HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No. - 10829 of 2026

Dinesh Pratap Singh

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Gaurav Srivastav, Rajesh Kumar Srivastava

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

Court No. - 70

HON'BLE RAJIV LOCHAN SHUKLA, J.

1. Heard Learned counsel for the applicant, Learned A.G.A. for the State and Ravitendra Pratap Singh Chandel, who claims that he has instructions on behalf of the informant but has not filed his vakalatnama.

2. The present anticipatory bail application has been filed on behalf of the applicant in Case Crime No.31 of 2024 under Section 420, 409, 120B IPC, Police Station Hari Parwat, District Agra, 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 claims that the applicant is a retired clerk aged about sixty years. There is a dispute with respect to sale of a Fortuner car supposedly belonging to one Kajal Agarwal said to have been purchased by the co-accused Rishabh Gupta. The applicant was a clerk in the RTO, Hathras and is stated to have changed the mobile number of the owner and uploaded the same to the portal on the basis of fake documents to facilitate the transfer of the vehicle in favour of Rishabh Gupta without the knowledge of the actual owner. Learned counsel for the applicant has contended that all relevant documents as were required for the change of the mobile number of the owner of the vehicle were produced. The applicant is not part of any conspiracy and had only performed his official duties as required under the law. The applicant has no criminal antecedents.

4. Learned counsel for the informant and the Learned AGA have opposed the prayer for bail and have contended that the applicant being posted at Hathras facilitated the change of the mobile number of the owner of the vehicle to one Dheeraj, who received the OTP at the time of transfer in Hathras and the actual transfer of the vehicle was then recorded in Agra. This act clearly demonstrates the participation of the applicant in the crime in question. Learned counsel has further submitted that in the order rejecting the final report and taking cognizance of the case, the Learned Magistrate has discussed in detail the forgery committed by the accused persons and the manner in which the complainant was deceived.

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

6. The FIR has been lodged by one N.C. Sharma, Assistant Road Transport Officer, Agra. The final report had been submitted in this case, the same was rejected and cognizance was taken by the Magistrate on 30.03.2026. The FIR was lodged in the year 2024. The applicant was not arrested during investigation. He has no criminal antecedents. Till date there does not appear to be any departmental proceedings against the applicant. There appears to be a genuine dispute with respect to the ownership of the Fortuner vehicle between two parties. An FIR appears to have been lodged by Rishabh Gupta against Kajal Agarwal, the owner of the Fortuner vehicle. The applicant is not the ultimate beneficiary of the transfer of the vehicle in question.

7. Taking into account the facts and circumstances of the case, 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-**Dinesh Pratap Singh**, 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 24, 2026
A. Pandey

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