



2026:AHC:56755

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 41205 of 2025

Ravindra Singh Alias Chunnu

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	: Ajay Singh Yadav, Diwakar Shukla, Kuldip Singh Yadav
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	: G.A., Ram Lakhan Deobanshi

Court No. - 66
(Sl. No. 59 out of 116)

HON'BLE KRISHAN PAHAL, J.

1. List has been revised.
2. Heard Sri Diwakar Shukla, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri Ram Lakhan Deobanshi, learned counsel for the informant as well as Sri R.P. Patel, learned State Law Officer and perused the record.
3. This is the second bail application filed on behalf of the applicant seeking bail in **Case Crime No. 114 of 2024, under Sections 147, 148, 307, 323, 504, 506, 302, 34 of IPC, Police Station- Kishanpur, District - Fatehpur**, during the pendency of trial.
4. The first bail application of the applicant was rejected by this Court vide order dated 9.1.2025 passed in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 44913 of 2024.
5. Learned counsel for the applicant has submitted that the applicant had challenged the said order dated 9.1.2025 by filing SLP (Crl.) Diary No. 42909 of 2025 which was dismissed in limini and the applicant was granted opportunity to apply for bail if the trial is delayed.
6. Learned counsel has also stated that the applicant is in jail since 28.05.2024, as such, the period of incarceration is about one year and ten months. His fundamental rights enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India stands violated. In case, the applicant is released on bail, he will not misuse the liberty of bail and shall cooperate with trial.

7. Per contra, learned counsel for the informant and learned State Law Officer have vehemently opposed the bail application.

8. This Court had called for a report regarding the status of trial and in compliance thereof, a report has been submitted by the Trial Court concerned on 28.01.2026. As per the said report, ten witnesses have been examined to date, as such, the trial is at its conclusive end.

9. The Supreme Court in case of *X vs. State of Rajasthan & Anr.* reported in **2024 INSC 909**, has held that once the trial has commenced, it should be allowed to reach to its final conclusion, which may either result in conviction or acquittal of the accused. The bail should not be normally granted to the accused after the charge has been framed. It should also not be granted by looking into the discrepancies here or there in the deposition.

10. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties, the aforesaid judgement of Supreme Court and taking into consideration the fact that the trial is at its conclusive end as already ten witnesses have been examined coupled by the fact that the first bail application of the applicant was rejected by a coordinate Bench of this Court stood affirmed by the Supreme Court, I do not find it a fit case to release the applicant on bail.

11. The bail application is, accordingly, **rejected**.

12. However, it is directed that the aforesaid case pending before the trial court be decided expeditiously, in view of the principle laid down in the recent judgements of the Supreme Court in the cases of **Vinod Kumar vs. State of Punjab 2015 (3) SCC 220** and **Hussain and Another vs. Union of India (2017) 5 SCC 702**, if there is no legal impediment.

13. It is clarified that the observations made herein are limited to the facts brought in by the parties pertaining to the disposal of bail application and the said observations shall have no bearing on the merits of the case during trial.

March 19, 2026

Siddhant

(Krishan Pahal,J.)