



2025:AHC:181584

## HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

## CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No. - 8039 of 2025

Ramesh And 2 Others

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Saurabh Tripathi, Shashikant Mishra

Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A.

## **Court No. - 72**

## HON'BLE JITENDRA KUMAR SINHA, J.

- **1.** Heard Sri Saurabh Tripathi, learned counsel for the applicants and Sri O.P. Singh, learned A.G.A. appearing for the State respondents and perused the record.
- **2.** The present application has been moved seeking anticipatory bail in Case Crime No. 117 of 2024, under Sections 115(2), 351(2), 110, 117(2) B.N.S., Police Station Sardhuwa, District Chitrakoot with the prayer that in the event of arrest, applicants may be released on bail.
- 3. It is contended by the learned counsel for the applicants that applicants are innocent and they have an apprehension that they may be arrested in the above-mentioned case. He further submits that no offence is made out against the applicants as there are general and omnibus allegations against them and that they indulged in beating the first informant side as a result of which three persons, namely, Ram Karan, Mansi and Sulekha received injuries. It is submitted that none of the injuries are dangerous to life. It is further submitted that the applicants have no criminal history. It is also submitted that applicants undertake to cooperate during trial and they would appear as and when required by the investigating agency or Court. It is lastly submitted that in case applicants are granted anticipatory bail, they shall not misuse the liberty of bail and they will cooperate with the investigation and would obey all conditions of bail.
- **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 considered the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.
- **6.** As per first information report, the applicants indulged in assaulting the first informant side as a result of which Ram Karan, Mansi and Sulekha received injuries but none of the injuries of the injured are dangerous to life. The applicants are having no criminal history.
- 7. It may be stated that in case of <u>Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State</u> <u>of Maharashtra</u>, (2011) 1 SCC 694, it has been held by Hon'ble Supreme Court that while deciding anticipatory bail, the Court must consider nature and gravity of accusation, antecedent of accused, possibility of accused to flee from justice and that Court must evaluate entire available material against the accused carefully and that the exact role of the accused has also to be taken into consideration.
- **8.** Considering the settled principle of law regarding anticipatory bail, submissions of the learned counsel for the parties, nature of accusation, role of applicants and all attending facts and circumstances of the case, without expressing any opinion on merits, a case for anticipatory bail is made out.
- **9**. The anticipatory bail application is **allowed**.
- **10.** In the event of arrest of the applicants- Ramesh, Khunnu and Tejbali involved in the aforesaid case crime, they shall be released on anticipatory bail on their furnishing a personal bond of Rs. 50,000/- with two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Court concerned, with the following conditions:-
- (i) The applicants shall not tamper with evidence and that they would appear before the trial Court on the date fixed unless exempted by the Court concerned;
- (ii) The applicants 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/her/them from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any

NABAIL No. 8039 of 2025

3

police officer;

(iii) The applicants would cooperate during trial and would not misuse the liberty of bail.

(iv) The applicants shall not leave India without prior permission of the

Court concerned.

11. In default of any of the conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty

to file appropriate application for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted

to the applicants herein.

(Jitendra Kumar Sinha, J.)

October 13, 2025

Abhishek