



2026:AHC:56262

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 9374 of 2026

Mehi Lal Yadav

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Anand Kumar Srivastava, Indra Bhan
Yadav, Sujit Kumar Yadav
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A., Rajesh Kumar Pandey

Court No. - 66

(Sr. No.16 out of 116)

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Dr. S.B. Singh, Advocate holding brief of Sri Sujit Kumar Yadav, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Rajesh Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the informant, Sri Arun Kumar Mishra, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the material placed on record.
3. Applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No.534 of 2025, under Sections 103(1), 61(2) B.N.S., Police Station Bhadohi, District Bhadohi, during the pendency of trial.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant has argued that the applicant is absolutely innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. A case of accidental injury has been converted into a case of homicide by the informant. The applicant was not seen driving the said car. The similarly placed co-accused, Munna Lal Yadav, has been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 24.02.2026 in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No.6755 of 2026, hence, the applicant, having an identical role, is entitled to bail on parity. The criminal history of one case assigned to the applicant stands explained. He is in jail since 10.12.2025 and will not misuse the liberty of bail.
5. Per contra, learned counsel for the informant and learned A.G.A. have vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that the car with

which the deceased was hit belongs to the applicant, as such, he is not entitled to bail.

6. The Supreme Court in ***Prabhakar Tewari vs. State of U.P. And Another, (2020) 11 SCC 648*** has observed that pendency of several criminal cases against an accused itself cannot be a basis for refusal of bail, if otherwise his case for bail is made out.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and in light of the judgement passed by this Court in ***Nanha S/o Nabhan Kha vs. State of U.P., 1993 Cr.L.J. 938*** and the judgements passed by the Supreme Court in ***Paras Ram Vishnoi vs. The Director, Central Bureau of Investigation, MANU/SCOR/22410/2021*** and in ***Satender Kumar Antil vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and Another, (2022) 10 SCC 51***, the Court is of the view that the applicant has made out a case for bail. The bail application is ***allowed*** on the ground of parity.

8. Let the applicant- **Mehi Lal Yadav**, 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.

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

(Krishan Pahal,J.)

March 19, 2026
(Ravi Kant)