2026:AHC:209412

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL APPEAL No. - 10257 of 2026

Smt Manjulika Verma

.....Appellant(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Appellant(s)	:	Dilip Kumar Goswami, Sanjay Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 74

HON'BLE SAMIT GOPAL, J.

1. List revised.

2. Heard Sri Sanjay Singh, learned counsel for the appellant and Sri Bade Lal Bind, learned counsel for the State and perused the record.

3. This criminal appeal under Section 14-A (2) of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act has been preferred by the appellant- **Smt Manjulika Verma**, with the prayer to set aside the order dated 09.09.2026 passed by the Additional District & Sessions Judge / Special Judge (SC/ST Act), Lalitpur in Bail Application No. 1432 / 2026 (Smt Manjulika Verma Vs. State of U.P. and others) arising out of Case Crime No. 774 of 2026, under Sections 308(5), 308(4), 352, 351(3) B.N.S., Police Station Kotwali Lalitpur, District Lalitpur, with a further prayer to release the appellant on bail in the aforesaid case during the pendency of trial.

4. The first information report of the present matter was lodged on 14.07.2026 by Anil Kumar Ashok the opposite party no.2 on the basis of an application moved under Section 173(4) BNSS against Rankeshwar Pratap Singh Chauhan, the appellant and 02 unknown persons alleging therein that he is an Assistant Engineer at Rajghat Bandh, Lalitpur. The appellant and co-accused Rankeshwar Pratap Singh Chauhan were the persons working there in the field hostel as outsourced employees who worked from January 2025 to 31 December 2025 and their contract ended on 31 December 2025 after which the contractor removed them. Both the persons many times

create disturbance in the work. The appellant was working in the field hostel/guest house wherein she surreptitiously recorded the conversations therein which were not having any incriminating talks. They then started pressurizing the informant for giving them job on which he told them that they were outsourced employees and giving job was for the contractor and not in his power. On 19.01.2026 they made a false complaint against the informant and his family members after which a compromise was entered between them at the police station and Rs. 5,40,000/- was paid to them. Subsequently on 08.04.2026 at about 4.00 pm the accused came to his house and again demanded Rs. 5 lakh which was refused by him and then they used caste related abuses and threatened him. On not fulfilling their illegal demand for money the accused together in order to blackmail him moved an application for lodging of first information report on 24.04.2026 before the court concerned. He then gave an application to the police on 08.04.2026 to the In-charge Police Staition and then on 20.05.2026 to the Superintendent of Police, Lalitpur through post on which also no action was taken.

5. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the appellant was working as an outsourced employee in the department of the first informant and thus has been named in the first information report just in order to falsely implicate her. While placing paragraph 12 of the affidavit it is submitted that in so far as the payment of money is concerned, there is no credible evidence to show payment of Rs. 5,00,000/- alleged to have been given as cash whereas Rs. 40,000/- was paid to co-accused Rankeshwar Pratap Singh Chauhan through electronic mode. It is submitted that the present first information report has been lodged on the basis of an application under Section 173(4) BNSS which has been moved after a delay of about 02 months before the court concerned from the date of incident. The appellant is a lady. The appellant has no criminal history as stated in para 27 of the affidavit and is in jail since 02.08.2026.

6. *Per contra,* learned counsel for the State opposed the prayer for bail. It is submitted that the investigation in the matter has concluded and charge-sheet has been submitted against the appellant and co-accused on 31.08.2026. It is submitted that the appellant is named in the first information report and had blackmailed the first informant and thus the present first information report has been lodged.

7. After having heard learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is evident that the appellant is a lady. Rs. Five lakh is alleged to have been given in cash for which there is no credible evidence. With regard to Rs. 40,000/- the same is alleged to have been given to co-accused Rankeshwar Pratap Singh Chauhan through electronic mode. The investigation in the matter has concluded and charge-sheet has been submitted.

8. Looking to the facts and circumstances of this case, the nature of evidence and also the absence of any convincing material to indicate the possibility of tampering with the evidence, this Court is of the view that the appellant may be enlarged on bail.

9. Let the appellant- **Smt Manjulika Verma**, be released on bail in the aforesaid case crime number on furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned with the following conditions which are being imposed in the interest of justice:-

(i) The appellant will not tamper with prosecution evidence and will not harm or harass the victim/complainant in any manner whatsoever.

(ii) The appellant will abide the orders of court, will attend the court on every date and will not delay the disposal of trial in any manner whatsoever.

(iii) The appellant shall file an undertaking to the effect that she shall not seek any adjournment on the date fixed for evidence when the witnesses are present in court. In case of default of this condition, it shall be open for the trial court to treat it as abuse of liberty of bail and pass orders in accordance with law.

(iv) The appellant will not misuse the liberty of bail in any manner whatsoever. In case, the appellant misuses the liberty of bail during trial and in order to secure her presence proclamation under section 84 B.N.S.S., 2023 may be issued and if appellant fails to appear before the court on the date fixed in such proclamation, then, the trial court shall initiate proceedings against her, in accordance with law, under section 209 B.N.S., 2023.

(v) The appellant shall remain present, in person, before the trial court on dates fixed for (1) opening of the case, (2) framing of charge and (3) recording of statement under Section 351 B.N.S.S., 2023. If in the opinion of the trial court absence of the appellant is deliberate or without sufficient

cause, then it shall be open for the trial court to treat such default as abuse of liberty of bail and proceed against her in accordance with law and the trial court may proceed against her under Section 269 B.N.S., 2023.

(vi) The trial court may make all possible efforts/endeavour and try to conclude the trial expeditiously after the release of the appellant.

10. The identity, status and residential proof of sureties will be verified by court concerned and in case of breach of any of the conditions mentioned above, court concerned will be at liberty to cancel the bail and send the appellant to prison.

11. Accordingly, the appeal succeeds and the same stands **allowed**.

12. The impugned order dated 09.09.2026 passed by the Additional District & Sessions Judge / Special Judge (SC/ST Act), Lalitpur of the aforesaid case is hereby set aside.

13. Pending application (s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

October 7, 2026
AS Rathore

(Samit Gopal,J.)

Digitally signed by :-
ABHISHEK SINGH RATHOR
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad