HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

APPLICATION U/S 528 BNSS No. - 48441 of 2026

Vinod Rathod

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite Party(s)

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

Court No. - 73

HON'BLE DR. GAUTAM CHOWDHARY, J.

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

2. The present application has been filed to direct the Trial Court/Court concerned to consider and accept the personal bond and two sureties in one criminal case treating the same for all the five cases criminal cases, details of which are given below:-

A. Case Crime No. 278 of 2025, under Section 109 of B.N.S., and Section 3/25/27 Arms Act, Police Station Chhata, District Mathura.

B. Case Crime No. 475 of 2025, under Sections 331(4), 305 of B.N.S., Police Station Highway, District Mathura.

C. Case Crime No. 271 of 2025, under Sections 111(2)(a), 310(3), 317(3) of B.N.S., Police Station Chhata, District Mathura.

D. Case Crime No. 592 of 2025, under Section 2/3 of U.P.Gangsters Act, Police Station Chhata, District Mathura.

E. Case Crime No. 436 of 2025, under Section 2/3 of U.P.Gangsters Act, Police Station Tajganj, District Agra.

3. Learned counsel for applicant contends that applicant is unable to arrange 10 sureties. Consequently, in spite of the fact that applicant has already been released on bail in all five criminal cases pending against him, the applicant has yet not been released from jail, as applicant has failed to furnish separate surety bonds in all the cases. In the facts and circumstances of the case, it is thus urged that applicant be directed to furnish a common personal bond and common surety bonds of like amount in all the cases. He therefore contends that appropriate direction be issued to the concerned trial Court.

4. He has then referred to Sections- 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490 of B.N.S.S. (hereinafter to be referred as BNSS) and on basis thereof contents that under the scheme of BNSS (hereinafter referred to as "the BNSS") there is no mandatory requirement of furnishing separate personal bonds as well as surety bonds for seeking enlargement on bail in different case crime numbers.

5. On the aforesaid factual and legal premise, learned counsel for applicant contends that such conditions which commensurate with the facts and circumstances of present case, are liable to be imposed, so that applicant who has been granted bail in all cases pending against him is ultimately bailed out.

6. Reference has also been made to the orders passed by Supreme Court dated 29.10.2018 in Hani Nishad @ Mohammad Imran @ Vikky Vs. State of U.P. and 09.08.2021 in Ramwati Awasthi & Others Vs. State of U.P. and Others. He has also referred to orders passed by this Court dated 15.03.2019 in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No.11380 of 2019, (Rizwan alias Atta Vs. State of U.P.), reported in 2019 (107) ACC 894 and 21.11.2019 in Criminal Misc. Application (under Section 482 Cr.P.C.) No.40957 of 2019, (Mobin Vs. State of U.P.), wherein Court has been modified the conditions of bail by providing that the personal bond and two sureties furnished by applicant, be accepted in all the cases pending against applicant.

7. On the aforesaid factual and legal premise, it is urged that present application be allowed and two sureties furnished by

applicant in one case crime number be accepted as sureties in all the cases.

8. Per contra, learned A.G.A. has opposed this application, but could not dispute the orders relied upon by learned counsel for applicant.

9. In view of above, present application succeeds and is liable to be allowed.

10. It is accordingly, provided that application shall be allowed to execute one personal bond and two sureties to the satisfaction of court concerned which shall hold in all five cases pending against present applicant.

(Dr. Gautam Chowdhary,J.)

November 2, 2026
S.Ali

Digitally signed by :-
SHAUKAT ALI
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad