2026:AHC:211815

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 30207 of 2026

Munish Kumar

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Suneel Kumar
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 64

HON'BLE VIVEK VARMA, J.

1. Sri Neeraj Kumar Sharma, learned A.G.A. submits that the notice of the present application has been served upon the informant/opposite party no.2 on 16.8.2026 and C.W.C./opposite party no.3 on 17.8.2026. The receiving endorsements produced by learned A.G.A. are taken on record. However, no one appears on behalf of the said opposite parties nor any counter affidavit has been filed on their behalf.

2. Heard counsel for the applicant and learned A.G.A. for the State. Perused the material available on record.

3. The present bail application has been filed with a prayer to enlarge the applicant on bail in Case Crime No. 118 of 2026, under Sections 137(2), 64(2)(M), 319(2) of B.N.S. and Section 5(L)/6 of POCSO Act, Police Station- Patwai, District- Rampur, during the pendency of trial.

4. Counsel for the applicant contends that the applicant was not named in the first information report and has been falsely implicated in the present case. The victim in her statements recorded under Section 180 B.N.S.S. and 183 B.N.S.S. also did not name the applicant, nor there is any allegation against him. Only on the basis that the applicant had called the victim on her mobile phone from 11.5.2026 to 26.5.2026, he has been implicated in the present case. It is contended that the CDR report does not link the applicant with the alleged offence. The applicant had not acted indecently with the victim. At this stage, there is no corroborative evidence to link the applicant with the offence. The applicant is in jail since 10.7.2026 having no criminal antecedents and in case he is enlarged on bail, he will not misuse the said

liberty.

5. Learned A.G.A. for the State has opposed the prayer for bail but could not satisfactorily dispute the aforesaid submissions from the record.

6. Having heard counsel for the parties and having perused the record, this Court *prima facie* finds that the applicant was not named in the first information report. The victim in her statements recorded under Section 180 B.N.S.S. and 183 B.N.S.S. also did not name the applicant, nor there is any allegation against him. At this stage, there is no corroborative evidence to link the applicant with the offence. Moreover, the applicant has no criminal antecedents and has remained confined for almost three months and after submission of the 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 the merits of the case, I am of the opinion that the applicant is entitled to be enlarged on bail.

7. Let the applicant **Munish Kumar**, involved in the aforesaid case be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned subject to the conditions that he:

(i) shall appear on the date fixed by the trial court;

(ii) shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence; and,

(iii) shall not pressurize the prosecution witnesses.

8. 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 8, 2026

Manish Kr

(Vivek Varma,J.)

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