2026:AHC:209817

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No. - 5068 of 2026

Navneet Pandey

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Devendra Mani Tripathi, Nagendra Pratap Singh, Shakti Shanker Tiwari, Subhash Chandra Tiwari, Sr. Advocate
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 71

HON'BLE VIVEK KUMAR SINGH, J.

1. Heard Sri Anil Bhushan, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Sri S.S. Tiwari, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Nagendra Pratap Singh, learned counsel for opposite party no.2/ informant, learned A.G.A for the State and perused the record.

2. This is the second anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of the applicant in Case Crime No.224 of 2025, under Sections 3(5), 309(6), 115(2), 352, 351(2), 317(2) of B.N.S. and Section 7 of Criminal Law Amendment Act, Police Station Kotwali Vindhyachal, District Mirzapur, with a prayer to grant him anticipatory bail.

3. The first anticipatory bail application, being Criminal Misc. Anticipatory Bail Application U/S 482 BNSS No. 7418 of 2025, was filed by the applicant, wherein an interim order was granted by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 22.09.2025. The matter was kept pending, and 27.10.2025 was fixed as the next date. It was provided in the aforesaid order that the applicant shall be released on interim anticipatory bail till the next date of listing or till the submission of the police report under Section 193(3) B.N.S.S. However, the aforesaid anticipatory bail application was dismissed for non-prosecution

4. Learned Senior Counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is absolutely innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case; he

has nothing to do with the alleged offence, in spite of which the police are trying to arrest him. It is further contended by the learned Senior Counsel that the charge-sheet has already been submitted on 21.10.2025 and, therefore, there is no requirement of the custodial interrogation of the applicant. The applicant has cooperated with the investigation. It is further contended that the applicant and the informant are both priests at Maa Vindhyavasini Temple, Mirzapur. As per the CCTV footage, the applicant and the informant were engaged in a scuffle; however, the CCTV footage does not show the applicant snatching a gold chain and Rudraksha beads from the informant's son. The applicant has not committed any act of extortion. The criminal antecedents of the applicant have been duly explained in paragraphs 46 to 56 of the bail application. It is next submitted by the learned Senior Counsel that anticipatory bail ought to have been granted to the applicant till the conclusion of the trial, in view of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Sushila Aggarwal and Others v. State (NCT of Delhi) and Another, (2020) 5 SCC 1**. Learned Senior Counsel for the applicant lastly contended that the applicant undertakes to cooperate during trial and shall appear as and when required by the court concerned. It has also been stated that, in case the applicant is granted anticipatory bail, he shall not misuse the liberty of bail, shall cooperate with the trial, and shall abide by all the conditions that may be imposed by the court.

5. On the other hand, learned A.G.A. and learned counsel for the informant have opposed the application for anticipatory bail, however, they do not dispute the factual aspect.

6. I have heard rival submissions of the learned counsel for the parties and perused the records.

7. The chargesheet has already been submitted in this case and there is no allegation against the applicant that he did not cooperate with the investigation. There is no requirement of custodial interrogation of the applicant.

8. In **Aman Preet Singh v. CBI, (2022) 13 SCC 764,** the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that :

> *"11. A reading of the aforesaid shows that it is the guiding principle for a Magistrate while exercising powers under Section 170CrPC which had been set out. The Magistrate or the Court empowered to take cognizance or try the accused has to accept the charge-sheet forthwith and proceed in accordance with the procedure laid down under Section 173CrPC. It has been rightly observed that in such a case the Magistrate or the Court is required to invariably issue a process of summons and not warrant of arrest. In case he seeks to exercise the discretion of issuing warrants of arrest, he is required to record the reasons as contemplated under Section 87 Cr.P.C that the accused has either been absconding or shall not obey the summons or has refused to appear despite proof of due service of summons upon him. In fact the observations in sub-para (iii) above by the High Court are in the nature of caution.*
>
> *12. In sofar as the present case is concerned and the general principles under Section 170Cr.P.C, the most apposite observations are in sub-para (v) of the High Court judgment in the context of an accused in a non-bailable offence whose custody was not required during the period of investigation. In such a scenario, it is appropriate that the accused is released on bail as the circumstances of his having not been arrested during investigation or not being produced in custody are itself sufficient to entitle him to be released on bail. The rationale has been succinctly set out that if a person has been enlarged and free for many years and has not even been arrested during investigation, to suddenly direct his arrest and to be incarcerated merely because charge-sheet has been filed would be contrary to the governing principles for grant of bail. We could not agree more with this."*

9. Hence, considering the settled principles of law regarding anticipatory bail, submissions of the learned counsel for the parties, nature of accusation, role of applicant and all attending facts and circumstances of the case, without expressing any opinion of the merits of the case, in my view, it is a fit case for anticipatory bail to the applicant till conclusion of trial in the matter.

10. Accordingly, the second anticipatory bail application is **allowed** with following directions:-

(i) In the event of arrest of the applicant- **Navneet Pandey,** involved in the aforesaid case, he shall be released on anticipatory bail till the conclusion of trial, on his furnishing a personal bond of Rs.50,000/- with two sureties each of the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned.

(ii) The applicant shall co-operate during trial and shall report to the court concerned as and when required for the purpose of fair trial.

(iii) 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; and

(iv) The applicant shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court.

11. In default or misuse of any of the conditions, the Public Prosecutor/ Investigating Officer/ first informant-complainant is at liberty to file appropriate application for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the applicant, before the concerned court.

(Vivek Kumar Singh,J.)

October 7, 2026
Radhika

Digitally signed by :-
RADHIKA VISHWAKARMA
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad