HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 37903 of 2026

Bhupendra Singh

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite Party(s)

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

Court No. - 64

HON'BLE VIVEK VARMA, J.

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

2. The present bail application has been filed with the prayer to enlarge the applicant on bail in Case Crime No.174 of 2026, under Sections 85, 108, 115(2) B.N.S., Police Station- Achhnera, District- Agra, during the pendency of the trial.

3. Counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is the husband of the deceased and has been falsely implicated in the present case. As per the postmortem report, cause of death could not be ascertained. Viscera was preserved and sent for chemical and toxicological examination. Viscera report is not part of the case diary. Further, as per the allegations in the first information report, the statement of the witness, namely, Saurabh Singh and the material collected during the course of investigation, the essential ingredients to constitute the offence under Section 108 B.N.S. are not made out. Mere allegations of demand of dowry or harassment, in the absence of any positive act of instigation, intentional aid, or proximate conduct compelling the deceased to commit suicide, would not constitute the offence of abetment to suicide. In support of his submission, counsel for the applicant has placed reliance on the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of ***Nipun Aneja and others vs. State of Uttar Pradesh (Criminal Appeal No.654 of 2017) decided on 03.10.2024*** and ***Abhinav Mohan Delkar vs. The State of Maharashtra and others (Criminal Appeal Nos.2177-2185 of 2024***) ***decided on 18.08.2025***. The applicant is in jail since 11.8.2026 having no criminal antecedents and in case, he is enlarged on bail, he will not misuse the said liberty.

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

5. Having heard counsel for the parties and having perused the record this Court *prima facie* finds that as per the allegations in the first information report, the statement of the witness, namely, Saurabh Singh and the material collected during the course of investigation, the essential ingredients to constitute the offence under Section 108 B.N.S. are not made out. There is no proximate or direct act attributable to the applicant that could be construed as instigation, conspiracy or intentional aid to the commission of suicide. Moreover, the applicant has no criminal antecedents and has remained confined for more than two months 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 merits of the case, I am of the opinion that the applicant is entitled to be enlarged on bail.

6. Let the applicant **Bhupendra Singh**, involved in the aforesaid case crime be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned subject to the conditions that he:

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

(ii) shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence;

(iii) shall not pressurize the prosecution witnesses.

7. 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