

# Rahul vs State Of U.P. And 3 Others on 4 February, 2025

**Author: Krishan Pahal**

**Bench: Krishan Pahal**

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

?Neutral Citation No. - 2025:AHC:15513

Court No. - 65

Case :- CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 43940 of 2024

Applicant :- Rahul

Opposite Party :- State Of U.P. And 3 Others

Counsel for Applicant :- Mahendra Kumar Yadav,Vinod Kumar Yadav

Counsel for Opposite Party :- G.A.

Hon'ble Krishan Pahal,J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Mahendra Kumar Yadav, learned counsel for the applicant and Ms. Ifrah Islam, learned State Law Officer and perused the record.
3. As informed by learned State Law Officer, notice to the informant has been served on 25.11.2024 but none is present on behalf of the informant even in the revised call.
4. Applicant seeks bail in Case Crime No. 454 of 2024, under Sections 64, 87, 137(2) of B.N.S. and Section 4(2) of the POCSO Act, Police Station Kotwali, District Mainpuri, during the pendency of trial.

## PROSECUTION STORY:

5. The FIR was instituted by the informant stating that her two daughters aged about 19 years (V1) and 15 years (V2) have been enticed away by the named accused person Aman on 08.07.2024 at about 8 p.m. ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT :

6. The applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has nothing to do with the said offence.

7. The FIR is delayed by about one day and there is no explanation of the said delay caused.

8. The applicant is not named in the FIR. His name has come up subsequently.

9. The first victim i.e. V1 had come back to the house of the informant and had informed her that she was taken away by one Akash not Aman who has been named in the FIR and in the statement, name of the applicant does not find mention.

10. Subsequently, the said victim i.e. V2 was retrieved and she had stated that she was taken away by Shanker and the applicant had subsequently married her and committed rape with her without her consent. She was also subjected to cruelty and was forced to cook meal.

11. It has come up in the statement that the victim (V2) was 15 years old but by her looks, she seems to be major, as she herself has stated that she was married to the applicant.

12. The consent is but evident from the FIR itself as it indicates that both the victims had gone with one Aman.

13. It is a clear cut case of false implication.

14. 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.

15. There is no criminal history of the applicant. The applicant is languishing in jail since 16.08.2024. The applicant is ready to cooperate with trial. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail.

## ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF STATE :

16. The bail application has been opposed but the submissions raised by the learned counsel for the applicant could not be disputed.

## CONCLUSION:

17. 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.

18. 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.

19. 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.

20. Reiterating the aforesaid view the Supreme Court in the case of Manish Sisodia Vs. Directorate of Enforcement 2024 INSC 595 has again emphasised 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".

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

22. 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.

23. 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.

24. Let the applicant-Rahul 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.

25. 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.

26. 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 Sumit S (Justice Krishan Pahal)