Sections 64(1), 62, 324(5), 310(2) BNS, Police Station Kotwali, District Meerut with the prayer to enlarge him on bail.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant has stated that there are general and omnibus allegations in the FIR against all the accused persons, but the victim, in her statement recorded under section 183 BNSS, has escalated the allegations to that of sexual assault against the applicant as an afterthought after legal consultation. There are a lot of accused persons named in the FIR along with some unknown persons.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant has further stated that the CCTV footage is not a conclusive evidence and the applicant has not been identified in it, causing any injury to any person. As such, he is entitled to bail. There is no criminal history of the applicant and he is in jail since 21.11.2025. He is ready to cooperate with trial. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.

6. Per contra, learned counsel for the informant and learned A.G.A. have vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that one of the two accused persons was granted bail and the bail application of other was rejected only on the ground that he was identified in the CCTV footage. he applicant is also identified in the said CCTV footage groping the victim. As such, he is not entitled to bail.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the CCTV footage, whereby applicant is identified in it and the said fact is admitted to both the parties, I do not find it a fit case for grant of bail to the applicant. The bail application is found devoid of merits and is, accordingly, ***rejected***.

8. However, it is directed that the aforesaid case pending before the trial court be decided expeditiously, without granting unnecessary adjournment to either party, in accordance with law, if there is no legal impediment.

9. It is clarified that the observations made herein are limited to the facts brought in by the parties pertaining to the disposal of bail application and the said observations shall have no bearing on the merits of the case during trial.

(Krishan Pahal,J.)

May 6, 2026

Vikas Verma