

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT JUDGE, PRAYAGRAJ.
ADMIN. ORDER NO. 500

Dated: July 18, 2026

ORDER

While enclosing herewith a pdf copy of Judgment/Order dated 12.05.2026 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Judicature, at Allahabad in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 11009 of 2026 titled Rambabu Vishwakarma Vs. State of U.P. vide Hon'ble High Court's Letter No. 9046/Admin. G-II Dated 15.07.2026 Hon'ble Court has observed that bail applications are adjourned in Hon'ble Court because of non-mentioning of the criminal history of the accused by the counsel for the applicant for want of knowledge. Accordingly Hon'ble Court has directed that **the district courts, while disposing of bail applications, shall also mention the applicant's criminal antecedents** and instructions to communicate the directions of **Order/judgement dated 15.09.2025** passed by the **Hon'ble High Court** in the aforementioned Criminal Misc. Bail Application to all the Judicial Officers working under supervision and Administrative control of undersigned for information, has been provided.

II. In compliance of Hon'ble Court's above directions, following order is being passed with immediate effect:

- (a) The System Officer is directed to provide a soft/pdf copy of **Order/judgment dated 12.05.2026** passed by the **Hon'ble High Court** in the aforementioned Criminal Misc. Bail Application as well as Hon'ble High Court's Letter No. **9046/Admin. G-II Dated 15.07.2026** to all the Judicial Officers working under control of undersigned for information & strict compliance in letter & spirit.
- (b) A hard-copy of above mentioned Order dated **12.05.2026** passed by the **Hon'ble High Court** in the aforementioned Criminal Misc. Bail Application as well as Hon'ble High Court's Letter No. **9046/Admin. G-II Dated 15.07.2026** be also circulated among all the Judicial Officers working under control of undersigned for information & strict compliance in letter & spirit.
- (c) In compliance of order/judgement dated 12.08.2025 passed by Hon'ble High Court in CrI. Misc. Application u/s 528 BNSS No. 6400 of 2025 titled Smt. Bacchi Devi Vs State of UP And Another, a meeting of all Judicial Officers of the Judgeship is convened on **21.07.2026 at 4.35 PM**, in the **Meeting Hall**, situated at the II-Floor of Newly constructed 24-Court Room Building of District Court Prayagraj for discussion and deliberation regarding compliance of **order/Judgement dated 12.05.2026** passed by **Hon'ble High Court of Judicature, at Allahabad in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 11009 of 2026 titled Rambabu Vishwakarma Vs. State of U.P.** All the Judicial Officers of the Judgeship are directed to participate in the said meeting.

Inform all concerned for strict compliance.


(Satya Prakash Tripathi)
District & Sessions Judge
Prayagraj.

Dated: July 18, 2026



Through e-mail

From,

Manjeet Singh Sheoran, HJS
Registrar General
High Court of Judicature at
Allahabad

To,

All the District Judges/OSD
All the Principal Judges of Family Courts
All the Presiding Officers of MACTs, LARRAs and Commercial Courts
State of Uttar Pradesh

No. 9046 /Admin G-II dated 15/07/2026

Sub- Regarding compliance of the directions issued by this Hon'ble Court vide order dated 12.05.2026 passed in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 11009 of 2026, Rambabu Vishwakarma Vs State of UP

Madam/Sir,

During the course of hearing of aforesaid case, this Hon'ble Court vide order dated 12.05.2026 (pdf copy enclosed), has observed that bail applications are adjourned in this Court because of non-mentioning of the criminal history of the accused by the counsel for the applicant for want of knowledge.


Accordingly, Hon'ble Court has directed that **the district courts, while disposing of bail applications, shall also mention the applicant's criminal antecedents.**

You are, therefore, requested to communicate the directions issued by Hon'ble Court to all the Judicial Officers of your judgeship for their information and strict compliance.

Encl. As above

With Regards,

Yours faithfully,


Registrar General



2026:AHC:110041

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 11009 of 2026

Rambabu Vishwakarma

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Vijay Bahadur Shivhare
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A., Govind Singh Rajpoot, Kali Shanker Tiwari

Court No. - 67

HON'BLE ARUN KUMAR SINGH DESHWAL, J.

1. A personal affidavit has been filed by Sri Chandan Agarwal, learned AGA-Ist on behalf of Sri Mrigank Shekhar Pathak, S.P., Hamirpur. The same is taken on record.
2. Heard Sri Vijay Bahadur Shivhare, learned counsel for the applicant, Sri Kali Shanker Tiwari, learned counsel for the first informant and Sri Bhupendra Pal Singh, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the record.
3. The instant bail application has been filed with a prayer to release the applicant on bail in Case Crime No.244 of 2025, under Sections 103 (1), 109, 331(6), 332A BNS, Police Station-Rath, District-Hamirpur, during the pendency of the trial.
4. In compliance with the order of this Court dated 04.05.2026, S.P., Hamirpur has appeared before this Court in person and has filed his personal affidavit mentioning therein that there was a mistake on the part of his subordinate officers as the FSL report was itself dispatched through Sub-Inspector, Suryakesh Pandey, who came to the High Court for filing the affidavit in Criminal Misc. Writ Petition No.8457 of 2026, but he mistakenly did not hand over the FSL report to the Government Advocate, and in the enquiry, the SHO

concerned, as well as Sub-Inspector Suryakesh Pandey, were found to be negligent. Therefore, show cause notices have been issued against them. It is further mentioned in the aforesaid affidavit that he tenders an apology for the negligence on behalf of his department. Along with this personal affidavit of S.P., Hamirpur, a copy of the FSL report has been annexed, which shows that the blood-stained t-shirt of the applicant, as well as the tractor topline recovered from the applicant, had human blood. Though the court is satisfied with the explanation of S.P., Hamirpur, this court is of the view that the delay in disposal of the present bail is due to the negligent attitude of the police department by not providing the FSL report to this court despite the specific order, though the same was obtained by the police from the concerned FSL. The court expects S.P., Hamirpur, to be more careful in future.

5. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of *Sunny Chauhan Vs. State of Haryana, SLP (Crl) No.1613 of 2026* has highlighted the issue of delayed disposal of bail applications in different high courts particularly Allahabad High court, though Hon'ble Apex Court left it to the Hon'ble The Chief Justice and Administrative Committee of Allahabad High Court to decide the mechanism for definite date for hearing the bail application and suggested 'judicial resource aggregation' and directed that bail matters be prioritized in cause list.

6. Whenever we Judges inspect the jails, most of us encounter a question from jail inmates (specially by old and women inmates): 'Why are their bail applications not being decided by the High Court, and why are only dates being fixed?' (*tarikh-pe-tarikh*). This innocent question leaves us bewildered.

7. After hearing a number of bail applications, this Court also realized several reasons for the delay in disposal and pendency of bail applications in Allahabad High Court, which are mentioned below, along with suggestions:

(1) *Non-supply of instructions by the police to AGA, though*

*this court has directed in the case of **Ratvar Singh Vs. State of U.P.** reported in 2025 SCC OnLine All 8088, to sent the instruction and documents through online mode to the Joint Director (Prosecution), High Court Allahabad but the police department is still following procedure of sending the instructions manually through paiokar, though the case and other documents available on CCTNS (police portal) can be sent to office of 'Government Advocate through e-mail by downloading the same from CCTNS' till direct access of CCTNS is available to the Joint Director (Prosecution) through ICJS-2.0;*

(2) Adjournment of bail applications because of non-mentioning the criminal history of the accused by the counsel for the applicant for want of knowledge. Though this can be avoided if the district courts, while disposing of bail applications, also mention the applicant's criminal antecedents. If the counsel are aware of the criminal history from the bail rejection order, they can easily explain it based on the information available on the e-court services app, which contains details of cases uploaded by the district court from the stage of remand and cognizance.

(3) Sometimes a delay in the disposal of a bail application is caused by the incomplete preparation of the case, either by the Government Advocates or by learned counsel for the accused;

(4) It is a normal practice prevalent in Allahabad High Court and the same is also followed by some Benches that after hearing the bail application, if the court finds no case made out for bail then on the request of applicant's counsel, it calls for a counter affidavit instead of disposing of the bail application, the bail is then posted in a daily cause list after long period;

(5) The second bail applications are adjourned in a routine manner to enable the registry to connect the record of the first bail application, though the same can be done by immediately linking the record of the first bail application with the second bail application at the time of uploading the second bail application on DMS;

(6) If the bail applications of the co-accused are pending, then these pending applications should be linked with the bail application which has already been listed before the court, and a record of the same should be available on DMS, and the Bench hearing the listed bail application should automatically be authorised to hear the other connected bail applications in the same case crime number.

(7) Insufficient stenographer/Private Secretary to Hon'ble Judges is also one of the reasons for non-disposal of cases quickly."

8. The disposal of the present bail application is also delayed because the FSL report has not been provided by the police despite the direction of this Court.

9. Coming back to the merits of this case, learned counsel for the applicant has submitted that applicant was not named in the FIR and the injured, Anil Rajput in his statement made allegation against four unknown persons, who entered into the house and after assaulting him, killed his wife but the police has filed chargesheet only against the applicant merely on the basis of recovery of one blood stained t-shirt and blood stained tractor topline, though there is no eyewitness or CCTV footage showing the presence of the applicant while entering in the house of the deceased. It is further submitted that the applicant has explained the criminal history of four cases in the accompanying affidavit. It is further submitted that a charge sheet has been filed in the present case; therefore, there is no requirement for custodial interrogation. The applicant is a law-abiding citizen, and he has been languishing in jail since 29.05.2025. If he is granted bail, he will not misuse his liberty and will cooperate with the trial proceedings.

10. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the first informant and learned A.G.A. have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that as per the CCTV footage of the CCTV camera installed at the neighboring house of the applicant, presence of the applicant was found near the house of the deceased at 1:02 am on the date of the

incident and thereafter, when the applicant was arrested, a blood stained t-shirt as well as blood stained tractor toplink was recovered from his bag, to which the applicant was going to dispose of. The FSL report duly substantiates the presence of human blood on the t-shirt of the applicant as well as the tractor toplink recovered from him. It is lastly submitted that the applicant is a hardcore criminal, he is also involved in two other cases of murder, and he is also absconding in one of the cases, i.e. case crime no.128 of 2017, police station-Churkhi, district-Jalaun. Therefore, the applicant is not entitled to bail.

11. Considering the aforesaid submission and taking into account that at the time of incident, presence of the applicant was found near the house of the deceased, coupled with the recovery of blood stained t-shirt of the applicant as well as blood stained tractor toplink used in assaulting the injured as well as deceased and taking into account the criminal history of the applicant as well as the fact that the applicant is absconding in another case of murder, this court is not inclined to release the applicant on bail.

12. Therefore, the bail application of the applicant is **rejected**.

13. Personal appearance of the concerned S.P. is exempted.

14. Let a copy of this order be placed by Registrar (Compliance) before **Hon'ble The Chief Justice** for his Lordship's kind perusal and necessary action.

May 12, 2026
S.C.

(Arun Kumar Singh Deshwal,J.)