HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No. - 10502 of 2026

Anil Kumar Bajpai

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Praveen Kumar Singh, Syed Imran Ibrahim

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

Court No. - 70

HON'BLE RAJIV LOCHAN SHUKLA, J.

1. Heard Learned counsel for the applicant 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.66 of 2025 under Sections 468, 419, 420, 467, 471, 120B IPC, Police Station Syedraja, District Chandauli, 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 is a retired Bank Manager of the Bank of Baroda. The allegation against him is of granting a KCC loan to the co-accused Prem Chandra Kewat on false documents with respect to the agricultural land of Prem Chandra Kewat. Learned counsel for the applicant has submitted that the incident is of the year 2018 and the FIR came to be lodged in the year 2025. The applicant has already retired from service in the year 2021. Finding the applicant to be a soft target post his retirement, this false first information report has been registered. Learned counsel has further submitted that the job of actual physical verification of the documents or the property belonging to the agriculturist is not of the Branch Manager. The Panel Counsel files his report regarding the ownership of the property and the actual physical verification is done by the Field Officer. The applicant had no role to play in the same. After his satisfaction regarding the report of the Panel

Counsel and of the Field Officer, the loan was sanctioned in performance of the official duties of the applicant. This criminal prosecution, which has been instituted on the filing of the FIR after more than seven years of the occurrence, is clearly an abuse of the process of law. The applicant has similarly been targeted for two other loans and simultaneously two other FIRs have been lodged against the applicant. The applicant has filed anticipatory bail applications in those cases also.

4. Learned AGA has opposed the prayer for bail and has contended that the applicant being the Branch Manager was the primary person responsible for the issuance of the fake KCC loan. Learned AGA has further submitted that the applicant has similarly issued two other fake loans for which FIRs have been registered. Being a repeat offender, he may not be considered for grant of anticipatory bail.

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

6. The beneficiary of the loan Prem Chandra Kewat has been granted regular bail by this Court in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No.19237 of 2026. The applicant is stated to be a retired Bank Manager aged about 65 years. The offence in question is of the year 2018. The FIR has been lodged in the year 2025. The offence against the applicant primarily is based on documentary evidence. The applicant is no longer required for any custodial interrogation or recoveries.

7. Taking note of the entire facts and circumstances of the case, the old age of the applicant and the delay in lodging of the FIR, I deem it appropriate to enlarge applicant on anticipatory bail.

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

9. In the event of the arrest of the applicant-**Anil Kumar Bajpai**, 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;

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

11. 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.

(Rajiv Lochan Shukla,J.)

October 23, 2026
A. Pandey

Digitally signed by :-
ANAND PANDEY
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad