2026:AHC:207847

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 34212 of 2026

Rang Lal Bind

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Gyanesh Singh, Vinay Kumar Singh Singraur

Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A.

Court No. - 65

HON'BLE SAMEER JAIN, J.

1. Heard Sri Anuj Kumar Gupta, advocate holding brief of Sri Vinay Kumar Singh Singraur, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri Vijay Bahadur Maurya, learned AGA for the State.

2. The instant bail application has been filed seeking release of the applicant on bail in Case Crime No.91 of 2026, under Sections 103(1), 309(6), 317(2) BNS, Police Station Manda, District Prayagraj, during pendency of the trial.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits, it is a case of circumstantial evidence and nobody was named in the FIR but after one month informant raised suspicion against applicant and co-accused and thereafter they have been made accused in the present matter.

4. He next submits, after one week from the statement of informant as per prosecution when applicant was arrested then from his possession some small jewelries of the deceased were recovered but the alleged recovery is false and planted one. He next submits, except above evidence there is no other evidence against applicant on record.

5. He next submits, in absence of any other corroboratory evidence merely on the basis of above evidence prima facie it cannot be said that applicant committed murder of the deceased.

6. He next submits, applicant is not having any criminal history and in the

present matter he is in jail since 20.05.2026.

7. Per contra, learned AGA however opposed the prayer for bail but could not dispute the arguments on facts advanced by the learned counsel for the applicant.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case.

9. It is a case of circumstantial evidence and nobody was named in the FIR. It reflects, during investigation after one month when informant raised suspicion against applicant then applicant has been made accused alongwith one another.

10. Further, however as per prosecution apart from the suspicion when applicant was arrested then from his possession some small jewelries of the deceased were recovered but this recovery was made after 38 days from the alleged incident and after more than a week from the statement of the informant in which she disclosed the name of applicant.

11. Further, it reflects, except the above recovery there is no other cogent and admissible evidence which can connect the applicant with the instant crime. This Court finds merit in the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the applicant that in absence of any other corroborative evidence merely on the basis of above recovery prima facie it cannot be said that applicant involved in commission of the alleged crime.

12. Further, applicant is not having any criminal history and in the present matter he is in jail since 20.05.2026.

13. Therefore, considering the facts and circumstances of the case discussed above, in my view, applicant is entitled to be released on bail.

14. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant bail application is allowed.

15. Let the applicant - **Rang Lal Bind** be released on bail in the aforesaid case on furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned with the following

conditions:-

(i) The applicant shall appear before the trial court on the dates fixed, unless his personal presence is exempted.

(ii) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly, make 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 any police officer or tamper with the evidence.

(iii) The applicant shall not indulge in any criminal and anti-social activity.

16. In case of breach of any of the above condition, the prosecution will be at liberty to move an application before this Court for cancellation of the bail of the applicant.

17. It is clarified that the observations made herein are limited to the facts brought in by the parties pertaining to the disposal of bail application and the said observations shall have no bearing on the merits of the case during trial.

(Sameer Jain,J.)

October 5, 2026
Shahroz

Digitally signed by :-
SHAHROJ ALAM
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad