2026:AHC:209513

# HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

## CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 30023 of 2026

Vinay Kumar

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Opposite Party(s)

---

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Rajesh Kumar Yadav, Ranjana Yadav
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A., Prem Prakash

---

**Court No. - 64**

**HON'BLE VIVEK VARMA, J.**

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, Sri V.P. Tripathi, learned A.G.A. for the State and Sri Prem Prakash, counsel for the informant. Perused the record.

2. The present bail application has been filed with a prayer to enlarge the applicant on bail in Case Crime No. 28 of 2026, under Sections 137(2), 87, 64(2)m B.N.S., and Section 3/4 POCSO Act, Police Station- Kone, District-Sonbhadra during pendency of the trial.

3. Counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. The incident is alleged to have occurred on 10.2.2026, whereas the first information report was lodged on 18.2.2026. The delay in lodging the first information report is fatal to the prosecution case. The victim is a major. The age of the victim was incorrectly got registered in the school records by the victim's parents to give her advantage in life. There is no lawful basis for the age related entry of the victim in the school records. Further, the victim in her statements recorded under Sections 180 and 183 B.N.S.S. stated that she had voluntarily left her maternal uncle's place, accompanied the applicant to Goa, solemnized marriage with him and both started living as husband and wife. There is no allegation of any forceful assault against the applicant. The applicant is in jail since 25.4.2026 having no criminal history. In case he is enlarged on bail, he will not misuse the said liberty.

4. Learned A.G.A. for the State and counsel for the informant have 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 victim in her statements recorded under Sections 180 and 183 B.N.S.S. stated that she had voluntarily left her maternal uncle's place, accompanied the applicant to Goa, solemnized marriage with him and both started living as husband and wife. There is no allegation of any forceful assault against the applicant. The applicant has no criminal antecedents. Further the applicant has presently remained confined for more than five 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 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, **Vinay Kumar** 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.

**(Vivek Varma,J.)**

**October 7, 2026**
S.S.

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