



2026:AHC:56041

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

**CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No.
- 1729 of 2026**

Mohd Yunus

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Atul Kumar Pandey
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A.

Court No. - 71

HON'BLE RAJIV LOCHAN SHUKLA, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned A.G.A. for the State as well as perused the record.

2. The present anticipatory bail application has been filed on behalf of the applicant in Case Crime No. 01 of 2026, under Section 2/3 of U.P. Gangsters and Anti Social Activities (Prevention) Act-1986, Police Station- Kotwali, District Pilibhit, (State Vs. Ahmad Nabi and Others) with a prayer to enlarge him on anticipatory bail, during the pendency of trial.

3. The Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. Learned counsel for the applicant states that on the basis of two base cases mentioned in the gang chart, proceedings of Gangsters Act have been initiated against the applicant. In both the cases, the applicant is on bail. The Learned counsel for the applicant further submits that co-accused Aqueel Ahmad, Mohd Farookh @ Chotu and Ahmad Nabi have already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide its orders dated 16.03.2026, 25.02.2026 and 25.02.2026 passed in **CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No. - 2492 of 2026 (Aqueel Ahmad Vs. State of U.P. and Another)**, **CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No. - 1432 of 2026 (Mohd Farookh @ Chotu Vs. State of U.P.)** and **CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No. - 1093 of 2026 (Ahmad Nabi Vs. State of U.P. and Another)**, respectively.

4. Learned A.G.A. has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail, however, has not disputed the fact that the applicant is on bail in the base cases mentioned in the gang chart against him. The Learned A.G.A. has also been unable to dispute the fact that the similarly situated co-accused have already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court.

5. I have considered the submissions made by the Learned counsels for the parties and perused the material brought on the record.

6. The applicant has been implicated in the present case on the strength of two base cases mentioned in the gang chart. Similarly situated co-accused Aqueel Ahmad, Mohd Farookh @ Chotu and Ahmad Nabi have already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide its orders dated 16.03.2026, 25.02.2026 and 25.02.2026 passed in **CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No.**

- 2492 of 2026 (*Aqueel Ahmad Vs. State of U.P. and Another*), CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No. - 1432 of 2026 (*Mohd Farookh @ Chotu Vs. State of U.P.*) and CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No. - 1093 of 2026 (*Ahmad Nabi Vs. State of U.P. and Another*), respectively. The applicant is not reported to be a previous convict in any of the case.

7. Taking into account the entire facts and circumstances as discussed above and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the applicant on anticipatory bail.

8. In view of the above, the anticipatory bail application of the applicant is *allowed*.

9. In the event of the arrest of the **applicant-Mohd Yunus**, he shall be released forthwith in the aforesaid case crime on anticipatory bail on furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Station House Officer of the police station/Court concerned with the following conditions:-

i. the applicant shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

ii. that 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 from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

iii. that the applicant shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

iv. that the applicant shall not pressurize/intimidate the prosecution witness;

10. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, the Court concerned shall be at liberty to cancel the bail.

11. It is made clear that observations made hereinabove are exclusively for deciding the instant anticipatory bail application and are not to be considered to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

March 18, 2026
Sachin

(Rajiv Lochan Shukla,J.)