



2026:AHC:200738

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

**CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL CANCELLATION APPLICATION No. - 235
of 2026**

Dilip Kumar

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 6 Others

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Dhiraj Singh, Praveen Kumar Shukla
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : Ashok Kumar Yadav, G.A., Nitin
Sharma, Phool Singh Yadav, Uttam
Kumar

Court No. - 68

(Sl. No. 201 out of 208)

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised. Heard Sri Anubhav Mishra, Advocate holding brief of Sri Dhiraj Singh, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Phool Singh Yadav, learned counsel for the O.P. Nos. 4 & 5 and Sri Nitin Sharma, learned counsel for the O.P. Nos. 6 & 7 and Sri R.P. Patel, learned State Law Officer.

2. The present bail cancellation application has been filed to set-aside the orders dated 11.09.2025, 27.08.2025, 25.08.2025 and 02.12.2025 passed by this Court granting bail to the O.P. Nos. 4 to 7, namely, **Kuldeep Yadav, Ratan Singh @ Suneel Yadav, Chintamani** and **Vikas Yadav** with regard to **Case Crime No.239** of 2024, **under Sections** 191(2), 191(3), 190, 352, 109(1), 115(2), 324(2), 351(3), 103(1) of BNS, **Police Station-** Utraon, **District-** Prayagraj, in **Criminal Misc. Bail Application Nos.** 30224 of 2025, 25264 of 2025, 25432 of 2025 and 40376 of 2025, respectively.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the opposite party nos. 4 to 7 are actively preventing the applicant from deposing before the trial court by issuing regular threats. It is urged that the applicant has already instituted two distinct criminal complaints against them, i.e. FIR Nos. 06 of 2026 and 101 of 2026, in respect of these subsequent actions. On these grounds, it is contended that the opposite party nos. 4 to 7 have flagrantly misused the liberty of bail granted to them, rendering the same liable to be cancelled. It is further submitted that any legitimate apprehension in the mind of the

applicant regarding his safety can be adequately redressed by directing the local police to provide him with security on the dates fixed for his deposition before the trial court.

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for opposite party nos. 4 to 7 submits that the allegations leveled against the said opposite parties are entirely baseless and speculative. It is contended that no medical or injury report exists on record to corroborate the alleged occurrences, and the instant application is merely an attempt by the applicant to secure the incarceration of opposite party nos. 4 to 7 on one pretext or another. Consequently, it is argued that the application lacks merit and is liable to be rejected.

5. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the rival submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the parties, and taking into consideration that the rejection of liberty requires a very high standard of proof which is not satisfied by the mere registration of subsequent FIRs without corroborative material, yet the security concerns of the applicant can be balanced by a protective directive, this Court is of the opinion that a case for cancellation of bail is not made out.

6. Accordingly, the instant bail cancellation application is hereby **dismissed**.

7. However, taking into account the assertion that the applicant faces regular threats regarding his deposition, the Senior Superintendent of Police / Superintendent of Police concerned is directed to ensure that adequate security and protection are provided to the applicant on the dates fixed for recording his statement before the Trial Court. The Trial Court is also directed to expedite the recording of the applicant's deposition without allowing any unnecessary adjournments to either side.

September 23, 2026

Siddhant

(Krishan Pahal,J.)