HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No. - 10921 of 2026

Ashok Kumar

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Krishna Kumar Shukla
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 71

HON'BLE VIVEK KUMAR SINGH, J.

1. Heard Sri Krishna Kumar Shukla, learned counsel for the applicant, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the record.

2. The present application has been moved seeking anticipatory bail in Case Crime no. 007 of 2016 under Sections 468, 471, 420 IPC, Police Station Mugalpura, District Moradabad with the prayer that in the event of arrest, the applicant may be released on bail.

3. It is contended by learned counsel for the applicant that applicant is not said to have obtained any benefit from the alleged forged documents and chargesheet in the case has already been submitted. It is also submitted that applicant was not aware about the proceedings of the case, therefore, he could not appear before the learned trial court and NBW have been issued against him on 06.10.2025. It is further submitted that identically situated co-accused Govind Singh has been granted anticipatory bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 19.01.2026 passed in NA Bail No. 330 of 2026. It is further submitted that applicant has no criminal history to his credit and he is ready and willing to co-operate during trial and he undertakes to appear as and when required by the investigating agency or Court and in case he is granted anticipatory bail, he shall not misuse the liberty of bail and would obey all conditions of bail.

4. On the other hand, learned A.G.A. opposed the prayer for grant of

anticipatory bail and submits that applicant has not been co-operating in the trial and NBW have been issued against him.

5. I have considered the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

6. As per the FIR, applicant along with other co-accused persons are said to have produced some forged documents in order to secure government job, however, on account of the said documents being found to be forged, no appointment letter was issued in favour of the applicant. Chargesheet in the case has already been submitted and the applicant is ready and willing to co-operate during trial.

7. It may be stated that in case of **Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra, (2011) 1 SCC 694**, it has been held by Hon'ble Supreme Court that while deciding anticipatory bail, the Court must consider nature and gravity of accusation, antecedents of the accused, possibility of accused to flee from justice and that Court must evaluate the entire available material against the accused carefully and the exact role of accused has also to be taken into consideration.

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

9. The anticipatory bail application is **allowed**.

10. In the event of arrest of the applicant **Ashok Kumar** involved in the aforesaid case crime, he shall be released on anticipatory bail on his furnishing a personal bond of Rs. 50,000/- with two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Court concerned, with the following conditions :-

(i) The applicant shall not tamper with evidence;

(ii) The applicant shall appear before the trial Court either in person or through counsel on each and every date fixed unless exempted by the Court concerned and shall not seek any undue adjournment;

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

(iv) The applicant would co-operate during trial and would not misuse the liberty of bail.

(v) The applicant shall not leave India without prior permission of the Court concerned.

11. In default of any of the conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to file appropriate application for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the applicant.

(Vivek Kumar Singh,J.)

November 2, 2026
A.P. Pandey

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