



2026:AHC:27104-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. WRIT PETITION No. - 1294 of 2026

Sanju @ Sanju Diwakar

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Dileep Kumar Shukla
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 45

HON'BLE RAJIV GUPTA, J.

HON'BLE ACHAL SACHDEV, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the record.
2. The instant writ petition seeks quashing of the FIR dated 25.12.2025, giving rise to Case Crime No. 175 of 2025, under Sections 85, 109(1), 115(2), 351(3) B.N.S., Police Station- Mahila Thana, District- Ghaziabad.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that from the allegation made in the first information report, prima facie no offence, complained of, is disclosed against the petitioner.
4. Per contra, learned AGA has submitted that the petitioner is husband of the respondent no. 4 and was married on 3.2.2025, however, after the said marriage, the petitioner started making additional demand of dowry and for non-fulfillment of demand of dowry, he used to torture her, maltreated her and subjected her to cruelty and turned her out from her matrimonial home and moreover from the allegations made in the first information report, prima facie offence, complained of is clearly disclosed against the petitioner and, as such, the first information report cannot be quashed in view of the law laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of ***State of Telangana Vs. Habib Abdullah Jellani reported in (2017) 2 SCC 779, Neeharika Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. vs. State of Maharashtra and Others reported in (2021) SCC Online SC 315*** and in a recent

decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Criminal Appeal No. 843 of 2024, Directorate Enforcement Vs. Niraj Tyagi and others.***

5. Having considered the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the the fact that the petitioner is husband of the respondent no. 4 and was married on 3.2.2025, however, after the said marriage, the petitioner started making additional demand of dowry and for non-fulfillment of demand of dowry, he used to torture her, maltreated her and subjected her to cruelty and turned her out from her matrimonial home and thus keeping in view the allegations made in the impugned F.I.R. and the relevant law cited by learned A.G.A. for the State and the fact that impugned F.I.R. prima facie discloses cognizable offence against the petitioner and noting the submissions made by learned AGA, we are of the opinion that impugned first information report can not be quashed.

6. The prayer for quashing the impugned FIR is, therefore, refused.

7. However, in case, the petitioner files an application for anticipatory/ regular bail before the appropriate Court, his bail application be considered and disposed of as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

8. With these observations, the instant writ petition is disposed of.

(Achal Sachdev,J.) (Rajiv Gupta,J.)

February 6, 2026

R