



HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

**CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No.
- 1369 of 2026**

Mangu

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Prakash Veer Tripathi
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 72

HON'BLE JITENDRA KUMAR SINHA, J.

1. Heard Sri Prakash Veer Tripathi, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri Uma Shanker Mishra, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the record.
2. Present application has been moved seeking anticipatory bail in Case Crime No. 91 of 2017, under Sections 420 IPC, Police Station Masuri, District Ghaziabad with the prayer that in the event of arrest, applicant may be released on bail.
3. At the very outset, learned A.G.A. submits that he has not received any instructions as yet.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that applicant is innocent and he has an apprehension that he may be arrested in the above-mentioned case. He further submits that no offence is made out against the applicant and the FIR has been lodged after a delay of more than five years and as per FIR mother of the applicant and father of the first informant have entered into an agreement to sell the property. It is submitted that the registered power of attorney is said to have been executed in favour of the first informant, however, the applicant has sold the property to third person by concealing the earlier sale deed. It was also submitted that applicant undertakes to co-operate during trial and he would appear as and when required by the investigating agency or Court. It has been stated that in case, applicant is granted anticipatory bail, he shall not misuse the

liberty of bail and will co-operate with the investigation and would obey all conditions of bail.

5. First information report report has been lodged after delay of more than five years. As per FIR, the mother of the applicant and father of the first informant are said to have entered into an agreement to sell the property, however, the applicant is said to have executed the sale deed in favour of the third person.

6. It may be stated that in case of **Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra**, (2011) 1 SCC 694, it has been held by Hon'ble Supreme Court that while deciding anticipatory bail, the Court must consider nature and gravity of accusation, antecedent of accused, possibility of accused to flee from justice and that Court must evaluate entire available material against the accused carefully and that the exact role of the accused has also to be taken into consideration.

7. Considering the above submissions of the learned counsel for the applicant and without expressing any opinion on merits, the applicant- **Mangu** involved in the aforesaid case crime be released on **interim anticipatory bail** on his furnishing a personal bond of Rs. 50,000/- with two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Court concerned **till 31.3.2026** with the following conditions :-

(i) The applicant shall not tamper with evidence and that he would appear before the trial Court on the date fixed unless exempted by the Court concerned;

(ii) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her/them from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) The applicant would cooperate during trial and would not misuse the liberty of interim interim anticipatory bail bail.

(iv) The applicant shall not leave India without prior permission of the Court concerned.

8. In default of any of the conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to file appropriate application for cancellation of interim anticipatory bail granted to the applicant herein.

9. List this case as fresh on 31.3.2026.

10. In the meantime, learned AGA may obtain instructions in the matter.

(Jitendra Kumar Sinha,J.)

February 18, 2026

Abhishek