



2026:AHC:51759-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. WRIT PETITION No. - 4637 of 2026

Vinod Rathor @ Vinod Kumar

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Shivajee Singh Sisodiya
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	G.A., Rahul Saxena

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, Sri Mukesh Joshi holding brief of Sri Rahul Saxena, learned counsel for respondent No. 4 and perused the record.
2. The instant writ petition seeks quashing of the FIR dated 4.2.2026 giving rise to Case Crime No. 0087 of 2026, under Sections 281, 125(a), 352, 109(1), 351(3), 324(2) of B.N.S., Police Station-Faridpur, District-Bareilly.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that petitioner is wholly innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case due to ulterior motive.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has 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 first information report qua the petitioner is liable to be quashed.
5. Per contra, learned AGA as well as learned counsel for the respondent No. 4 has vehemently opposed the said prayer and has submitted that petitioner has criminal history of as many as 16 cases and the petitioner while making good his escape on a vehicle, caused injuries to as many as three persons and some unknown persons also.
6. Learned counsel for the respondent No. 4 has next drawn the attention of the Court to the injury reports of the victims Prince Sharma, Omendra Chauhan and Raman Singh, who have been medically examined.
7. Learned counsel for the petitioners has next submitted that from the allegation made in the first information report, prima facie offence,

complained of is clearly disclosed against the petitioners 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 and 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.**

8. Having considered the rival submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that petitioner in an attempt to make good his escape on a vehicle caused injuries to three victims Prince Sharma, Omendra Chauhan and Raman Singh and other unknown persons, who have been medically examined and keeping in view the allegations made in the first information report and noting the injuries and the relevant law cited by the learned AGA and the fact that impugned first information report discloses cognizable offence, we are of the opinion that the impugned first information report cannot be quashed.

9. The prayer for quashing of the first information report is therefore, refused.

10. However, in case the petitioner files an application for anticipatory bail before the competent court, his bail application be considered and disposed of as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

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

March 13, 2026
KU

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