2026:AHC:227285

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No. - 11421 of 2026

Smt. Saroj

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite Party(s)

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

Court No. - 71

HON'BLE VIVEK KUMAR SINGH, J.

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

2. The present application has been filed on behalf of the applicant- Smt. Saroj in Case Crime No.131 of 1996, under Sections 302, 201, 364-A of IPC, Police Station Mant, District Mathura, with a prayer to grant her anticipatory bail.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is absolutely innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case; he has nothing to do with the alleged offence in spite of that the police are trying to arrest the applicant. The applicant is an old lady about 74 years of age. The case was registered in the year 1996, however, the applicant was not nominated in the FIR. The case is based upon circumstantial evidence and the chargesheet was submitted on 19.04.2003. The proceedings were challenged by the applicant before this Court by way of filing an application under section 482 No.18943 of 2005. The proceedings were kept stayed by a Division Bench of this Court, however, the aforesaid 482 Cr.P.C. application was dismissed for want of prosecution vide order dated 08.05.2019. No recall/restoration application was filed by the applicant since she was not informed by her counsel regarding dismissal of the aforesaid 482 application. The learned court concerned had issued non-bailable warrant against the applicant and the police knocked the door of the applicant. The applicant as soon as came to

know about the dismissal of the 482 application, she filed an anticipatory bail application before the court concerned, which was rejected by the learned court concerned vide order dated 01.05.2026. It is further submitted that identically situated co-accused Tejpal has been acquitted by the learned trial court vide judgment and order dated 15.10.2009 in S.T. No.440 of 2002. It is further submitted that since the investigation is over in this matter and chargesheet has already been submitted a long way back on 19.04.2003, therefore, no useful purpose would be served by sending the applicant behind the bar. There is no requirement of custodial interrogation of the applicant in this 30 years old case. The applicant has no criminal antecedent to her credit. Learned counsel for the applicant lastly contended that the applicant undertakes to cooperate during trial and shall appear as and when required by the court concerned. It has also been stated that, in case the applicant is granted anticipatory bail, she shall not misuse the liberty of bail, shall cooperate with the trial, and shall abide by all the conditions that may be imposed by the court.

4. On the other hand, learned A.G.A. has opposed the application for anticipatory bail, however, he does not dispute the factual aspect.

5. I have heard rival submissions of the learned counsel for the parties and perused the records.

6. The chargesheet has already been submitted in this case and there is no allegation against the applicant that she did not cooperate with the investigation. There is no requirement of custodial interrogation of the applicant.

7. In **Aman Preet Singh v. CBI, (2022) 13 SCC 764,** the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that :

> *"11. A reading of the aforesaid shows that it is the guiding principle for a Magistrate while exercising powers under Section 170CrPC which had been set out. The Magistrate or the Court empowered to take cognizance or try the accused has to accept the charge-sheet forthwith and proceed in accordance with the procedure laid down under Section 173CrPC. It has been rightly observed that in such a case the*

Magistrate or the Court is required to invariably issue a process of summons and not warrant of arrest. In case he seeks to exercise the discretion of issuing warrants of arrest, he is required to record the reasons as contemplated under Section 87 Cr.P.C that the accused has either been absconding or shall not obey the summons or has refused to appear despite proof of due service of summons upon him. In fact the observations in sub-para (iii) above by the High Court are in the nature of caution.

12. In sofar as the present case is concerned and the general principles under Section 170Cr.P.C, the most apposite observations are in sub-para (v) of the High Court judgment in the context of an accused in a non-bailable offence whose custody was not required during the period of investigation. In such a scenario, it is appropriate that the accused is released on bail as the circumstances of his having not been arrested during investigation or not being produced in custody are itself sufficient to entitle him to be released on bail. The rationale has been succinctly set out that if a person has been enlarged and free for many years and has not even been arrested during investigation, to suddenly direct his arrest and to be incarcerated merely because charge-sheet has been filed would be contrary to the governing principles for grant of bail. We could not agree more with this."

8. Hence, considering the settled principles of law regarding anticipatory bail, submissions of the learned counsel for the parties, nature of accusation, role of applicant and all attending facts and circumstances of the case, without expressing any opinion of the merits of the case, in my view, it is a fit case for anticipatory bail to the applicant till conclusion of trial in the matter.

9. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is **allowed** with following directions:-

(i) In the event of arrest of the applicant- **Smt. Saroj,** involved in

aforesaid case shall be released on anticipatory bail till the conclusion of trial, on her furnishing a personal bond of Rs.50,000/- with two sureties each of the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned;

(ii) The applicant shall co-operate during trial and shall report to the court concerned as and when required for the purpose of fair trial.

(iii) 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; and

(iv) The applicant shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court.

10. In default or misuse of any of the conditions, the Public Prosecutor/ Investigating Officer/ first informant-complainant is at liberty to file appropriate application for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the applicant, before the concerned court.

(Vivek Kumar Singh,J.)

November 2, 2026
Nitendra

Digitally signed by :-
NITENDRA TIWARI
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad