2026:AHC:209310

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 28102 of 2026

Brahm Prakash @ Brahm Prakash Gautam

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Birendra Kumar, Yogesh Kumar Mishra
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 64

HON'BLE VIVEK VARMA, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and Sri Anupam Anand, learned Brief Holder for the State-opposite party.

2. The present bail application has been filed with the prayer to enlarge the applicant on bail in Case Crime No. 72 of 2026, under Section 69 B.N.S., Police Station Durgaganj, District Bhadohi, during the pendency of the trial.

3. Learned 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 victim and the applicant were in consensual relationship for a considerable period of time. The consensual relationship which if continued between the parties for considerable period of time could not be said to have continued under the 'misconception of fact' under Section 28 of the B.N.S. and could not be said to be 'sexual intercourse by employing deceitful means' under Section 69 of B.N.S. The applicant never made any promise to marry the victim. At this stage, there is no corroborative evidence to link the applicant with the offence. The applicant is in jail since 07.07.2026 having no criminal history and in case he is enlarged on bail, he will not misuse the said liberty.

4. Learned Brief Holder 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 victim and the applicant were in consensual relationship for a considerable period of time. At this state, there is no corroborative evidence to link the applicant with the offence. Further, the applicant has presently remained confined for more than three months and after submission of 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 merits of the case, I am of the opinion that the applicant is entitled to be enlarged on bail.

6. Let the applicant, **Brahm Prakash @ Brahm Prakash Gautam** involved in the aforesaid case be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each of the like amount to the satisfaction of court concerned on the following conditions that:

i. the applicant shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence;

ii. the applicant shall not pressurize the prosecution witness;

iii. the applicant shall appear on each and every date fixed by the trial court.

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 7, 2026
Abhishek

(Vivek Varma, J.)

Digitally signed by :-
ABHISHEK SINGH
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad