



2025:09:14 10:47:13

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 552 of 2026**

Ravi Kesarwani

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	: Anurag Pandey, Dev Raj Singh, Virendra Singh
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	: Anup Kumar Pandey, G.A., Mohitosh Singh, Rahul Chaudhary

Court No. - 65
(Sr. No.128 out of 259)

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised. Second supplementary affidavit filed by learned counsel for the applicant and counter affidavit filed by learned counsel for the informant are taken on record.
2. Heard Sri Virendra Singh, Sri Dev Raj Singh, learned counsels for the applicant, Sri Mohitosh Singh, learned counsel for the informant, Sri Rajendra Prasad Singh, learned State Law Officer for the State and perused the material placed on record.
3. Applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No.406 of 2025, under Sections 64(1), 351(3), 305 BNS, Police Station Civil Lines, District Prayagraj, during the pendency of trial.
4. As per prosecution story, the applicant is stated to have taken the victim to a go-down on the pretext of getting her treatment and instead committed rape with her, and retained the keys and mobile of the victim with him.
5. Learned counsel for the applicant has argued that the FIR is delayed, as no date and time of the offence is mentioned therein. The statement of the victim recorded under Section 180 BNSS also does not mention any date and time of the offence. The date and time of the offence came up for the first time in the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 BNSS, whereby it is stated that the applicant committed the said offence on 14.09.2025, which itself indicates that the FIR is delayed by about 11 days; as such, the victim has inflated the allegations at the time of recording of her

statement under Section 183 BNSS, whereby she has stated that the applicant got her injured as his friend Aakash crushed her feet under his car.

6. The learned counsel for the applicant has further argued that there is no medical corroboration of the incident. The victim is a married lady. The incident of causing injury to the foot of the victim cannot be attributed to the applicant. The applicant has no criminal history and is in jail since 10.11.2025. He undertakes to cooperate with the trial and not misuse the liberty of bail.

7. Learned counsel for the informant and learned State Law Officer have vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that there is no contradiction in the statement of the victim recorded under Sections 180 and 183 BNSS to the FIR, except the date and time of the offence; she has mentioned each and every detail in it. The applicant has a cordial relationship with the police, as he obliges them with eateries; as such, he is not entitled to bail.

8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, the evidence on record, taking into consideration the delay of about 11 days in the institution of the FIR and the fact that there is no medical corroboration of the incident, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, *prima-facie* the Court is of the view that the applicant has made out a case for bail. The bail application is **allowed**.

9. Let the applicant- **Ravi Kesarwani**, be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond and two sureties to the satisfaction of the court concerned, subject to verification of sureties, with the conditions that he shall not tamper with evidence or intimidate witnesses and shall appear before the trial court as required.

10. Breach of any condition shall entail cancellation of bail. The observations herein shall not affect the trial on merits.

(Krishan Pahal,J.)

May 6, 2026
(Ravi Kant)