



2026:AHC:197255

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No.
- 8592 of 2026

Shailendra Kumar Verma

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Anurag Vajpeyi, Praveen Kumar Singh,
Sr. Advocate
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A., Rajiv Chowdhury

Court No. - 68
(Sl. No. 56out of 131)

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.

2. Heard Sri Manish Tiwari, learned Senior Advocate assisted by Sri Praveen Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Rajiv Chowdhury, learned counsel for the informant and Sri A.K. Mishra, learned A.G.A. for the State as well as perused the record.

3. The present anticipatory bail application has been filed on behalf of the applicant in Crime No.366 of 2026, registered under Sections 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 352 BNS, at Police Station- Bhelupur, District Varanasi, with a prayer to enlarge him on anticipatory bail.

PROSECUTION STORY:

4. The applicant, who happens to be the brother of the informant, is stated to have forged the documents and got title of the property, which belong to the informant as well, transferred solely to his name.

ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

5. The allegations are *per se* false. The mother and father of the applicant expired in the year 1995 and 2005 respectively and as a settlement, the applicant had executed the gift deed of three flats in the name of his sister (informant) and her two daughters, respectively, in the year 2021 and

subsequently, the applicant got the said title transferred in his name in the year, 2023 but the informant, in order to get their share in the property belonging to the applicant, has instituted the said FIR.

6. The matter of civil in nature has been converted into criminal case by the informant. The matter was settled between the parties, as such, the applicant executed the said gift deed. Had it not been so, there were no reason for the applicant to execute the said gift deed.

7. The applicant has no criminal antecedents to his credit. Learned counsel for the applicant undertakes that applicant has co-operated in the investigation and is ready to do so in trial also failing which the State can move appropriate application for cancellation of anticipatory bail.

ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF STATE/INFORMANT:

8. The parents had died way back about 22 years to the FIR and the applicant got transferred the title deed in his name in the year 2023. The said delay of about 19 years speaks volume of the complicity of the applicant. The informant herself was a share-holder in the flats that were gifted to her as well to her daughters, as such, applicant is not entitled for anticipatory bail.

CONCLUSION:

9. On due consideration to the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the applicant as well as learned A.G.A. and considering the nature of accusations and there being no criminal antecedents of the applicant, the anticipatory bail application of the applicant is ***allowed***.

10. In the event of arrest of the applicant, **Shailendra Kumar Verma**, involved in the aforesaid case crime number, shall be released on anticipatory bail till the conclusion of trial on furnishing a personal bond with two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Presiding Officer/Court Concerned, with the conditions that:-

- i. that the applicant shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
- ii. that the applicant shall not, directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from*

disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence;
iii. that the applicant shall not leave India without previous permission of the court;
iv. that the applicant shall not tamper with the evidence during the trial;
v. that the applicant shall not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witness;
vi. that the applicant shall appear before the trial court on each date fixed unless personal presence is exempted;

11. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, the court concerned shall have the liberty to cancel the bail granted to the applicant.

12. It is made clear that observations made in granting anticipatory bail to the applicant shall not in any way affect the learned trial Judge in forming his independent opinion based on the testimony of the witnesses.

(Krishan Pahal,J.)

September 21, 2026
Shalini