



2026:AHC:21896-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (PIL) No. - 3421 of 2025

Raju Niramal and 4 others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and 8 others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Mahesh Prasad Pandey, Vinay Kumar Pandey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	Ramanand Pandey (A.C.S.C.)

Chief Justice's Court

HON'BLE ARUN BHANSALI, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE KSHITIJ SHAILENDRA, J.

1. This petition, purportedly in public interest, has been filed by the petitioners seeking direction to the respondents to inquire into the complaint made by the petitioners against respondents no. 6 to 9.
2. When the matter came up before the Court, the respondents were directed to ensure that the documents, as required, are made available to the inquiring authority and a report is produced.
3. The report has been produced, inter alia, indicating that the inquiry was conducted and after inquiry, the allegations made in the complaint were found to be incorrect. Further indications have been made that during course of conducting the inquiry, two groups started fighting among themselves and that insofar as the petitioners are concerned, they were absolutely unaware of the facts and apparently were acting at someone else's behest.
4. Counsel for the petitioners submits that he has material to indicate that the report, which has been given, is incorrect.
5. The petition essentially was filed seeking inquiry into the allegations made and now, once the inquiry report has been submitted, the same is sought to be challenged by the petitioners.
6. Insofar as the petition, as filed, is concerned, the same has been rendered infructuous. The petition is, therefore, dismissed as having

become infructuous.

7. However, if the petitioners, based on the report, have any other cause, they would be free to prosecute in accordance with law.

(Kshitij Shailendra, J) (Arun Bhansali, CJ)

February 2, 2026

RK/SL