2026:AHC-LKO:39626

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW

APPLICATION U/S 528 BNSS No. - 2335 of 2026

Ram Chandar Pasi

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Secy. Deptt. Of Home Lko.

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Uttam Kumar Verma, Uday Pratap Singh
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 16

HON'BLE SHREE PRAKASH SINGH, J.

Heard learned counsel for the applicant, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the material placed on record.

By means of the instant applicant, the applicant has prayed that this Court may be pleased to direct the learned Court below not to insist the petitioner to file separate sureties and bonds in each and every six cases and accept only two sureties and one personal bond in lieu of all cases.

The learned counsel appearing for the applicant submits that it has become impossible for the applicant to submit separate sureties and bonds in each of cases, in which, he has been granted bail. He added that the applicant has been granted bail in six cases arising out of following Case Crime Numbers :-

1. Case Crime No. 06/2026, under Sections 305(A), 331(4), 317(2) of B.N.S., PS - Ikauna, District - Shrawasti.

2. Case Crime No. 14/2026, under Sections 317(2), 331(4), 305(A) of B.N.S. (Old sections 411, 457, 380 of IPC), PS - Ikauna, District - Shrawasti.

3. Case Crime No. 18/2026, under Sections 317(2), 331(4), 305(A) of B.N.S. (Old sections 411, 457, 380 of IPC), PS - Ikauna, District - Shrawasti.

4. Case Crime No. 21/2026, under Sections 317(2), 331(4), 305(A) of B.N.S. (Old sections 411, 457, 380 of IPC), PS - Ikauna, District - Shrawasti.

5. Case Crime No. 26/2026, under Sections 317(2), 331(4), 305(A) of B.N.S. (Old sections 411, 457, 380 of IPC), PS - Ikauna, District - Shrawasti.

6. Case Crime No. 33/2026, under Sections 109(1), 352, 351(3) of B.N.S. and Section 3/25 of Arms Act (Old sections 304, 307, 504, 506 of IPC), PS - Ikauna, District - Shrawasti.

He next added that despite the Trial Court granted the bail in aforesaid matters, the applicant is still in jail. Being poor person, he is unable to produce the sureties in each cases. It is further submitted by the learned counsel for the applicant that in similar circumstances, namely, in the case of **Hani Nishad @ Mohammad Imran @ Vikky vs. The State of Uttar Pradesh [SLP (Crl.) No.8914-8915/2018]** the Supreme Court vide order dated 29.10.2018 has permitted the petitioner to submit separate personal bonds and two sureties of heavy amount to hold good in all the cases.

Referring the aforesaid judgement and order, he submits that the applicant may also be given the benefit of the ratio of the judgement passed in **Hani Nishad @ Mohammad Imran @ Vikky (supra).**

Considering the aforesaid fact, the petition is **disposed off** with a direction to the applicant to furnish a personal bond of Rs.50,000/- and two sureties of the like amount in one case, which shall be treated to be valid in all other cases wherein the bail orders have been passed.

(Shree Prakash Singh,J.)

May 29, 2026
Raj

Digitally signed by :-
RAJ NIGAM
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad,
Lucknow Bench