



HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 15260 of 2026

Vikas

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	R.B. Pal, Umesh Kumar Pal
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 65
(Sr. No.24 out of 259)

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised. Learned State Law Officer has informed that the notice to the informant has been served on 22.04.2026, but none is present on behalf of the informant.
2. Heard Sri R.B. Pal, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Jai Kishan Chaurasia, learned State Law Officer for the State and perused the material placed on record.
3. Applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No.83 of 2026, under Sections 137(2), 87, 65(2) BNS, 2023 and Section 5M/6 POCSO Act, Police Station Koraon, District Prayagraj, during the pendency of trial.
4. As per prosecution story, the two victims, daughter and niece of the informant, are stated to have been enticed away by the applicant and co-accused Shiva Singh on 10.03.2026 at about 9:00 p.m. The victim V₁ is stated to have been released somehow from the clutches of the applicant and reached her house on 12.03.2026 at about 12:00 p.m.
5. Learned counsel for the applicant has argued that the applicant is absolutely innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. The FIR is delayed by about three days, and there is no explanation for the said delay. The FIR is even delayed by about one day from the date of recovery of the victim V₁. The victims seem to be consenting parties. The victim V₁ had gone with the applicant, and the victim V₂ had gone with co-accused

Shiva Singh, and they did not raise any alarm whatsoever. There is no medical corroboration of the incident, as they refused medical examination. Even the statements of the victims recorded under Section 183 BNSS indicate their consent. The victims, by their appearance, seem to be major, although there is no valid document to suggest that they were minors. The applicant has no criminal history and is in jail since 18.03.2026. He undertakes to cooperate with the trial and not misuse the liberty of bail.

6. Learned State Law Officer has vehemently opposed the bail application but could not dispute the submissions made by the counsel for the applicant.

7. 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 in the institution of the FIR and the statement of the victim V₁ recorded under Section 183 B.N.S.S., which indicates her consent, 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**.

8. Let the applicant- **Vikas**, 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.)

May 6, 2026
(Ravi Kant)