



2026:AHJ:8711/2

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 24686 of 2025

Tejveer Alias Bhoola

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	: Abhaya Raj Singh, Arvind Kumar Singh, Manglam Pandey, Shadab Alam
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	: G.A., Sushil Kumar Pandey

Court No. - 65
(Sl. No. 143 out of 277)

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Manglam Pandey, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri Sushil Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the informant as well as Sri Jai Kishan Chaurasia, learned State Law Officer and perused the record.
3. This bail application has been filed on behalf of the applicant seeking bail in **Case Crime No. 173** of 2025, **under Sections 64, 351(3)** of BNS and **Section 67** of Information Technology Act, **Police Station-** Raya, **District -** Mathura, 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. The FIR is delayed and there is no explanation of the said delay caused.
5. Learned counsel has also stated that the present case essentially pertains to a consensual relationship. It is submitted that the victim, in her statement, has alleged that the applicant took two lakh rupees as extortion money from her in lieu of deleting the indecent videos of her, but these allegations are false, baseless, and appear to be an after thought. It is further contended that the informant received the indecent photographs and videos of the victim from two mobile numbers, i.e. 7037630555 and 9058624921, neither of which belongs to the applicant, as such, it is a clear cut case of false implication.

6. Learned counsel has further contended that the applicant is languishing in jail since 30.05.2025, 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.

7. Per contra, the learned State Law Officer vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that a mobile phone was recovered from the possession of the applicant bearing two IMEI numbers, i.e. 869175053774113 and 869175053774105, and on it the mobile number 9027107312 was found. The applicant himself has allegedly stated that this mobile belongs to him, and from it the indecent photographs of the victim were clicked. Perusal of the said mobile indicated the presence of several indecent photographs and videos of the victim in its gallery. It is argued that, even if the two mobile numbers 7037630555 and 9058624921 mentioned above do not belong to the applicant, the presence of the alleged indecent photographs and videos of the victim in the gallery of his mobile clearly indicates his complicity, and that no other person could have made the said material viral as it was in his exclusive possession.

8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the presence of the alleged indecent photographs and videos of the victim in the gallery of the mobile of the applicant, I do not find it a fit case to release the applicant on bail.

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

10. 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.

11. 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.

April 20, 2026

Siddhant

(Krishan Pahal,J.)