HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No. - 11107 of 2026

Manoj Saini

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Ajay Kumar Mishra
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 70

HON'BLE RAJIV LOCHAN SHUKLA, J.

1. Heard, Learned counsel for the applicant, the Learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the record.

2. The present anticipatory bail application has been filed on behalf of the applicant in Case Crime No.20 of 2026, under Sections 308(6) BNS, Police Station- Rajpura, District Sambhal, with a prayer to enlarge him on anticipatory bail as the applicant apprehends his arrest in the above-mentioned case.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant has contended that the applicant is not named in the F.I.R. The F.I.R. has been lodged against Sheila, who was allegedly extorting money from the husband of the informant.

4. Learned counsel has further contended that in fact, Sheila had lodged an F.I.R. against the husband of the informant on 24.10.2025, which was registered as Case Crime No. 300 of 2025, under Sections 69, 351(2), 324(4) and 325(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, at Police Station Rajpura, District Sambhal. As a counterblast to the said case, the informant has lodged the present F.I.R. against Sheila. The name of the applicant surfaced during the course of investigation in the second statement of the informant, which was recorded on 24.03.2026.

5. Learned counsel has further submitted that the co-accused, Sheila has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court in NA BAIL No. 4645 of 2026. The case of the applicant stands on a similar footing to that of the

co-accused, Sheila. The applicant has a criminal history of three other cases. However, none of the said cases, in the event of conviction, entails imprisonment more than seven years and the applicant is not a previous convict.

6. Learned A.G.A. has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and contended that name of the applicant has surfaced during the investigation. The applicant is a repeat offender, having three other criminal cases registered against him, he may not be entitled for grant of anticipatory bail.

7. Learned A.G.A. does not dispute the explanation given by learned counsel for the applicant with respect to his criminal antecedents.

8. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

9. The applicant is not named in the F.I.R. His name has surfaced in the second statement of the informant. The co-accused Sheila, had lodged an F.I.R. against the husband of the informant.

10. In the prima facie opinion of the Court, the present case appears to be a counterblast to the case registered by the co-accused, Sheila. The co-accused, Sheila, has already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court.

11. Taking into account all the facts and circumstances of the case and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I deem it fit to enlarge the applicant on anticipatory bail.

12. In view of the above, the anticipatory bail application of the applicant is allowed.

13. In the event of the arrest of the applicant **Manoj Saini**, he shall be released forthwith in the aforesaid case crime on anticipatory bail on furnishing a personal bond and surety each 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. 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;

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

15. 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
S.A.

Digitally signed by :-
SALMAN AHMAD
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad