



UPLK010071212026

COURT OF THE SESSIONS JUDGE, LUCKNOW.

PRESIDING OFFICER : MALKHAN SINGH, H.J.S.

BAIL APPLICATION (U/S 483 B.N.S.S.) NUMBER : 3399/2026.

Abhishek Singh @ Anand Singh, S/O Narendra Pratap Singh, R/O Paitepur, Shankarpur, PS Chawni, District Basti.

.....ACCUSED/APPLICANT.

VERSUS

State of Uttar Pradesh.

.....PROSECUTION.

Case Crime Number: 0118/2026.

U/S: 115(2), 351(3), 69 BNS.

P.S.: PGI, Lucknow.

11.06.2026

This application, praying for bail under Section 483 BNSS, supported with affidavit, has been moved on behalf of the applicant **Abhishek Singh @ Anand Singh** in Case Crime Number and Sections aforementioned.

In a nutshell, Prosecution Case is that informant/prosecutrix has alleged that she befriended Abhishek Singh through Facebook and they started talking to each other. He induced her on the pretext of marriage and better future and on 28/29.04.2025, he took her to Hotel Shubham where they had snacks and thereafter on 02.05.2025, he again took her to same hotel and forcefully raped her and made natural and unnatural relations with her and secretly recorded a video and on the strength of said video, he took her to said hotel several times i.e. on 05 May, 20 May, 05 June, 20 June, 15 July, 28 July, 29 December, 30 December and made physical relations forcefully. On 08 August, he called her at room of his cousin and raped her. She became pregnant twice and he forcefully got her pregnancy aborted. He engaged into fight on marriage talks.

Heard learned counsel for applicant, learned private counsel for informant/prosecutrix as well as learned A.D.G.C (CrI.) for State and perused material available on record.

Learned counsel for the applicant has submitted that the applicant is innocent, he has not committed any offence and he has been falsely implicated in this case. Admittedly, applicant and informant became friends through Facebook and applicant had arranged meeting of informant with his family and applicant's family became ready for marriage, however, thereafter, applicant came to know about relations of informant with another guy namely Pradeep Kumar Dubey and when applicant confronted the informant, she got agitated and got lodged this FIR. During investigation, no evidence of abortion was found and as such, Section 89 BNS was removed from this case. Furthermore, case in hand pertains to Section 69 BNS and not Section 64 BNS. Applicant and informant were in consensual relations. Applicant has no previous criminal history. Applicant is in jail since 18.05.2026.

Learned A.D.G.C. (Criminal) and learned private counsel for informant have opposed the bail application and submitted that applicant made physical relations with the prosecutrix on the pretext of marriage and recorded a video and

thereafter, on the strength of said video, applicant blackmailed the victim and made physical relations repeatedly and thereafter, refused to perform marriage with her. Prosecutrix has supported the prosecution version in her statements under Section 180 and 183 BNSS.

Allegations against the applicant are of making physical relations with the informant under false promise of marriage and after allegedly recording a video of her in compromised state, he blackmailed her and forced himself upon her several times. Perusal of case-diary reveals that Section 89 BNS was removed during investigation for want of evidence. During investigation, Investigating Officer visited the alleged place of occurrence i.e. Hotel Oyo Shubham and spoke to the Hotel Manager namely Ram Singh, who apprised the Investigating Officer that he has no information of stay of applicant and victim at the said hotel. Learned counsel for the applicant has vehemently argued that applicant and victim were in consensual relations and applicant was ready to perform marriage with the victim and he also made her meet his parents, however, after knowing about her relations with another man Pradeep Dubey, applicant restrained from persuading the informant. Learned counsel for applicant has annexed photographs of victim with said person Pradeep Dubey as well as some photographs of victim with the applicant and his family members. Upon specific query of the Court with regard to any video recording of informant allegedly made by the applicant, learned ADGC (Crl.) has apprised the court that no video recording has been recovered from the applicant despite the fact that applicant is already in custody from about more than 20 days. Thus, there is no video recording available on case-diary to substantiate the allegations levelled against the applicant. The allegations in itself suggest multiple meetings between applicant and victim and in the absence of any video, the relations *prima facie* appear to be consensual. Applicant is in jail since 18.05.2026. No previous criminal history of applicant has been brought to the notice of this Court.

After hearing learned counsels for both parties, keeping in mind the entire facts and circumstances of the case, without commenting on merits, I find it a fit case for grant of bail.

ORDER

Accordingly, bail application is **allowed**. Let accused/applicant be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond of Rs. 70,000/- and one surety of like amount to the satisfaction of court concerned subject to filing an undertaking so as to abide by the conditions enumerated in Section 480(3) BNSS.

Date: 11.06.2026

(Malkhan Singh)
Sessions Judge,
Lucknow.