HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No. - 10814 of 2026

Siddharth Hazara

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Ishan Deo Giri, Prateek Kumar Srivastava, Raj Singh

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

Court No. - 70

HON'BLE RAJIV LOCHAN SHUKLA, J.

1. Learned counsel for the applicant is permitted to amend the prayer clause of the anticipatory bail application during course of the day.

2. Heard Learned counsel for the applicant; and Learned A.G.A. for the State.

3. The present anticipatory bail application has been filed on behalf of the applicant in Case Crime No.204 of 2023, under Sections 34, 409, 419, 420, 467, 468 and 471 of the I.P.C., Police Station – Kopaganj, District Mau, with a prayer to enlarge him on anticipatory bail, as the applicant apprehends his arrest in the aforesaid case.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant has contended that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. The applicant was the Deputy General Manager of Biecco Lawrie Limited, Kolkata. The dispute in question arises out of a tender. A tender contract was awarded to the company in the year 2013. Learned counsel has further submitted that only the co-accused Atul Pachori had been nominated in the FIR as an accused. The applicant has since retired. He is an old man aged about 62 years. The Co-accused Sachin Kumar Singh has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court in NABAIL No. 9303 of 2026. Learned counsel has further submitted that the applicant has no previous criminal case to his credit except one another case arising from the same contractual dispute lodged after 3 days of the present FIR, being Case Crime No. 356 of 2023, in which the applicant is also sought to be falsely implicated.

5. Learned A.G.A. has opposed the prayer for bail and has contended that remaining scrap after execution of the tender, amounting to Rs. 2,79,31,237.80, was misappropriated by the accused. The FIR makes out a cognizable offence punishable with maximum imprisonment of life in the event of a conviction. No indulgence may be granted to the applicant. The Learned A.G.A. has further pointed out that it was the applicant who had forged security bonds, which were put up as guarantee for the tender amount. Learned A.G.A., however, does not dispute the explanation given by Learned counsel for the applicant with respect to his criminal antecedents nor the fact that co-accused Sachin Kumar Singh, who was the Site Engineer, has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court.

6. I have considered the submissions made by the Learned counsel for the parties.

7. The applicant is an old man aged about 62 years. The tender in question was awarded in the year 2013. The FIR came to be lodged in the year 2023. Co-accused Sachin Kumar Singh has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court. The applicant was not named in the FIR. The investigation is still pending and in the prima facie opinion of the Court, the applicant is not required for any custodial interrogation or recoveries.

8. Taking note of the entire facts and circumstances of the case, as also the fact that co-accused Sachin Kumar Singh has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court, I deem it appropriate to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant.

9. The anticipatory bail application of the applicant is **allowed**.

10. In the event of the arrest of the applicant- **Siddharth Hazara,** involved in the aforesaid case crime, he shall be released on anticipatory bail, on his furnishing a personal bond and surety in the like amount 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. 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. The applicant shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

iv. The applicant shall not pressurize/intimidate the prosecution witness;

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

12. 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
Kushal

Digitally signed by :-
KUSHAL AGRAWAL
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad