HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No. - 10362 of 2026

Sanjay Kumar Saroj @ Baba

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Abhishek Kumar Pandey, Birendra Singh, Yash Pratap Singh
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A., Kuldeep Singh, Shriyansh Singh

Court No. - 70

HON'BLE RAJIV LOCHAN SHUKLA, J.

1. Heard Learned counsel for the applicant, Learned counsel for the informant and Learned A.G.A. for the State as well as perused the record.

2. The present anticipatory bail application has been filed on behalf of the applicant in Case Crime No.159 of 2024, under section 420, 504, 506, 467, 468, 471 & 120-B I.P.C., Police Station-Kotwali Katra, District- Mirzapur, with a prayer to enlarge him on anticipatory bail as the applicant apprehends his arrest in the abovementioned case.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. The applicant was named in the FIR with the allegation that the applicant had promised public employment in the Group-D services to the informant and thereafter, had also promised the informant, once his selection could not be made in the Group-D services on the post of Sub Inspector. The learned counsel has stated that allegations of receiving Rs.24 lakhs for securing a job for the informant are absolutely false. In fact the applicant had borrowed Rs.4 lakhs from the informant and part of which has also been returned. Learned counsel relies upon affidavit filed by one Shiv Prakash Bind, who had introduced the applicant to the informant and the said Shiv Prakash Bind has categorically stated that the applicant needed financial help for which loan had been taken and the allegation of taking Rs.23 lakhs and 44 thousand for getting jobs to several persons including the informant are absolutely false. Applicant has no criminal antecedents.

4. Learned AGA has opposed the prayer for bail but does not dispute the fact that the applicant has no criminal antecedents.

5. Learned counsel for the informant has stated that Rs.23 lakhs, 44 thousand has been taken by the applicant from the informant and other known persons of the informant on the pretext of getting them government jobs. The said money has been usurped by the applicant. Learned counsel has further contended that a huge amount of money has been misappropriated in his account and the applicant may not be considered for granting anticipatory bail.

6. I have considered the submissions made by the Learned counsels for the parties.

7. The co-accused Ujjwal Saroj @ Deepak, who is the brother of the applicant and is not named in the FIR was granted regular bail by this Court in Bail Application No.4372 of 2026. As per the averments made in the FIR the informant was seeking to get an employment in the Group-D services or in the U.P. Police on payment of money. Such an admission casts clear suspicion over the prosecution version, when it is the admitted case of the prosecution that government employment was being sought to be obtained on payment of money

8. Taking into account the facts and circumstances of the case, I deem it appropriate to enlarge applicant on anticipatory bail.

9. In view of the above, the anticipatory bail application of the applicant is ***allowed***.

10. In the event of the arrest of the applicant-Sanjay Kumar Saroj @ Baba, he shall be released forthwith in the aforesaid case crime on anticipatory bail on furnishing a personal bond and surety to the satisfaction of the Station House Officer of the police station/Court concerned with the following conditions:-

i. the applicant shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

ii. that 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 or to any police officer;

iii. that the applicant shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

iv. that the applicant shall not pressurize/intimidate the prosecution witness;

11. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, the Court concerned shall be at liberty to cancel the bail.

12. It is made clear that observations made hereinabove are exclusively for deciding the instant anticipatory bail application and are not to be considered to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

October 27, 2026
Neeraj

(Rajiv Lochan Shukla,J.)

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