



2026:AHC:22338-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. WRIT PETITION No. - 29879 of 2025

Satyam Vishwakarma

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Suresh Dhar Dwivedi
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 has been filed by the petitioner with the prayer to quash the F.I.R. dated 23.07.2025 giving rise to Case Crime No. 154 of 2025, under Section 310(2) B.N.S., Police Station- Mataundh, District- Banda.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is wholly innocent and has been falsely implicated in the instant case due to ulterior motive. It is next submitted that from the allegation made in the first information report, no offence whatsoever is disclosed against the petitioner and, as such, the impugned F.I.R. is liable to be quashed.
4. Per contra, learned A.G.A. has vehemently opposed the said prayer and submitted that from the allegations made in the impugned first information report, prima facie offence is clearly disclosed against the petitioner, therefore, the impugned first information report can not be quashed.
5. Learned A.G.A. further placed reliance on the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex 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.***

6. Having considered the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and the relevant law cited by learned A.G.A. and taking into consideration the allegations made in the impugned first information report, we are of the opinion that prima facie, offence is clearly disclosed against the petitioner and as such, the impugned first information report cannot be quashed.

7. The prayer for quashing the impugned first information report is, therefore, refused.

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

9. With the aforesaid observations, the instant writ petition is **disposed of**.

February 2, 2026
KS

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