



HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 8096 of 2025

Tariq Ansari

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Ambreen Masroor, Gufran Ahmad
Khan, Sadrul Islam Jafri, Sr. Advocate
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A.

Court No. - 65
(Sr. No.46 out of 243)

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised. Learned State Law Officer has informed that notice to the informant has been served on 21.2.2025.
2. Heard Ms. Samara Ushmani, learned counsel for applicant, 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.248 of 2024, under Sections 333, 65(2) B.N.S. and Section 5M, 6 POCSO Act, Police Station Ushait, District Budaun with the prayer to enlarge him on bail.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant has stated that there are material contradiction in the statement of victim recorded during trial. She has categorically stated that the shop, where she used to visit, is far away from the place of occurrence. The witnesses of fact have already been examined, as such, there is no likelihood of applicant tampering with evidence. He is not a flight risk. It is true that the FIR is prompt, but it is a clear cut case of false implication. There is no criminal history of the applicant. The applicant is in jail since 7.10.2024 and he is ready to cooperate with trial. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.
5. Per contra, learned State Law Officer has vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that victim has sustained injuries on the vital part

of the body. The victim is a tender girl of 08 years old. The act of the applicant falls within the category of extreme mental depravity. The trial is also at its conclusive end, as such, the applicant is not entitled to bail.

6. This Court had called for the status of trial from the concerned trial court. As per the status report dated 17.4.2026, the prosecution evidence is complete. Eleven witnesses have already been examined, and even the arguments in the matter were heard. However, the defence counsel moved an application before the trial court, and after the disposal of said application, the arguments shall again be heard, and the case shall be disposed of.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that trial is at its conclusive end and also taking into account the age of victim being about 08 years and she having sustained injuries on her vital part of the body, 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, in accordance with law, without granting unnecessary adjournment to either party, 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 12, 2026
Vikas Verma