



2026:AHC:190845

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

**CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No.
- 8308 of 2026**

Mohammad Anas

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Sudarshan Singh
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : Deepak Kumar Singh, G.A., Shubham Singh

Court No. - 68
(Sr. No.73 out of 76)

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Akhil Tiwari, Advocate holding brief of Sri Sudarshan Singh, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri Arun Kumar Mishra, learned A.G.A. for the State as well as perused the record. Learned counsel for the informant is not present.
3. The present anticipatory bail application has been filed on behalf of the applicant in Case Crime No.73 of 2026 registered under Sections 115(2), 352, 351(2), 308(5), 309(4), 61(2) B.N.S. at Police Station- Puramufti, District Prayagraj with a prayer to enlarge him on anticipatory bail.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant has stated that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. A false allegation of demanding the ransom of Rs.2 lakhs has been made in the FIR instituted by an advocate. The allegations are *per se* false. There is no evidence of the applicant having demanded the said ransom and having snatched Rs.2,500/-. The applicant has no criminal antecedents and apprehends his arrest in the present case. The applicant has co-operated in the investigation and undertakes to co-operate during the course of trial as well, failing which the State shall be at liberty to move an appropriate application for cancellation of anticipatory bail.

5. Per contra, learned A.G.A. has vehemently opposed the anticipatory bail application but unable to dispute the submissions raised by the learned counsel for the applicant.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, the evidence on record, and taking into consideration the fact that there is no cogent evidence to substantiate the allegations levelled against the applicant, 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 anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is **allowed**.

7. Let the accused-applicant, **Mohammad Anas**, be released on anticipatory bail in the aforesaid case crime till the conclusion of the trial on furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each to the satisfaction of the court concerned, subject to the conditions that he shall cooperate with the investigation and trial, shall not tamper with the evidence or influence any witness, shall not leave India without prior permission of the trial court, and in case of breach of any of these conditions, the court concerned shall be at liberty to cancel the anticipatory bail.

8. The observations made herein are confined to the disposal of the present anticipatory bail application and shall not affect the merits of the trial.

(Krishan Pahal,J.)

September 11, 2026

(Ravi Kant)