

# **Fareed Ahmad vs State Of U.P. on 4 February, 2025**

**Author: Krishan Pahal**

**Bench: Krishan Pahal**

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

?Neutral Citation No. - 2025:AHC:14991

Court No. - 65

Case :- CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 39333 of 2024

Applicant :- Fareed Ahmad

Opposite Party :- State of U.P.

Counsel for Applicant :- Umair Mahmood

Counsel for Opposite Party :- G.A.

Hon'ble Krishan Pahal,J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard learned counsel for the applicant as well as Ms. Ifrah Islam, learned State Law Officer and perused the material placed on record.
3. Applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No. 233 of 2024, U/S 69, 127(2), 351(2), 351(3) BNS, Police Station Haldaur, District Bijnor, during the pendency of trial.

**PROSECUTION STORY:**

4. On 17.7.2024, the applicant is stated to have established corporeal relationship with the victim on the false promise of marriage (nikah).

**ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT:**

5. The applicant is absolutely innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case with a view to cause unnecessary harassment and to victimize him. He has nothing to do with the said offence.

6. The FIR is delayed by twenty days and there is no explanation of the said delay caused.

7. It is a clear cut case of consensual relationship. The victim is major aged about 28 years. The applicant is also of the same age.

8. Several other submissions have been made on behalf of the applicant to demonstrate the falsity of the allegations made against him. The circumstances which, as per counsel, led to the false implication of the applicant have also been touched upon at length.

9. There is no criminal history of the applicant. The applicant is languishing in jail since 19.8.2024. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.

**ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF INFORMANT/STATE:**

10. The bail application has been opposed but the fact that there is no criminal history of the applicant has not been disputed.

**CONCLUSION:**

11. In the case of Pramod Suryabhan Pawar vs. State of Maharashtra and Another reported in 2019 (9) SCC 608 and Ansaar Mohammad vs. State of Rajasthan and Another, reported in 2022 SCC OnLine SC 886, it has been stated that entering into any kind of corporeal relationship with a person on the pretext of getting marriage cannot be termed as rape.

12. In light of the judgement of the Supreme Court passed in Niranjana Singh and another vs. Prabhakar Rajaram Kharote and others AIR 1980 SC 785 this Court has avoided detailed examination of the evidence and elaborate documentation of the merits of the case as no party should have the impression that his case has been prejudiced. A prima facie satisfaction of case is needed but it is not the same as an exhaustive exploration of the merits in the order itself.

13. The well-known principle of "Presumption of Innocence Unless Proven Guilty," gives rise to the concept of bail as a rule and imprisonment as an exception.

14. A person's right to life and liberty, guaranteed by Article 21 of the Indian Constitution, cannot be taken away simply because the person is accused of committing an offence until the guilt is

established beyond a reasonable doubt. Article 21 of the Indian Constitution states that no one's life or personal liberty may be taken away unless the procedure established by law is followed, and the procedure must be just and reasonable. The said principle has been recapitulated by the Supreme Court in *Satender Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and Ors.*, 2022 INSC 690.

15. Reiterating the aforesaid view the Supreme Court in the case of *Manish Sisodia Vs. Directorate of Enforcement* 2024 INSC 595 has again emphasized that the very well-settled principle of law that bail is not to be withheld as a punishment is not to be forgotten. It is high time that the Courts should recognize the principle that ?bail is a rule and jail is an exception?.

16. Learned State Law Officer could not bring forth any exceptional circumstances which would warrant denial of bail to the applicant.

17. It is settled principle of law that the object of bail is to secure the attendance of the accused at the trial. No material particulars or circumstances suggestive of the applicant fleeing from justice or thwarting the course of justice or creating other troubles in the shape of repeating offences or intimidating witnesses and the like have been shown by learned State Law Officer.

18. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, the evidence on record, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the Court is of the view that the applicant has made out a case for bail. The bail application is allowed.

19. Let the applicant- Fareed Ahmad involved in aforementioned case crime number be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned subject to following conditions.

(i) The applicant shall not tamper with evidence.

(ii) The applicant shall remain present, in person, before the Trial Court on dates fixed for (1) opening of the case, (2) framing of charge and (3) recording of statement under Section 313 Cr.P.C./351 B.N.S.S. If in the opinion of the Trial Court absence of the applicant is deliberate or without sufficient cause, then it shall be open for the Trial Court to treat such default as abuse of liberty of bail and proceed against him in accordance with law.

20. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, it shall be a ground for cancellation of bail. Identity, status and residence proof of the applicant and sureties be verified by the court concerned before the bonds are accepted.

21. It is made clear that observations made in granting bail to the applicant shall not in any way affect the learned trial Judge in forming his independent opinion based on the testimony of the witnesses.

Order Date :- 4.2.2025 Shalini (Justice Krishan Pahal)