



2026:AHJ:91277

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 30771 of 2025

Ravi Pratap Shukla

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Ajay Kumar Pandey, Akash Dwivedi,
Shiv Kumar Gupta, Vidit Narayan
Mishra

Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A., Vinay Kumar Singh Chandel

Court No. - 65

(Sr. No.148 out of 259)

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised. Supplementary affidavit filed today is taken on record.
2. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, 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.153 of 2025, under Sections 64, 123, 351(2) B.N.S., Police Station Kotwali, District Ghaziabad, 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. The FIR is delayed by about 9 days and there is no explanation of the said delay caused. The victim is a consenting party, as she had gone with the applicant all the way to a hotel, which was booked by the applicant through MakeMyTrip, and the allegations that the applicant spiked her drink and food are false. There is no medical corroboration of the incident. The victim obviously is major, as she was preparing for competitive examinations. There is no recovery of any photographs or videos from the applicant. The criminal history assigned to the applicant stands explained. He is in jail since 28.06.2025 and undertakes to cooperate with the trial and not misuse the liberty of bail.

5. Learned counsel for the informant and learned A.G.A. have vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that the applicant has misused his clout, being a person of influence, although they could not dispute the fact that the applicant and the victim were visible in the CCTV footage of the hotel sitting in the waiting area.

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, 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 fact that there is no medical corroboration of the incident, 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- **Ravi Pratap Shukla**, 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.)

April 23, 2026
(Ravi Kant)