HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 37753 of 2026

Kareena Gautam

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite Party(s)

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

Court No. - 64

HON'BLE VIVEK VARMA, J.

1. Supplementary affidavit filed by counsel for the applicant is taken on record.

2. Counsel for the applicant prays for and is permitted to correct the police station in the prayer clause of the application.

3. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and Sri Neeraj Kumar Sharma, learned AGA for the State-opposite party. Perused the material available on record.

4. The present bail application has been filed with a prayer to enlarge the applicant on bail in Case Crime No. 301 of 2026, under Sections 318(4), 319(2), 111(2)II, 317(4), 115(2), 351(3), 352 of B.N.S., Police Station-Bardah, District Azamgarh, during the pendency of trial.

5. Counsel for the applicant contends that the applicant was not named in the first information report. On the basis of information furnished by an informer the applicant was arrested along with six co-accused and has been falsely implicated in the present case. False recovery of two sarees, a pant shirt cloth, ornaments of yellow metal and a box containing red vermilion has been shown. There is no independent witness to the alleged recovery. The recovered articles do not connect the applicant with the offence. Except the confession of the applicant in police custody, there is no corroborative evidence to link the applicant with the offence. The applicant is neither a member of any organized crime syndicate nor she acted on behalf of such syndicate. The applicant is a lady and is in jail since 11.9.2026 having no

criminal antecedents and in case she is enlarged on bail, she will not misuse the said liberty.

6. Learned AGA has opposed the prayer for bail but could not satisfactorily dispute the aforesaid submissions from the record.

7. Having heard counsel for the parties and having perused the record, this Court prima facie finds that the applicant was not named in the first information report. There is no independent witness to the alleged recovery. Except the confession of the applicant in police custody, there is no corroborative evidence to link the applicant with the offence. Moreover, the applicant is a lady having no criminal antecedents. She has remained confined for more than a month and there is no hope of early conclusion of trial, more so when no reasonable apprehension has been brought to the fore by the State that the applicant, if enlarged on bail, would either tamper with the evidence or delay the trial or intimidate the witness, without commenting on the merits of the case, I am of the opinion that the applicant is entitled to be enlarged on bail.

8. Let the applicant **Kareena Gautam**, involved in the aforesaid case be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned subject to the conditions that she:

(i) shall appear on the date fixed by the trial court;

(ii) shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence; and,

(iii) shall not pressurize the prosecution witnesses.

9. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move bail cancellation application before this Court.

October 24, 2026
Manish Kr

(Vivek Varma,J.)

Digitally signed by :-
MANISH KUMAR
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad