



UPBJ010044972026

**In the Court of Sunil Kumar Singh-III, Special Judge,S.C./S.T.(P.A.)
Act, Bijnor.**

Bail Application No-1620/2026

Rajneesh _____ Applicant/accused
(Detained in jail since 04-05-2026)
Versus
U.P. Govt. _____ Opposite Party.

Bail Application No-1783/2026

1-Pankaj Kumar _____ Applicant/accused
(Detained in jail since 07-05-2026)
2- Atar Singh _____ Applicant/accused
(Detained in jail since 04-05-2026)
Versus
U.P. Govt. _____ Opposite Party.

Bail Application No-1784/2026

Pushpendra Kumar _____ Applicant/accused
(Detained in jail since 04-05-2026)
Versus
U.P. Govt. _____ Opposite Party.

Bail Application No-1916/2026

Sanjay Kumar _____ Applicant/accused
(Detained in jail since 10-05-2026)
Versus
U.P. Govt. _____ Opposite Party.

Crime No.-149/2026
U/S-191(2),140(1),103(1), 3(5) BNS
& 3(2)5 S.C./S.T.(P.A.) Act
P.S.-Sheohara, Distt. Bijnor.

Dated:04-06-2026

Bail Applications

1. These are first bail applications moved on behalf of the aforesaid accused persons-applicants seeking their release on bail. Since all the four bail applications arise out of the same case crime number and are based on identical facts and circumstances, they are being decided by this common order.

Arguments

2. Learned counsel for the accused persons submitted that the accused persons are innocent and have been falsely implicated due to enmity. It is argued that no direct evidence is available against the accused persons and the prosecution story is based upon suspicion. It is further submitted that the accused persons have no criminal antecedents and are languishing in jail since their arrest. It is, therefore, prayed that the accused persons be enlarged on bail.

3. Per contra, learned SPP and the private counsel for the complainant opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that the allegations against the accused persons are grave and serious in nature. It is argued that there is sufficient material collected during investigation connecting the accused persons with the commission of the offence. Considering the seriousness of the allegations and the nature of evidence available on record, the accused persons do not deserve to be released on bail.

Heard

4. Heard learned counsel for the accused persons, learned SPP for the State, private counsel for the complainant and perused the record.

Brief Facts

5. As per the prosecution case, the informant alleged that his son Gulshan Kumar had solemnized a registered marriage with Deepa Kumari against the wishes of her family members. Due to the said marriage, the accused persons, namely Pankaj Kumar, Atar Singh, Rahul Saini, Arjun Singh and other unknown persons, were harbouring animosity towards Gulshan Kumar. It is further alleged that on the intervening night of 29/30.04.2026, Deepa Kumari called Gulshan Kumar and asked him to take her along. Thereafter, when Gulshan Kumar reached the village on a motorcycle, the accused persons intercepted, forcibly took Gulshan Kumar away and committed murder.

Postmortem Report

6. The postmortem examination report reveals that the deceased had sustained 12 ante-mortem injuries. The cause of death has been opined as **shock and haemorrhage as a result of ante-mortem injuries** sustained by the deceased.

Findings

7. Upon consideration of the rival submissions and the material available on record, this Court finds that the allegations against the accused persons pertaining to a heinous offence involving abduction and murder of a young man. The prosecution case discloses a motive arising out of the marriage of the deceased with Deepa Kumari. The FIR contains specific allegations against the named accused persons.

The postmortem report corroborates the prosecution case to the extent that the death was homicidal in nature and occurred due to shock and haemorrhage caused by ante-mortem injuries. At this stage, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, there appears to be sufficient prima facie material connecting the accused persons with the commission of the offence. It is also pertinent to note that the deceased belonged to the Scheduled Caste community. The allegations disclose that the accused persons, acting in concert, abducted and murdered the deceased. The offence alleged is not only grave in nature but also has serious social ramifications. The materials collected during investigation prima facie reveal the commission of a heinous offence against a member of the Scheduled Caste community. Considering the gravity and seriousness of the accusations, the nature of evidence collected during investigation, the severity of punishment prescribed for the offence alleged, and the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court does not find any good ground for grant of bail.

Order

Accordingly, bail application moved on behalf of the accused person namely **Rajneesh, Pankaj Kumar, Atar Singh, Pushpendra Kumar** and **Sanjay Kumar** are **rejected**. A copy of this order be placed on the records of bail application No-1783 of 2026, 1784 of 2026 and 1916 of 2026 connected with the present case.

Dated:04-06-2026

(Sunil Kumar Singh III)
Special Judge, S.C/S.T. (P.A.) Act,
Bijnor.
J.O. Code-U.P.-6076