



HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 44568 of 2025

Rohan @ Ritik

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Pradeep Kumar Bhardwaj
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	Atul Kumar Tiwari, G.A.

Court No. - 65
(Sr. No.124 out of 269)

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Pradeep Kumar Bhardwaj, learned counsel for applicant, Sri Rizwan Nagish, Advocate holding brief of Sri Atul Kumar Tiwari, learned counsel for the informant as well as Sri Jai Kishan Chaurasia, learned State Law Officer for the State and perused the material placed on record.
3. The present bail application has been filed by the applicant in Case Crime No.294 of 2025, under Sections 123, 75, 64(1) B.N.S. and 66(C), 67 I.T. Act, Police Station Simbhawali, District Hapur with the prayer to enlarge him on bail.
4. As per prosecution story, the applicant spiked the water of the victim and rendered her unconscious, and thereupon raped her and even video recorded the said act and posted it on social media, thereby maligning the victim.
5. Learned counsel for the applicant has stated that the FIR is delayed and there is no explanation of the said delay caused. The victim is obviously above 18 years old as she was a student of B.Sc., 2nd year. She is a consenting party. There is no recovery of any indecent video of the victim whatsoever. It has also not been established as to who made the said video viral. There is no criminal history of the applicant. The applicant is in jail since 29.9.2025 and he is ready to cooperate with trial. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.

6. Per contra, learned counsel for the informant and learned State Law Officer have vehemently opposed the bail application on the ground that the video recording was handed over by the victim to the Investigating Officer, who perused it on computer and found it indecent, wherein the victim was found crying and disrobed. As such, the applicant is not entitled to bail.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the applicant had made viral the indecent video of the victim, I do not find it a fit case for grant of bail to the applicant. The bail application is found devoid of merits and is, accordingly, ***rejected***.

8. However, it is directed that the aforesaid case pending before the trial court be decided expeditiously, in accordance with law, without granting unnecessary adjournment to either party, if there is no legal impediment.

9. It is clarified that the observations made herein are limited to the facts brought in by the parties pertaining to the disposal of bail application and the said observations shall have no bearing on the merits of the case during trial.

(Krishan Pahal,J.)

May 14, 2026

Vikas Verma