HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 37488 of 2026

Nirupma Mishra

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Ananya Shukla
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	Atul Tripathi, G.A.

Court No. - 69

HON'BLE AVNISH SAXENA, J.

1. Heard Ms. Sakshi Mehrotra, learned counsel holding brief appeared for accused applicant, Sri Atul Tripathi, learned counsel for the informant and learned A.G.A. for State.

2. The present bail application has been moved by the applicant/ accused- **Nirupma Mishra** to enlarge him on bail in Case Crime No. 86 of 2024, under Sections 420, 504, 506, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC, P.S.- Shivkuti, District- Prayagraj, during the pendency of trial.

3. It is the contention of learned counsel for applicant that the FIR has been lodged on 06.06.2024 against three named accused with the allegation that the co-accused were running the company in the name of Niharika Ventures, wherein they deals with the investments in land and good return. The allegation against the accused/applicant, who is mother of co-accused Niharika Dwivedi, that when the investors came and asked for money, the accused/applicant has threatened of filing false cases against them and amount will not be returned. It is the contention of learned counsel that the accused/applicant is neither in any capacity in Niharika Ventures nor is the beneficiary. The applicant has nine cases criminal history, which are identical in nature and lodged by the investors. In one case she is on bail and in other cases she is in jail. The charge sheet is submitted. The accused applicant is languishing in jail since 23.06.2024. He seeks to be enlarged on bail.

4. Learned A.G.A. for State and learned counsel for the informant have

opposed the prayer for bail and submit that the matter pertains to scam of Rs. 400 Crores, wherein most of the informant have joined in the same FIR. Further submits that there are nearly 500 Advocates of the Prayagraj, who have invested and lost their money. There is specific role attributed to the applicant as such the bail application be rejected.

5. This Court has taken into consideration the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. Considering the role the accused/applicant of threatening the persons for lodging of false FIR against investors and non return of money. It prima facie shows that the accused/applicant has no role in the company, the accused/applicant is entitled to be released on bail.

7. Hence, without touching merit of the case, the bail application is **allowed**.

8. The accused/applicant 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 court concerned in view of observation made by the Supreme Court in its dictums of **Girish Gandhi Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh [(2024) 10 SCC 674] and Policy Strategy for grant of bail in re [(2024)10SCC 685].**

9. The accused-applicant shall cooperate in judicial process for fair and speedy disposal.

(Avnish Saxena,J.)

October 28, 2026
Abhishek Sri.

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