2026:AHC:226899

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 38094 of 2026

Ranvir Singh

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Pankaj Bharti
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A., Sunil Kumar Pathak

Court No. - 65

HON'BLE SAMEER JAIN, J.

1. Heard Sri Pankaj Bharti, learned counsel for the applicant; Sri Sunil Kumar Pathak, learned counsel for the informant and Dr. S. B. Maurya, learned AGA for the State-respondent.

2. The instant application has been filed seeking release of the applicant on bail in Case Crime No. 158 of 2026, under Sections 352, 103(1) BNS, Police Station Bhopa, District Muzaffarnagar, during pendency of the trial in the court below.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that FIR of the present case was lodged against the applicant and one another on 11.6.2026 at 16:10 hours and according to the FIR on 11.6.2026 at about 10 am in the morning when father of the informant was near the house of the applicant then applicant and other accused beaten him through wooden sticks but entire allegations levelled against the applicant are totally false.

4. He further submitted that it reflects, the another son of the deceased had taken the deceased to the hospital on 11.6.2026 at 14:50 hours where he was declared dead and therefore, it reflects, deceased was taken to the hospital even before lodgement of the FIR of the present case and therefore, story narrated in the FIR, prima facie, appears to be doubtful.

5. He further submitted that there is no eye witness account and after the FIR when Investigating Officer recorded the statement of the applicant then he confessed his guilt and narrated the incident and thereafter when statements of other witnesses were recorded then they also started repeating the version

of the applicant though they were not the eye witness. He next submits, according to the prosecution in his statement applicant stated that incident occurred in his house and similar statement in photographic manner have been given by other witnesses and therefore, prima facie, their statements appear to be doubtful. He next submits, it was not possible for any witness to give photographic description of the incident allegedly occurred inside the house of the applicant.

6. He further submitted that actually nobody could see the real incident and as there was enmity between applicant and informant therefore informant lodged the FIR of the present case.

7. He further submitted that however as per the prosecution when applicant was arrested then on his pointing out one wooden stick was recovered but alleged recovery is false and planted one and even the alleged recovery was made from an open place which was accessible to all.

8. He further submitted that applicant is having no previous criminal history and he is in jail in the present matter since 12.6.2026 i.e. for last more than four and half months.

9. Per contra, learned AGA as well as learned counsel for the informant opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that apart from the statement of the applicant recorded by the Investigating Officer there are several witnesses who reiterated his statement but could not dispute the fact that according to these witnesses incident occurred inside the house of the applicant and inspite of that they gave photographic description and none of the witnesses stated that either he witnessed the deceased while he was entering in the house of the applicant.

10. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case.

11. However applicant is named in the FIR and even from the statements of witnesses it reflects, they stated that he inside his house made assault upon the deceased due to which he sustained injuries but from their statements it could not be reflected, they were the eye witnesses. Considering the fact that before the statements of above witnesses Investigating Officer had recorded the statement of applicant and in his statement he confessed that when deceased was inside his house then he made assault upon him and similar

statements have been given by above witnesses their statements prima facie appear to be doubtful.

12. Further, even it reflects, before lodgement of the FIR another son of the deceased has taken the deceased to the hospital where he was declared dead. Considering this fact the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the applicant that this fact casts serious doubt on the story narrated in the FIR cannot be ruled out, at this stage.

13. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, prima facie, it could not be reflected that nobody could see the real incident.

14. Further, however according to the prosecution on the pointing out of the applicant one wooden stick was also recovered but alleged recovery has been made from an open place which was accessible to all.

15. Further, applicant is having no previous criminal history and he is in jail in the present matter since 12.6.2026 i.e. for last more than four and half months.

16. Therefore, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, discussed above, in my view, applicant is entitled to be released on bail.

17. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant bail application is **allowed**.

18. Let the applicant-**Ranvir Singh,** be released on bail in the aforesaid case on furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned with the following conditions:-

(i) The applicant shall appear before the trial court on the dates fixed, unless his personal presence is exempted.

(ii) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly, make 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 any police officer or tamper with the evidence.

(iii) The applicant shall not indulge in any criminal and anti-social activity.

19. In case of breach of any of the above condition, the prosecution will be at liberty to move an application before this Court for cancellation of the

bail of the applicant.

20. It is clarified that the observations made herein are limited to the facts brought in by the parties pertaining to the disposal of bail application and the said observations shall have no bearing on the merits of the case during trial.

November 2, 2026
Ankita

(Sameer Jain,J.)

Digitally signed by :-
ANKITA SRIVASTAVA
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad