



2026:AHC:194811

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 32959 of 2026

Dinesh Yadav

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Dhirendra Pratap Singh
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 68
(Sl. No.32 out of 291)

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Dhirendra Pratap Singh, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri A.K. Shukla, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the material placed on record.
3. Applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No. 132 of 2026, under Sections 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 319(2) BNS and 12(1)(B) Passport Act, 1967, Police Station Kopaganj, District Mau, 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 co-accused person Monu Yadav is stated to have used the document of the applicant to get issued another passport while already having a passport issued in his name. The said allegations are per se false. The applicant has not given his document to the co-accused person Monu Yadav. There is a criminal history of one case assigned to the applicant, which stands explained. The applicant is languishing in jail since 2.7.2026 and he is ready to cooperate with trial. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.
5. Learned A.G.A. has vehemently opposed the bail application but the submissions raised by the learned counsel for the applicant could not be disputed.

6. This Court is of the view that if a case for bail is otherwise made out, an accused cannot be kept incarcerated solely on account of his criminal antecedents. In the instant case, the criminal history assigned to the applicant has been properly explained.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, there being no cogent evidence against the applicant of having given his document to co-accused person 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- **Dinesh Yadav**, who is involved in aforementioned case crime be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned subject to verification of sureties, with the condition that he shall not tamper with evidence or intimidate witnesses and shall appear before the trial court as required.

9. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, it shall be a ground for cancellation of bail.

10. It is made clear that observations made in granting 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 16, 2026

Shalini