



2026:AHC:44125-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. WRIT PETITION No. - 3048 of 2026

Haji Tasleem

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Aditya Prasad Mishra
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 31.10.2025 giving rise to Case Crime No. 640 of 2025, under Sections 8/20 of Narcotics Drugs & Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, Police Station- Lohiya Nagar, District- Meerut.
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 has submitted that the petitioner is involved in as many as 65 criminal cases. Moreover, from the allegation 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, taking into consideration the allegations made in the impugned F.I.R., the relevant law cited by learned A.G.A. for the State and the fact that the petitioner is involved in as many as 65 other criminal cases and in view of the fact that the impugned F.I.R. prima facie discloses cognizable offence against the petitioner, we are of the opinion that impugned first information report cannot be quashed.

6. The prayer for quashing the impugned F.I.R. is, therefore, refused.

7. The writ petition lacks merit and it is accordingly, **dismissed**.

February 25, 2026

KS

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