HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No. - 10578 of 2026

Raju Yadav

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Opposite Party(s)

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

Court No. - 71

HON'BLE VIVEK KUMAR SINGH, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, learned A.G.A for the State and perused the record.

2. The present application has been filed on behalf of the applicant in Case Crime No.106 of 2025, under Sections 115(2), 352, 351(3), 140(1), 192(2) B.N.S., Police Station - Rasra, District Ballia, with a prayer to grant him anticipatory bail.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is absolutely innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has nothing to do with the alleged offence in spite of that the police are trying to arrest him. It is further contended that the applicant is not nominated in the FIR dated 13.03.2025, which was lodged against co-accused Prince Singh, Samrat Singh, Dhannu Singh, and Raj Nishad. No one was nominated as an unknown accused. When the statement of the informant/ victim was recorded, he did not take the name of any fifth person as an accused. After a long time, on 01.07.2025, an application was moved by the informant, and he alleged that apart from the four nominated co-accused, five other persons had also participated in the offence. He took the name of the applicant in the application dated 01.07.2025. It is the admitted case of the prosecution that the victim was left at the spot and he was not taken away by the named accused persons. The criminal antecedents of eight cases have been explained in paragraph no. 20 of the affidavit. It is further submitted that no offence under Section 140(1) of the B.N.S. is made out against the applicant since the victim was not taken away by the nominated accused persons. The

naming of the applicant is an afterthought and was done with due consultation. Learned counsel for the applicant further submits that the applicant undertakes to cooperate during investigation and trial and shall appear as and when required by the Investigating Agency or the Court concerned. It has also been stated that, in case the applicant is granted anticipatory bail, he shall not misuse the liberty of bail, shall cooperate with the investigation, and shall abide by all the conditions that may be imposed by the Court.

4. On the other hand, learned A.G.A. has opposed the application for anticipatory bail, however, he does not dispute the factual aspect.

5. I have heard the rival submissions of both sides and perused the record.

6. In **Sushila Aggarwal and others vs. State (NCT of Delhi) and another, (2020) 5 SCC 1**, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that while considering an application for grant of anticipatory bail, the court has to consider the nature of the offence, the role of the person, the likelihood of his influencing the course of investigation, or tampering with evidence including intimidating witnesses, likelihood of fleeing justice, such as leaving the country, etc. It has further been held that Courts ought to be generally guided by considerations such as the nature and gravity of the offences, the role attributed to the applicant, and the facts of the case, while considering whether to grant anticipatory bail, or refuse it. Whether to grant or not is a matter of discretion.

7. In **Siddharth Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Another, (2022) 1 Supreme Court Cases 676**, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that personal liberty is an important aspect of our constitutional mandate. The occasion to arrest an accused during investigation arises when custodial investigation becomes necessary or it is a heinous crime or where there is a possibility of influencing the witnesses or accused may abscond. Merely because an arrest can be made because it is lawful does not mandate that arrest must be made. A distinction must be made between the existence of the power to arrest and the justification for exercise of it. If arrest is made routine, it can cause incalculable harm to the reputation and self-esteem of

a person. If the Investigating Officer has no reason to believe that the accused will abscond or disobey summons and has, in fact, throughout cooperated with the investigation, then there is no compulsion on the officer to arrest the accused.

8. Considering the settled principle of law regarding anticipatory bail, submissions of the learned counsel for the parties, nature of accusation, role of applicant and all attending facts and circumstances of the case, without expressing any opinion on merits, a case for anticipatory bail is made out.

9. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is **allowed** with following directions:-

(i) In the event of arrest of the applicant- **Raju Yadav**, involved in the aforesaid case, he shall be released on anticipatory bail till the conclusion of trial, on his furnishing a personal bond of Rs.50,000/- with two sureties each of the like amount to the satisfaction of the Station House Officer of the police station concerned or the court concerned.

(ii) The applicant shall co-operate with the Investigating Officer during investigation and shall report to the Investigating Officer as and when required for the purpose of conducting investigation;

(iii) 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 her/him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer; and

(iv) The applicant shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court.

10. In default or misuse of any of the conditions, the Public Prosecutor/ Investigating Officer/ first informant-complainant is at liberty to file appropriate application for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the applicant, before the concerned court.

(Vivek Kumar Singh,J.)

October 24, 2026
Radhika

Digitally signed by :-
RADHIKA VISHWAKARMA
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad