2026:AHC:211630

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 19120 of 2026

Babu Lal @ Daroga

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Abrar Ahmad Siddiqui
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A., Kunwar Mayank Singh

Court No. - 69

HON'BLE AVNISH SAXENA, J.

1. Heard Sri Abrar Ahmad Siddiqui, learned counsel for accused applicant, Sri Kunwar Mayank Singh, and learned A.G.A. for State.

2. The present bail application has been moved by the applicant accused-**Babu Lal @ Daroga** to enlarge him on bail in Case Crime No. 379 of 2025, under Sections 318(4), 319(2), 338, 336(3), 340(2) of BNS, P.S.-Mau, District- Chitrakoot, during the pendency of trial.

3. It is the contention of learned counsel for applicant that FIR has been lodged on 27.11.2025 by Ajay Kumar Yadav against 8 persons with the allegations that a fake sale deed has been registered in favour of co-accused Vimlesh Kumar by the person impersonating the parents of informant namely Kallu Yadav and Gulab Kali. It is further contended that accused applicant has not been named in the FIR, later on he has been shown impersonating Kallu Yadav as one of the seller. There is no identification carried out. The applicant is an innocent person. No consideration amount has been received. Rs. 39 lakh has been passed on through cheque in the name of Kallu Yadav and Gulab Kali, which has never been encashed. Co-accused Mala, who impersonated Gulab Kali was enlarged on bail. The applicant has no criminal history. The charge sheet is submitted and he accused applicant is languishing in jail since 01.04.2026. He seeks enlargement of accused on bail.

4. Learned counsel for informant and learned A.G.A. for State opposed the bail application and submit that there is investigation wherein the sale

deed was taken to consideration which was registered and it is found that photograph of the accused applicant is affixed on the sale deed and he has been identified by the purchaser Vimlesh Kumar (co-accused). He submits that it is an apparent fraud and therefore, the bail application be rejected.

5. This Court has taken into consideration the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. Considering the complicity of the accused applicant that he has impersonated as an owner and got executed the sale deed, the accused/applicant is not entitled to be released on bail.

7. Hence, without touching merit of the case, the bail application is hereby **rejected**.

(Avnish Saxena,J.)

October 8, 2026
Sharad/-

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