2026:AHC:209843

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 29105 of 2026

Arman

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Amitrana, Dhiraj Singh, Umair Mahmood
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 64

HON'BLE VIVEK VARMA, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and Sri N.K. Sharma, learned A.G.A. 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. 208 of 2026, under Section 69 B.N.S., Police Station Kiratpur, District Bijnor, 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. Placing reliance upon the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 B.N.S.S., it is contended that the applicant and the victim were in consensual relationship for almost four years. 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 21.07.2026 having no criminal history and in case he is enlarged on bail, he will not misuse the said liberty.

4. Learned AGA 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 as per the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 B.N.S.S., the applicant and the victim were in consensual relationship for almost four years. At this stage, there is no corroborative evidence to link the applicant with the offence. Further, the applicant has presently remained confined for more than two months and 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, **Arman** 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