



2026:AHJ:58779

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 7258 of 2026

Mazid

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Abhishek Kumar Saroj, Hemendra
Pratap Singh, Nagendra Bahadur Singh
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A., Syed Shahnawaz Shah

Court No. - 66

(Sr. No.32 out of 116)

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Hemendra Pratap Singh, learned counsel for applicant, Sri Syed Shahnawaz Shah, learned counsel for the informant as well as learned A.G.A. for the State.
3. The present bail application has been filed by the applicant in Case Crime No.126 of 2024, under Sections 147, 148, 149, 323, 307, 325, 452, 504, 506, 308, 302 I.P.C., Police Station Gulawti, District Bulandshahr with the prayer to enlarge him on bail.
4. This is the second bail application on behalf of the applicant. The first one was rejected by this Court vide order dated 16.1.2025 passed in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No.39631 of 2024.
5. Learned counsel for the applicant has argued that the trial is moving at a snail's pace as only four witnesses have been examined to date and the cross-examination of PW-4 is going on. As such, there is no likelihood of conclusion of trial in near future. The applicant is languishing in jail since 6.8.2020, as such, the fundamental rights of the applicant enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India stand violated. There is no criminal antecedent of the applicant. 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 trial is moving on and already four witnesses have been examined. The applicant is the main accused person, as such, he is not entitled to bail.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that applicant is the main accused person and there being no new ground for pressing the instant bail application, I do not find it a fit case for grant of bail to the applicant. The instant 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 as early as possible in view of the principle as has been laid down in the recent judgments of the Supreme Court in the cases of ***Vinod Kumar vs. State of Punjab; 2015 (3) SCC 220*** and ***Hussain and Another vs. Union of India; (2017) 5 SCC 702***, 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.)

March 19, 2026

Vikas Verma