



2026:AHC:71152

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 24893 of 2025

Karan Kumar Alias Pradum

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Jai Prakash Rai, Om Prakash
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 65
(Sl. No. 101 out of 262)

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised. As informed by learned AGA, notice to the informant has been served on 10.07.2025 but none is present on behalf of the informant.
2. Heard Sri Jai Prakash Rai, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri Deepak Kumar Singh, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the record.
3. This bail application has been filed on behalf of the applicant seeking bail in **Case Crime No. 28 of 2025, under Sections 64, 75, 351(2), 352 of BNS and 66E & 67 of I.T. Act and 3/4(2) of POCSO Act, Police Station- Drumandganj, District - Mirzapur**, during the pendency of trial.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant has submitted that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has nothing to do with the said offence as alleged in the FIR. As per the statement of the victim recorded u/s 183 BNSS, she seems to be a consenting party as she is stated to be madly in love with the applicant although it is also alleged that he posted certain indecent photographs of her on instagram. It is argued that the applicant has not used his ID, as such, he is entitled for bail. He is languishing in jail since 05.04.2025, having no criminal history to his credit. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail and shall cooperate with trial.

5. Per contra, learned AGA has vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that as per the forensic report, the applicant has misused his number and created the said instagram ID from which the said indecent video of the victim was posted, as such, he is not entitled for bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the applicant has misused his clout and posted the indecent video of the victim on instagram, I do not find it a fit case to release the applicant on bail.

7. The bail application is, accordingly, **rejected**.

8. However, it is directed that the aforesaid case pending before the trial court be decided expeditiously, in view of the principle laid down in the recent judgements 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.)

April 2, 2026
Siddhant