



HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL CANCELLATION APPLICATION No. - 344
of 2026

Sandeep Singh Solanki

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Amit Shukla
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	Vijit Saxena, G.A.

Court No. - 66

HON'BLE ARUN KUMAR SINGH DESHWAL, J.

1. Heard Sri Nitish Kesherwani, Advocate holding brief of Sri Amit Shukla, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri Vijit Saxena, learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 and learned AGA for the Sate.

2. This matter was heard on 10.09.2026. On that date, counsel for the applicant had submitted that the present bail cancellation application has been filed to cancel the bail of opposite party no.2 on the ground that he has not deposited Rs.15 lakh as per undertaken at the time of releasing the opposite party no.2. It was also submitted by counsel for the applicant that the opposite party no.2 has filed a modification application in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No.3821 of 2026 to modify the condition to deposit of Rs.15 Lakh as the same was taken on the instruction of father of the accused-opposite party no.2, who was not aware about the actual transaction.

3. Learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 has submitted that after releasing the applicant on bail, he could not deposit the amount as per undertaking of his father and he also arrested in another case under Gangster Act on 07.05.2026. It is further submitted that he has moved an application

harassing the opposite party no.2 and his family and has threatened him not to pursue his application before the District Magistrate regarding compensation awarded by the High Court.

4. The above act of District Magistrate for sitting over the application for compensation moved by the opposite party no.2. is contemptuous. This Court is also not aware whether the Director General of Police, U.P. has taken any action against erring police officials in pursuance of the direction of this Court dated 19.02.2026 passed in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 3821 of 2026.

5. Therefore, the Director General of Police, U.P. is directed to submit instruction to learned AGA whether he has taken any action against the erring police officials in compliance of paragraph no.25 of the order of this Court dated 19.02.2026 passed in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 3821 of 2026.

6. This Court vide order dated 19.02.2026 passed in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 3821 of 2026 also directed that the Magistrate or CJM may randomly check the police stations, under their respective jurisdictions, after court hours regarding working of CCTV cameras installed in the police stations with prior intimation to their District Judges. Paragraph no.27 of the order dated 19.02.2026 is quoted as under;

"27. Therefore, this Court further observed that the CJMs of all the districts or the concerned Magistrates may randomly check the police stations, under their respective jurisdictions after court hours regarding the working of CCTV cameras in police stations, with prior intimation to their District Judge, and if the CJM or the Judicial Magistrate having territorial jurisdiction over the concerned police station inspects the concerned police station to check the CCTV camera to verify whether the directions of the Apex Court in the case of Paramvir Singh Saini (supra) has been complied that would be considered as part of his/her official duty. During this inspection, all the police officials shall cooperate with him and any hindrance or disrespect to any judicial officer will be dealt with strictly"

7. This Court further directed to circulate the aforesaid order to all the District Judges of U.P.

8. Mr. Nishant Singla, Joint Registrar (Inspection), High Court informed to

established law that the Judicial Order cannot be withheld by a Committee in an administrative side. This Court is of the view that if the Committee is of the view that order is not legally correct, it is within its jurisdiction to send the matter to the Litigation Committee to challenge the order.

10. As the issue of non-working of CCTV cameras in police station has not only been highlighted by the Apex Court in the case of **Paramvir Singh Saini vs Baljit Singh and others reported in (2021) 1 SCC 184** but recently the Division Bench of this Court in **Mahendra Gaur and others Vs State of U.P. and others passed in Habeas Corpus Writ Petition No.506 of 2026** as the issue is urgent in nature and affect the criminal justice administration. Therefore, this Court expect that the concerned Committee will take a call about the direction of this Court dated 19.02.2026 in Criminal Misc. Bail Application No.3821 of 2026 to circulate the same to all the District Judges of U.P.

11. On the request of learned counsel for the applicant, case is adjourned for the day.

12. List this case on 27th October, 2026 as fresh.

13. **Registrar (Compliance)** is directed to send a copy of this order the Director General of Police, U.P. as well as District Magistrate, Lalitpur for compliance.

October 8, 2026
A.Kr.

(Arun Kumar Singh Deshwal,J.)