HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 6341 of 2026

Chandrabhan @ Lakadu

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Chakradhari Tiwari, Chandra Prakash Mishra, Sanjeev Kumar Khare
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 64

HON'BLE VIVEK VARMA, J.

1. Heard Sri Chandra Prakash Mishra, counsel for the applicant and Sri Neeraj Kumar Sharma, learned A.G.A. for the State. Perused the material available on record.

2. The present bail application has been filed with a prayer to enlarge the applicant on bail in Case Crime No.432 of 2025, under Sections 64(1), 62(2)(M), 352, 351(3) of B.N.S. and Section 67A I.T. Act, Police Station- Vindhyachal, District- Mirzapur, during the pendency of trial.

3. Counsel for the applicant contends that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. The first information report has been lodged belatedly. The informant/victim was a married lady and she was in consensual relationship with the applicant. As per the investigating officer, the alleged indecent video was provided to him by the victim herself. The applicant has not circulated or made viral any indecent video or photograph of the victim. At this stage, there is no corroborative evidence to link the applicant with the offence. Investigation has been completed and the charge sheet has been submitted. The applicant is in jail since 28.12.2025 having no criminal antecedents and in case he is enlarged on bail, he will not misuse the said liberty.

4. Learned A.G.A. for the State has opposed the prayer for bail but could not satisfactorily dispute the aforesaid submissions from the record.

5. Having heard counsel for the parties and having perused the record, this Court *prima facie* finds that the first information report has been lodged

belatedly. The informant/victim was a married lady. As per the investigating officer, the alleged indecent video was provided to him by the victim herself. At this stage, there is no corroborative evidence to link the applicant with the offence. Moreover, the applicant has no criminal antecedents and has remained confined for almost ten months and after submission of the charge sheet there is no hope of early conclusion of trial, more so when no reasonable apprehension has been brought to the fore by the State that the applicant, if enlarged on bail, would either tamper with the evidence or delay the trial or intimidate the witness, without commenting on the merits of the case, I am of the opinion that the applicant is entitled to be enlarged on bail.

6. Let the applicant **Chandrabhan @ Lakadu**, involved in the aforesaid case be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned subject to the conditions that he:

(i) shall appear on the date fixed by the trial court;

(ii) shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence; and,

(iii) shall not pressurize the prosecution witnesses.

7. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move bail cancellation application before this Court.

October 23, 2026

Manish Kr

(Vivek Varma,J.)

Digitally signed by :-
MANISH KUMAR
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad