



IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, PRAYAGRAJ
Present: Satya Prakash Tripathi(H.J.S.)
Anticipatory Bail Application No.– 2466 of 2026

Mohd. Shaheed @ Baba aged about 54 years, s/o **Mohd. Hassan**, R/o – Village Malethua Jalalpur, P.S. – Phoolpur, District– Prayagraj.

... Accused /Applicant

Versus

State of U.P.

... Prosecution/Opposite party

Case crime no. 455 of 2026
U/s– 140, 103(1), 61(2)(A),
3(5) & 137(2) B.N.S.

Diposal of Anticipatory Bail Application

Dated : 15.07.2026

1. This Anticipatory Bail Application has been filed by the learned counsel on behalf of the applicant/accused Mohd. Shaheed @ Baba with a prayer to enlarge him on anticipatory bail in Case Crime no. 455 of 2025, u/s 140, 103(1), 61(2)A, 3(5) & 137(2) B.N.S, P.S.– Phoolpur, District– Prayagraj. In support of this anticipatory bail application, affidavit has been filed by the applicant/accused.

2. I have heard the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the applicant/accused. I have also heard learned D.G.C.(Crl.) on behalf of State and perused the prosecution records.

3. In the anticipatory bail application, it has been averred that the applicant/accused is quite innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. The co–accused persons have already been released on bail. The applicant/accused has been implicated in this case in a counterblast as a case in case crime no. 0028 of 2025 u/s 316(2), 351(2), 115(2) 85 B.N.S. & 4/3 D.P. Act has been filed against the family of the complainant. The statements recorded by the witness are false and fabricated. The applicant/accused does not have any prior criminal history.

4. The Ld. Counsel for the accused/applicant has reiterated the contents of bail application and argued before the court that the applicant/accused was not present on the spot at the time of the incident. He is not named in the F.I.R. Further, contradictory statements have been recorded in the case diary. Also, the applicant/accused takes care of the donation of the mosque and the main dispute is regarding that only. No any solid evidence is available corroborating the involvement of the applicant/accused in the said crime. Hence, it has been prayed that accused/applicant be released on bail.

5. Per contra, the learned D.G.C (Criminal) on behalf of the State vehemently opposed the said anticipatory bail application and argued that applicant/accused is not entitled for bail as the applicant/accused has an

active role in the commission of the murder. The name of the accused/applicant came into light during investigation. There are sufficient evidence available on record corroborating the involvement of the accused/applicant. Hence, it has been prayed that the anticipatory bail application of the applicant/accused be dismissed.

6. As per the F.I.R. version, the first informant Smt. Aashiya w/o Parvez Alam has lodged the F.I.R. on 14.10.2025 at about 23:36 hours at the P.S. Phoolpur and complained that her son Hasnain Alam s/o Parvez Alam had been missing. She had searched a lot for him, but to no avail. She got some information regarding the fact that Mohd. Junaid s/o Saeed Baba and Mohd. Salman s/o Mohd. Rashid, residents of Malethua, Sandalpur had taken her son to some unknown place.

7. I have perused the F.I.R., case diary, charge-sheet, report from the P.S. concerned, postmortem report, and other relevant papers etc. During the investigation, it is revealed that some eye-witness had seen the first informant's son being taken away by the named accused Mohd. Shaheed @ Baba and Junaid on the motorcycle, whereas the other co-accused Mohd. Sahil, Mohd. Suhail and Mohd. Salman followed them on another motorcycle. Later on, the dead body of Hasnain was found beside Gulchapa Nahar on 15.10.2025. Further, the fact was revealed that the above named five accused had killed the first informant's son Hasnain in furtherance of their common intention owing to old enmity. The Postmortem report of the deceased discloses that the cause of death is Hemorrhage Shock due to ante mortem injuries found on different parts of the body including head, face and forehead. In the Inquest Report, the Panchan witnesses had seen serious and severe injuries sustained by deceased upon his head and face. It infers that the crime was committed by several persons and therefore the participation of the accused/applicant in the said crime appears prominent at this stage. This case is of very serious nature. No sufficient, substantive or cogent grounds are available for granting the bail. Therefore, this anticipatory bail application is liable to be rejected.

ORDER

This anticipatory bail application of the applicant/accused **Mohd. Shaheed @ Baba s/o Mohd. Hassan** is hereby rejected.

Dated: 15.07.2026

(Satya Prakash Tripathi)
Sessions Judge
Prayagraj.
J.O. Code – UP 5687